Faculty on the Lecturer in Discipline Track at the School of Engineering and Applied Science are members of the School’s faculty who are on a professional career track that allows the School to appoint valuable members who offer instruction, services, and leadership, and contribute to the educational mission of the School and who would otherwise be subject to the “up-or-out” rules and the ad hoc review system. Faculty members in these instructional roles are appointed at the rank of Associate, Lecturer in Discipline, or Senior Lecturer in Discipline. They are appointed for a stated term and may be part-time or full-time. The terms are renewable and are not subject to the limits on non-tenured service. However, they ordinarily may be appointed for more than six years only if they have successfully passed a major review that is conducted by the end of the fifth year. Lecturers in Discipline are not eligible for tenure and this track is different from the track for professors of professional practice (for more details, please see Columbia University Faculty Handbook http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/handbook/).

**Senior Lecturers in Discipline** are officers of instruction holding the doctorate or its professional equivalent who have substantial experience and accomplishments in teaching and academic services and leadership (including but not limited to curriculum development, development of pedagogical materials or technologies, student advising, outreach, etc). Such appointments are contingent upon the faculty member successfully passing the major reviews described below.

**Lecturers in Discipline** are normally officers holding the doctorate or its professional equivalent who have excellent teaching experience, and who have not yet attained that substantial achievement expected of a Senior Lecturer in Discipline.

**Associates** are officers who have a special competence in a given field but do not yet qualify for the title of Lecturer in Discipline.

**Statutory Terms for Appointment**

By University Statute, all initial appointments to a non-tenured rank are for one year only. Subsequent appointments may be for a term of one, two, or three years. Passage of the major review and subsequent continuing reviews carry the opportunity for reappointment for a term of up to five years.

The University may choose not to renew an appointment beyond its stated term because of budgetary considerations, changes in staffing needs, or less than optimal performance on the part of the candidate. In such cases, following a resolution adopted by the Senate on February 5th, 2016, the University must give written notice to the candidate according to the following schedule:

1) not later than March 1 before the end of the first year of service;
2) not later than December 15 before the end of the second year of service;
3) for faculty with up to six years of service, at least twelve months before the end of the stated term of their appointment;  
4) for faculty entering their seventh year of service, by May 31 of year six;  
5) for faculty with more than seven but fewer than twelve years of service, at least 18 months prior to the end of the stated term of their appointment.  
6) for faculty with 12 or more years of service, at least 24 months prior to the end of the stated term of their appointment.

Years of service are measured as years of service on full-time, multi-year appointments, and do not include service on adjunct (part-time) or one-year full-time appointments.

Procedures for Review

The procedures for reviews for faculty on the Lecturer in Discipline track are as follows. For simplicity, the year stipulated refers to the number of years of counted service. The following review schedule may be accelerated by mutual consent of the Dean and the faculty member undergoing review.

1. Confirming Review (First Year)
   
The first year of service at Columbia for all full-time faculty members of Lecturers in Discipline, regardless of rank, serves as a probationary period and a decision must be made whether or not to extend the statutory initial appointment. Reviews in the first year of service are essentially confirming reviews and are conducted by the review committee organized by the Chair. Those who successfully complete the probationary period may be extended through the fifth year, during which the Major Review is conducted. Those who do not are notified by the Dean in writing by March 1 that their appointment will not be renewed beyond June 30.

2. Major Review (Fifth Year after Initial Appointment)
   
   This review evaluates whether or not a candidate has gained substantial experience and made substantial accomplishments in teaching, services, and/or leadership in a field that is vital and important to the School and the University. The process of major review, therefore, is concerned both with the state and objectives of the School and with the qualities of the nominee.

   No later than the end of the fifth year of counted appointment, faculty members on the Lecturer in Discipline track undergo a Major Review whose outcome is either an offer of a up to five-year renewal appointment or written notice of nonrenewal after a sixth and terminal year of appointment. No faculty member on this track may hold an appointment on the Lecturer in Discipline track (regardless of ranks) for more than six counted years of service without successfully passing the Major Review. The School is under no obligation to conduct a major review, and the passage of major review is approved only if an individual of widely recognized excellence is found to fill a scholarly and programmatic need that is demonstrably vital to a discipline and central to the University’s purposes. The decision whether a successful major review appointment in the candidate’s field meets the School’s scholarly/programmatic needs is
customarily made by the Executive Committee in the fourth year; the review of the candidate’s qualifications begins only after a positive decision is made on this issue.

Those who will not be put up for major review during their fifth year must receive written notification by at least twelve months before the end of the stated term of their appointment.

Those who have had four or more years of continued service by the time this policy is adopted will have their Major Review deadline extended until one year after adoption of the policy.

Candidates should be evaluated for the following qualities:

1) superlative record of teaching;
2) achievement and/or innovation in support of the School’s pedagogical mission, which may include (but need not be limited to) teaching core or other large, multi-section courses; advising and mentoring students and managing educational programs; developing and improving elements of the School’s curriculum; contributing to the development of teaching materials and innovative teaching practices; writing new textbooks or creating new teaching materials; conducting outreach educational activities; or developing methodological advances in teaching;
3) demonstrated excellence in carrying out service to the School, such as contributing to the training and professional development of teaching assistants, and other faculty, particularly lecturers in Discipline and adjunct faculty; conduct outreach activities; and/or serving on school and university committees;
4) demonstrated recognition in the profession as evidenced by contributions in the areas of teaching, service, and leadership.

**Procedures for Review**

The candidate should submit a complete, up-to-date curriculum vitae, as well as a full statement of accomplishments, current activities and future plans related to teaching, service, and leadership. The candidate also should include copies of syllabus and other written work if available. Evidence of teaching performance, including teaching evaluations, should be provided to the ad hoc committee.

The department should organize two classroom observations (one announced and one unannounced) by senior faculty members who have substantial teaching experience in areas related to the candidate (preferably one within the department and one from outside). Comprehensive reports of the observation should be prepared and included in the dossier submitted to the ad hoc committee.

The department should submit a comprehensive letter including analysis of the performance of the candidate and justification for the recommendation of the review.

The Senior Executive Vice Dean will appoint a school-level ad hoc committee consisting of three senior faculty members. The members of the ad hoc committee are responsible for reading the candidate’s dossier and all materials. The ad hoc committee may request additional
information from the department or seek information on its own to form the basis of its assessment of the department’s recommendation. The ad hoc committee will report in writing on its recommendation and vote, whether positive or negative to the Dean.

Once the ad hoc committee has voted to recommend successful passage of major review and/or promotion to a higher title on the same track, the Dean will make the final decision based on the candidate’s dossier and the impact of the decision on the academic mission of the institution. The Dean will then notify the faculty member in writing about the outcome of the review.

Successful passage of the Major Review provides the opportunities of a renewal appointment of up to five years and promotion to a higher appointment rank (e.g., Senior Lecturer in Discipline).

Reasons for non-renewal may be based upon, but not limited to, the following:

a. Evidence of continuous and on-going unsatisfactory teaching performance.
b. Failure to maintain an active professional involvement at a high level of excellence as evidenced by the review.
c. A shift in the ongoing and future goals, needs, specializations, and practices of the School’s curriculum that cannot be adequately met or fulfilled by the faculty member.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer in Discipline**

Promotion from Lecturer in Discipline to Senior Lecturer in Discipline may be considered immediately after successful completion of the Major Review, or some time afterwards with a new review following the same process for the Major Review. The completion of a successful Major Review does not necessarily entail promotion to senior lecturer in Discipline. No promotions in rank or title are possible beyond Senior Lecturer in Discipline. Promotion to senior lecturer in Discipline does not entail tenure. Promotion of a lecturer in Discipline to senior lecturer in Discipline may not normally be made before completing three years of service. The Dean, in consultation with the Sr. Executive Vice Dean, determines if and when to recommend promotion to senior lecturer in Discipline.

**3. Subsequent Renewals**

After successfully passing the major review, a faculty member on the Lecturer in Discipline track will be eligible for multiple renewable contracts of two to five years in each renewal, subject to an appropriate review, to be conducted no later than the fifth year after the previous review. The Chair will appoint a three-person review committee to conduct a review and make a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the department. All committee members will be tenured faculty or faculty on the Lecturer in Discipline Track with a title higher than the title of the candidate.

The candidate should submit a complete, up-to-date curriculum vitae, as well as a full statement of professional, teaching and service accomplishments, current activities and future plans. Teaching evaluation should be submitted, along with copies of syllabus and other written work if
available. The statement should document work during the period since the passage of the previous review.

The review committee will consider the candidate’s ongoing professional work; teaching; and contributions to the School and the University at large. It may obtain outside letters of reference and make inquiries of experts in the field; however, it is not required to do so. Upon completion of its review, the committee will prepare a written assessment of the faculty member and make a recommendation on reappointment. The recommendation on reappointment is forwarded to the Executive Committee for consideration and vote. The results of the Executive Committee decision are forwarded to the Dean, who makes the final decision about renewal. The Dean informs the candidate in writing of the results of the reviews.