

**INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN’S, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES
LECTURER REVIEW AND PROMOTION POLICY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Lecturers must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Review of Lecturers and Promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the College policy takes precedence.

Overview

Lecturers are a vital component of our faculty. The review and promotion process for lecturers is intended to reflect their unique mission in our program, primarily focused on instruction and service. While promotion to senior lecturer is not equivalent to tenure, such a promotion indicates the carefully adjudicated decision made by the Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) that such faculty are extremely valuable and effective members of our program and that they are colleagues with whom we hope to have a long-term affiliation. The following descriptions of criteria, standards, and processes involved in retention and promotion are intended to illustrate what we expect of those hired as lecturers, and how we evaluate them so as to ensure that we recognize and retain those with exceptional instructional records.

The following material describes WGSS-specific interpretations and implementations of the College lecturer policy, including details about compiling and evaluating dossiers for the annual, third-year and fifth-year reviews.

Annual Review

All lecturers are reviewed annually for contract renewal, as these positions are not tenure-track and are not intended to become so. Lecturers who are reappointed after five years of consecutive service can be promoted to senior lecturer, to begin in their seventh year of service. Lecturers not reappointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year. Reappointment of lecturers is dependent not only on their performance in instruction and service, but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of the WGSS. Since annual reviews and annual contract renewal reviews are distinct from the third-year and fifth-year reviews in that they involve different evaluating bodies, different materials, and different time spans, one may not be able to make a reliable inference from the annual reviews to the results of the third-year and fifth-year review.

At the beginning of each calendar year, by a date specified by the director, each lecturer submits to the director:

- (1) an annual report for the previous calendar year, following College guidelines;
- (2) a teaching portfolio, as outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-time Faculty;
- (3) a listing of service activities, which may include such activities as advising and serving the academic needs of students; administrative assignments that constitute part of

assigned workload; service to the WGSS, college, or university; or community service that relates to professional expertise; and
(4) a narrative statement discussing achievements in teaching and service, future goals for each, and, if appropriate, an assessment of what is needed from WGSS to support the accomplishment of these goals.

The WGSS annual review committee reviews each lecturer's materials and, by a date specified by the director, provides to the director a rating of each lecturer in instruction and service and a brief statement explaining the most significant factors that affected the ratings. The rating for instruction shall employ the evaluative categories listed in Appendix I. The rating for service shall reflect an evaluation of the lecturer's degree of diligence and level of effectiveness, as discussed in the section on Service later in this policy.

The WGSS director comments in writing on the annual review committee's report and forwards both to the Dean's Office. It shall be open to the director to suggest mentoring of lecturers for the sake of improving their instruction and/or service.

The Dean's Office will evaluate the recommendation and provide the lecturer with its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal. In accordance with University guidelines, the lecturer will receive the results of the review in writing.

Third and Fifth Year Formal Reviews: Comparison

The third-year and fifth-year reviews proceed according to a timeline set by the College and are based on a cumulative dossier submitted by lecturers which includes materials about all accomplishments since their initial appointment. While both reviews require a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of the lecturer's instructional and service contributions, the third-year review also offers an opportunity for colleagues to provide appropriate mentoring and guidance to a lecturer seeking reappointment. Thus, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year review, intended to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, a lecturer's achievements to date, and to generate advice about possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review. Lecturers must be rated as at least **very good** in instruction and as having provided **high quality** service to be recommended for reappointment at the time of their third-year review. Lecturers must be rated as at least **excellent** in instruction and as having provided **high quality** service in order to be recommended for promotion to Senior Lecturer at the time of their fifth-year review.

College Timeline for Third-Year Review

According to College Policy, by the fourth week of the spring semester, lecturers in their third year will provide dossier materials to the director, such materials as defined in later sections of this document. By the sixth week of the spring semester, the director will provide the dossier materials to an elected committee, composed of three or more faculty members, at least one of whom is tenured, and all of whom are either tenure-track or senior lecturers. By the tenth week of the spring semester, the committee will provide to

the director a written assessment of the lecturer's effectiveness in instruction and service based on the dossier materials. By the thirteenth week of the spring semester, the director will forward to the Dean's Office the lecturer's dossier materials, the review committee's assessment, the director's assessment of the lecturer's effectiveness in instruction and service, and the director's assessment of the WGSS's programmatic need for the position. The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and provide to the lecturer its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal.

College Timeline for Fifth-Year Review

The fifth-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis toward identifying lecturers who have a record of excellence in instruction and high-quality service. According to College policy, by the fourth week of the spring semester, lecturers in their fifth year will provide dossier materials to the director, such materials as defined in later sections of this document. By the sixth week of the spring semester, the director will provide the lecturer's dossier materials to WGSS's fifth-year lecturer review committee, which will consist of senior lecturers and tenured faculty. By the tenth week of the spring semester, the committee will provide to the director a written assessment of the lecturer's effectiveness in instruction and service. By the thirteenth week of the spring semester, the director will provide to the Dean's Office the lecturer's dossier materials, the review committee's assessment, the director's assessment of the lecturer's effectiveness in instruction and service, and the director's assessment of WGSS's programmatic need for this position.

Following College policy, an elected College Lecturer Review Committee will be composed of at least five tenured faculty and senior lecturers, who must include one from each of the departments or institutes with a lecturer under review in the current year, and at least one from each of the four areas of the College (Natural and Computational Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts). This committee will review the lecturer's dossier materials, and, by June 15, make a recommendation to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and provide to the lecturer its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal.

Materials to Be Submitted for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Instruction

Only those lecturers judged at least **excellent** in instruction can be considered for promotion to senior lecturer. To demonstrate their abilities as instructors, lecturers should collect written evidence of their teaching effectiveness. Along with a list of courses taught and syllabi, tests, handouts, and descriptions of class activities for each course, lecturers should include a statement of their philosophy of teaching, and a description of the objectives and goals of their professional and intellectual development. In addition, the dossier could include the following: copies of assignments prepared for classes; copies of graded student work, showing the lecturer's notes and advice written to the student; accounts of scores and written comments on student evaluations; proposals for

new courses; copies of prize-winning student work, descriptions of internships, senior research projects, or independent study carried out under their supervision; evidence of former students' success in subsequent academic work or in class-related work done after graduation; copies of letters of recommendation written for students; and descriptions of recognition, such as invitations to attend events held to honor outstanding teachers. Lecturers should get permission from all students whose papers they include in the dossier, and they should not include solicited letters from students.

Professional Development

Evidence of professional development is not required for lecturers but may be included in the dossier at the lecturer's discretion. We recognize that a faculty member who is engaged in professional projects is often able better to convey to students pedagogical insights into writing, research, theory, and other interdisciplinary matters, and it is in these respects that the lecturer's professional development materials may affect his or her rating in instruction. It should be emphasized, however, that it is entirely possible to attain a rating of "excellent" in instruction without a professional development record.

Service

The WGSS values the service rendered by lecturers. **High quality** service is required of successful candidates for senior lecturer. To demonstrate their service, candidates for promotion should collect and provide written evidence of their diligence and effectiveness. They should include in the dossier a list of committees served on, with brief descriptions of the work performed on each committee, such as reports or other documents prepared by the lecturer. As applicable to their particular circumstances, lecturers may add further materials documenting their service; for instance, a description of service in various administrative roles, such as Director of Undergraduate Studies (with a letter from the supervising director); evidence of assistance to colleagues and graduate students, such as participation in teaching seminars, work as a mentor, guest lecturing, or help with a web site; evidence of assistance to student clubs or honor societies; evidence of university or community service related to teaching or professional development; or descriptions of work at planning or participating in conferences. Lecturers should document any arrangements made upon their initial appointment (or later) for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. They should not include solicited letters from colleagues or community members.

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Instruction

An evaluation of **poor** or **fair** describes, respectively, an unacceptable or minimally acceptable record of instruction. The lecturer's marginal effectiveness as a teacher should be clearly evident in documents that rate performance, such as student evaluations and other supporting materials included in the lecturer's dossier.

An evaluation of **good** describes a performance that barely exceeds adequate. The lecturer's supporting material provides evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a university instructor. The lecturer's level of performance should be clearly evident in such documents as student evaluations and other materials included in the dossier.

An evaluation of **very good** describes the performance of a highly competent lecturer whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and enthusiastic instruction but also of conscientious mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a strong commitment to the mission of WGSS. The lecturer's effectiveness as a teacher should be clearly evident in documents that rate performance, such as student evaluations and other materials included in the dossier.

An evaluation of **excellent** indicates that the lecturer's performance and supporting material demonstrate the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the WGSS. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, including exceptional preparation, demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, and clear grading standards. The lecturer's superior effectiveness as a teacher should be evident in documents that rate performance, such as student evaluations and other materials included in the dossier. Finally, the materials in the dossier should demonstrate a vibrant intellectual life consistent with the academic responsibilities of a university faculty member.

An evaluation of **outstanding** acknowledges the work of a lecturer whose accomplishments exceed the criteria for excellent and who demonstrates a superb ability to communicate these skills and accomplishments. The lecturer's supporting materials must demonstrate nearly flawless reports on teaching, exceptional preparation for classes, and extensive mentoring of students. This rare lecturer must be recognized among students and colleagues as one of the best--most effective and committed--teachers in the WGSS, a recognition that should probably include honors or awards for teaching.

Service

According to College policy, lecturers must be evaluated as providing **high quality** service in order to be eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Specifically,

An evaluation of **high quality** service is granted to lecturers who have been **diligent** in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them and have performed all assigned tasks in a thorough and timely manner) and who have been **effective** (e.g., who have performed well in the service duties assigned to them and whose documents relating to service were clear, accurate and useful).

Appendix I:

Format and Contents for 3rd and 5th Year Review Dossier:

Lecturers under third-year and fifth-year review submit to the director a dossier that includes information about all accomplishments since their initial GSU appointment.

I. Cover page includes lecturer's name, WGSS and/or other departmental affiliations, date(s) of appointment at Georgia State University as lecturer, visiting or temporary lecturer, instructor, visiting instructor, part-time instructor, or graduate teaching assistant, as well as information about leaves of absences.

II. Curriculum vitae immediately follows the cover page.

III. Information on Instruction includes

A. Statement of instructional interests, qualifications, brief description of educational philosophy, a set of goals and objectives for the next several years, and a list of courses and/or areas the lecturer is qualified to teach.

B. Courses Taught during the period under review, listed according to College guidelines.

C. Teaching Portfolio according to College guidelines.

D. Student Evaluations with student comments and a summary of questions 1-17 on the standardized College end-of-term course evaluation for every course taught in the period under review. Some brief explanation of the background and context of the courses taught to provide insight into the results of the evaluations may also be included.

E. Newly Developed Courses and Instructional Programs (if applicable) may include participating in materials and curriculum development projects, organizing or presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogy.

F. Instructional Service lists activities that provide learning for students beyond the lecturer's teaching assignment. Examples could include guest lecturing, supervision of internships, senior research projects or independent studies, observing instructional efforts of graduate teaching assistants, and offering oral and written feedback, working with graduate students in or outside of specific graduate courses, or training graduate teaching assistants.

G. Published Materials (if applicable) could include articles, textbooks, creative activities, or other publications that have a bearing on the lecturer's instructional performance.

H. Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction (if applicable).

IV. Information on Service includes

A. Instructional Service lists activities that provide education of faculty, such as supervising and/or mentoring faculty, organizing or leading faculty workshops.

B. Assistance to colleagues could include assisting and consulting with colleagues about educational/teaching issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, or assistance with new instructional technology), providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts or grant applications, and helping with or collaborating on research projects.

C. Contributions to WGSS and College such as serving as a member or chair of a committee, planning and/or developing programs or activities, offering student advisement and mentoring.

D. Contributions to the University such as serving as a member or chair of a committee or representing the University at outside functions.

E. Professional Service such as involvement with and work for professional organizations, conferences, including serving as a volunteer, member, officer, board or committee member, or other administrative positions.

F. Community Service activities related specifically to lecturer's area of competence, including, but not limited to, such activities as publishing articles in newspapers, serving on boards, giving lectures, speeches, presentations, media interviews or workshops for community groups.