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Lecturers must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Review of Lecturers and Promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the College manual takes precedence.
Overview

The Department of Applied Linguistics & ESL at Georgia State University is careful to hire the best lecturers and has every expectation that these lecturers will meet or exceed the requirements for contract renewals. To that end, the department is committed to strongly supporting the work of its lecturers so that they may contribute to the work of the department, the College, and the University.

This document describes the processes for annual review, third- and fifth-year review of lecturers, and the promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer. Lecturers are reviewed annually for contract renewal. In addition, lecturers are reviewed in their third and fifth year of service. Lecturers who are reappointed after five years of consecutive service will 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.

In the review processes, the primary consideration is contributions in instruction and service. Instruction includes teaching students, both inside and outside the classroom environment. Service includes advising and serving the academic needs of students. Service is normally at the departmental and college levels, but this may include university service. Professional service as well as public service involving professional expertise is also relevant. Other activities, such as publications of research and scholarship, are not required by the College; however, the department considers such activities in the reviews of lecturers, particularly as they bear on instructional performance.

Reappointment of lecturers and promotion of lecturers to senior lecturers are dependent not only on lecturer performance in instruction and service but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of the College and its units.

Since annual 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 fifth-year review.

See the following documents for more information on the review processes:

http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/lect/lect_as.pdf (Manual For Review Of Lecturers And Promotion Of Lecturers To Senior Lecturers, College of Arts & Sciences, Georgia State University)

http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/lect/lect_gsu.pdf (Georgia State University “Policy on Lecturers”)

http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf (Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness, College of Arts & Sciences, Georgia State University)
I. Annual Reviews

A. Annual Review Process

1. At the beginning of each calendar year, by a date specified by the department chair provided by the College, each lecturer

   • submits to the department chair an annual report for the previous calendar year, following College guidelines.

   • submits to the department chair an Instruction and Service Portfolio, which includes (a) a curriculum vitae; (b) an annual report for the previous calendar year, following College guidelines; and (c) other documentation as outlined in this document.

2. Lecturers in the department are often assigned administrative responsibilities as part of their workload. Lecturers should detail in their review documents specific instructional and service activities related to their assignments. For example, a lecturer who is responsible for coordinating the IEP/ESL tutoring lab should detail both the instructional and the service aspects of the assignment. In this case, “training provided to tutors” would be detailed as instruction while “tutor-schedule coordinating” would be included as service.

3. The department chair reviews materials for conformity to College guidelines and this document. Materials that do not meet the required standards are returned to the lecturer. Accepted materials are given to a department annual review committee.

4. Each portfolio is reviewed by a departmental Lecturer Annual Review Committee comprised of a member of the Executive Committee appointed by the Chair and two Senior lecturers, as indicated in the department bylaws.

5. The chair of the Lecturer Annual Review Committee is appointed by the department chair.

6. No committee member shall participate in her/his own evaluation.

7. The Lecturer Annual Review Committee provides to the department chair (a) a rating of each lecturer in both instruction and service and (b) a brief statement explaining the most significant factors that affected the ratings.

8. Ratings for instruction shall employ the following evaluative categories: outstanding (6), excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), and poor (1). The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. For information on rating descriptors, see Appendices B and C.

9. The specific nature of the instructional and service activities varies based on the needs of the department and the workload assignments of the lecturer. Thus, the distribution of effort across different instructional and service activities may vary, and the Lecturer Annual Review Committee should assess the effectiveness of the Lecturer across the full range of activities.
10. The department chair provides each lecturer with a written report of the results of the annual review and returns the portfolios to the Lecturers. Each lecturer signs a form to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation and has the right to respond in writing to the evaluation. Both the evaluation and any written response will be submitted by the department chair to the Dean’s office and a copy of the written response will be kept in the faculty’s file.

11. It shall be open to the department chair, if s/he sees fit, to discuss with the Lecturer Annual Review Committee the grounds for the ratings and, as appropriate, to discuss these ratings with the appropriate program director and to mentor or suggest mentoring of faculty for the sake of improving their instruction and/or service.

12. Lecturers’ assessments will be taken into consideration when recommending merit and equity raises.

B. Annual Review Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review documents are due: curriculum vitae, annual report, Instruction and Service portfolio</td>
<td>January-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair provides annual review committee with documents.</td>
<td>February-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual review committee provides ratings and brief statement explaining the most significant factors that affected the ratings to department chair.</td>
<td>Week 11, spring term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair submits assessment information to the Dean’s office.</td>
<td>Week 13, spring term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair provides each lecturer with a written report of the results of the annual review and returns the Instruction and Service portfolio to the lecturer.</td>
<td>Conclusion of spring term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Format of the Instruction & Service Portfolio: Annual Review

1. For annual review, at the beginning of each calendar year, by a date specified by the department chair, each lecturer submits to the department chair an Instruction and Service Portfolio. The portfolio must contain the following in this order:

   a. Cover page, which includes the lecturer’s name, department, and dates under review (e.g., January-December 20xx).

   b. Curriculum vitae, which follows the conventions in the field.

   c. Annual report for the previous calendar year, following College guidelines.

   d. Information on instruction, using the instructional categories and descriptions listed in this document.

   e. Information on service, using the service categories and descriptions listed in this document.
2. All materials must be placed in a 3-ring, large capacity binder. Each section should be clearly separated from the others by dividers. Staples or paper clips should not be used in the compilation of materials. Binders should not be filled to capacity.

3. At the completion of the annual review process, portfolios will be returned to lecturers.

D. Categories for Instruction: Annual Review Portfolio

For the annual review process, lecturers must submit written evidence of effective instruction, divided into the following categories: (a) courses taught/syllabi, (b) student evaluations, (c) teaching portfolios, (d) new courses, new teaching practices, and other contributions to instructional programs, (e) instructional service, (f) published materials, and (g) honors or special recognition for instruction. This information should be compiled as part of the lecturer’s Instruction and Service Portfolio. A description of each instructional category follows:

1. Courses Taught/Syllabi. Using the following format, the lecturer must provide a list of the courses taught during the previous calendar year (see Appendix A). In addition, the lecturer must provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught during the previous calendar year. Only one syllabus for each different course should be included.

2. Student Evaluations. The lecturer must include standardized College end-of-term course evaluations for every course taught during the previous calendar year, provided those evaluations are available at the time of the review. Student comments can be included, if desired by the lecturer. The lecturer may also include some brief explanation of the background and context of the courses taught to provide insight into the results of the evaluations.

3. Teaching Portfolios. In accordance with College policy, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses, one a specialty course and one a more general course, as appropriate to the lecturer’s teaching assignments. The lecturer may include supplementary materials to demonstrate teaching preparation, effectiveness of pedagogical methodology, and pedagogical creativity. These materials may include web pages or other evidence of innovative uses of technology for instruction, a selection of customized course handouts and assignments, descriptions of learning activities, assessment instruments, other written/visual evidence of course-generated student projects, selected samples of students’ work that illustrates their improvement in the course, and written suggestions for revisions to standardized syllabi (original written suggestions should be given to the appropriate program director). Supplementary materials should demonstrate the range, variety, and levels of courses the lecturer has taught.

4. Newly Developed Courses and Instructional Programs (if appropriate). Examples may include participating in materials and curriculum development projects, organizing or presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogy (e.g., short-term training of English-language teachers), and starting conversational exchange partnerships with university and ESL students. In addition, in-progress publications related to the lecturer’s professional area(s) of expertise may be included.
5. **Instructional Service.** The lecturer should provide a list of activities that are of “instructional service” nature that provide learning for students beyond the lecturer’s teaching assignment. Examples may include guest-lecturing in graduate courses, serving as a cooperating teacher who mentors graduate students in connection with the Practicum course, observing the instructional efforts of graduate students, visiting lecturers/instructors and part-time instructors and offering oral and written feedback, working with students in or outside of specific courses, working with students/faculty on research projects. In addition, lecturers should include examples of instructional service related to assigned administrative responsibilities in the department, such as overseeing student directed readings, coordinating/administering special programs/internships/study abroad, training graduate teaching assistants about classroom issues, providing special topics sessions/workshops for students, joining volunteer student groups on field trips to learn about U.S. culture (e.g., food bank, retirement home), training graduate students about ESL tutoring, serving as advisor of a student organization.

6. **Published Materials** (if appropriate). Articles, textbooks, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the lecturer’s professional expertise may be included.

7. **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction** (if appropriate). Honors or other special recognition of the quality of a lecturer's instruction should be listed.

### E. Categories for Service: Annual Review Portfolio

1. For the annual review process, lecturers must submit written evidence of service activities, divided into the following categories: (a) instructional service, (b) assistance to colleagues, (c) contributions to the department and college, (d) contributions to the university, (e) professional service, (f) community service, and (g) public service. This information should be compiled as part of the lecturer’s Instruction and Service Portfolio. Lecturers should only include categories in which they have provided service.

2. Contributions that are listed in the instruction section of a lecturer’s portfolio must not be included in the service section.

3. A description of each service category follows:

**a. Peer Instructional Service.** Lecturers should provide a list of activities of an “instructional service” nature that provide formal, scheduled training of faculty. Examples may include supervising and/or mentoring faculty, organizing or leading faculty workshops, etc. Semester of service should be included.

**b. Assistance to Colleagues.** Lecturers should list their ad hoc efforts in assisting colleagues. These include consulting 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 or collaborating on research projects. Semester of service should be included.

**c. Contributions to the Department and College.** Lecturers should list their contributions to the department and college, including directing a program (IEP, ESL, undergraduate, graduate), serving as a member of or chairing a committee, planning and/or developing departmental/college activities, offering student advisement and mentoring, and any other
assistance not part of committee duties. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

d. **Contributions to the University.** Lecturers should list their contributions to the University, including serving as a member or chairing a committee or representing the University at outside functions. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

e. **Professional Service.** Lecturers should list their involvement with and work for other organizations. This includes serving as a volunteer, member, officer, or consultant for a nonprofit or business organization as GSU faculty with specialization in language learning, teaching, or analysis. This also includes volunteering or presenting at professional conferences, and serving as a regular officer, board or committee member, member of the local arrangements committee for a conference, or other administrative positions in professional associations. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

f. **Community Service.** Lecturers should list their community activities, limited to involvement related specifically to their area of competence. These include activities such as serving as a volunteer teacher for refugee groups; organizing volunteer student groups to work with food banks and other groups; giving lectures, speeches, presentations, or workshops for community groups; giving media interviews; or publishing articles in newspapers in their area(s) of professional expertise. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

g. **Public Service.** Lecturers should list assistance related to their area of competence given to government agencies or public officials (e.g., serving on or consulting for task forces or advisory committees) or given to develop or enhance community, state, or national resources. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

**F. First-Year Review Decisions & Timeline**

During the first year of a lecturer’s service as lecturer, reappointment is permitted if the lecturer has demonstrated competent teaching ability and value to the department.

| Lecturer’s teaching ability and value to the department is assessed by the department Executive Committee in consultation with the department chair and the director of any program in which the lecturer teaches or serves. | Beginning of spring term |
| Department chair provides a written report of the lecturer’s review to the Dean’s office. | Beginning of spring term |
| 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. | Beginning of spring term (around February 1) |
II. Third- and Fifth-Year Reviews

A. Third-Year Review Process

1. A formal review is made in the spring term of the third academic year of a lecturer’s service as lecturer.

2. The third-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of instructional and service contributions made by the lecturer. The review provides an opportunity for colleagues to review the lecturer’s accomplishments and to provide appropriate mentoring assistance and guidance to a lecturer seeking reappointment at the fifth-year review. The third-year cumulative review is distinguished from the annual review in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments while still permitting time for changes in orientation and activity of the individual involved.

3. The third-year review employs the following categories for the evaluation of instruction: outstanding (6), excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), poor (1). The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. Contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the department, college, or university, professional service, and community and public service. Service for lecturers is dependent on the mission as defined by the department, but it is generally at the departmental or college level. Some lecturers in the department may be assigned primarily service responsibilities by the department chair depending on the needs of the department and its units. For information on rating descriptors, see Appendices B and C.

4. For recommendation for reappointment the following year, a lecturer under third-year review should receive an evaluation of at least very good in instruction and be rated as having high quality service.

B. Third-Year Review of Lecturers Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers provide all required materials to the Chair/Director.</td>
<td>(4th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Director provides all materials to departmental review committee. This is an elected committee composed of at least 3 tenured faculty and senior Lecturers, with at least 1 being a tenured faculty member.</td>
<td>(5th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee provides its written assessment to the Chair/Director.</td>
<td>(9th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Director forwards all materials, the committee's report and his/her comments to Dean's Office, including as assessment of the departmental need for this position.</td>
<td>(11th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office provides lecturer with reappointment Decision designated by the Board of Regents.</td>
<td>August 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After all assessments, a conference will be held between the chair, associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and make further recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


C. Fifth-Year Review Process

1. A formal review is made in the spring term of the fifth academic year of a lecturer’s service as lecturer.

2. The fifth-year review addresses the lecturer’s cumulative accomplishments in instruction and in service. The review is to provide a cumulative analysis towards identifying lecturers who have a record of excellence in instruction and high-quality service.

3. The fifth-year review employs the following categories for the evaluation of instruction: outstanding (6), excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), poor (1). The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. Contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the department, college, or university, professional service, and community and public service. Service for lecturers is dependent on the mission as defined by the department, but it is generally at the departmental or college level. Some lecturers in the department may be assigned primarily service responsibilities by the department chair depending on the needs of the department and its units. For information on rating descriptors, see Appendices B and C.

4. For recommendation for reappointment following the fifth-year review and for promotion to senior lecturer, a lecturer under fifth-year review should receive an evaluation of at least excellent in instruction and be rated as having provided high quality service.

D. Fifth-Year Review Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers in their fifth year will provide all required materials to the chair.</td>
<td>(4th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair will provide the departmental fifth-year lecturer review committee with this material. This committee will consist of all senior lecturers, all senior academic professionals, and all tenured faculty in the department. The final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole.</td>
<td>(5th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee will use appropriate departmental guidelines and college manual to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in instruction and service to the department chair.</td>
<td>(9th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair will provide a written assessment of the lecturer’s effectiveness in instruction and service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward the following to the Dean’s Office: his/her report, the departmental committee report, the candidate’s materials, an electronic copy of the CV and Statement of Instructional Interests included in the candidate’s materials, and electronic copies of the chair’s report and the departmental committee report.</td>
<td>(11th week of Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Lecturer Review Committee* will write a letter of assessment to be submitted to the Dean’s Office.</td>
<td>(15th week of Spring) April 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide a letter of assessment to the Provost</td>
<td>May 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office provides Lecturer with reappointment decision.</td>
<td>August 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See <a href="http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/lect/lect_gsu.pdf">http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/lect/lect_gsu.pdf</a> for the university-level and Board of Regents policies pertaining to lecturers (e.g. review decisions, definition, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the review process, dossiers will be returned to lecturers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The College Lecturer Review Committee will be composed of at least 5 tenured faculty and senior lecturers. These must include one from each of the departments 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).

E. Format of the Third- and Fifth-Year Review Dossiers

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

2. Lecturers must explicitly follow the directions for categorizing supporting evidence that is submitted. Dossiers must contain the following sections, when appropriate, in this order:

   a. **Cover page.** The cover page must include the lecturer’s name, department, and date of appointment as lecturer at Georgia State University. In addition, date(s) of appointment as visiting instructor, part-time instructor, or graduate teaching assistant at Georgia State University should be included. Information about leaves of absences, with the dates of the leaves indicated, should also be included.

   b. **Curriculum vitae,** following conventions in the field.

   c. **Information on Instruction.** The following information on instruction, when appropriate, should be included:

      i. **Statement of Instructional Interests, Goals, and Qualifications.** The lecturer should briefly describe an educational philosophy, describe a set of goals and objectives in instruction and service projects for the next three years, and provide a list of courses and/or areas s/he believes s/he is qualified to teach.

      ii. **Courses Taught During the Last Four Academic Years (5th year) or Since Hire Date (3rd year), including summers, if applicable.** Using the format in Appendix A, the lecturer must provide a list of courses taught during the period under review.

      iii. **Teaching Portfolios.** Each lecturer must compile a teaching portfolio.

         • The portfolio must include standardized College end-of-term course evaluations from GoSolar for all courses taught in the period under review. Student written comments may be included, if desired. 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.

         • Lecturers shall also include more complete data from two courses taught per calendar year. This data must include syllabi and may include course materials, written student work/comments, faculty feedback, etc. In consultation with the department chair, lecturers will vary the courses in their portfolios so that over a 3-year period, the portfolios will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught.

         • In addition, a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught during the period under review (and not highlighted above) must be included. Only one syllabus for each different course should be included.
• If desired, the information required for the “teaching portfolio” can be compiled in a separate binder, clearly labeled.

iv. **Student Evaluations.** The lecturer must include a summary of questions 1-17 on the standardized College end-of-term course evaluation for every course taught during the last four academic years (or all since hire date for third-year review). Student written comments should not be included in this section. These student evaluation numerical scores are available in a crystal report (with no comments). Department chairs will assist the candidates in obtaining these materials. Currently in AL/ESL, the Administrative Specialist-Academic can print out crystal reports of numerical summaries.

v. **Newly Developed Courses and Instructional Programs** (if appropriate). Examples may include participating in materials and curriculum development projects, organizing or presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogy (e.g., short-term training of English-language teachers), starting conversation exchange partnerships with university and ESL students, etc.

vi. **Instructional Service/programs.** The lecturer should provide a list of activities that are of “instructional service” nature that provide learning for students beyond the lecturer’s teaching assignment. Examples may include guest-lecturing in graduate courses, serving as a cooperating teacher who mentors graduate students in connection with the Practicum course, observing the instructional efforts of graduate students, visiting lecturers/instructors and part-time instructors and offering oral and written feedback, working with students in or outside of specific courses, working with students/faculty on research projects. In addition, lecturers should include examples of instructional service related to assigned administrative responsibilities in the department, such as overseeing student directed readings, coordinating/administering special programs/internships/study abroad, training graduate teaching assistants about classroom issues, providing special topics sessions/workshops for students, joining volunteer student groups on field trips to learn about U.S. culture (e.g., food bank, retirement home), training graduate students about ESL tutoring, serving as advisor of student organization.

vii. **Published Materials** (if appropriate). Articles, textbooks, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the lecturer’s professional expertise may be included.

viii. **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction** (if appropriate). Honors or other special recognition of the quality of a lecturer’s instruction should be listed.

d. **Information on Service.** The following information on service, when appropriate, should be included in this order:

i. **Peer Instructional Service.** Lecturers should provide a list of activities of an “instructional service” nature that provide formal, scheduled training for faculty. Examples may include supervising and/or mentoring faculty, organizing or leading workshops for faculty both in and outside the department. Semester of service should be included.
ii. **Assistance to Colleagues.** Lecturers should list ad hoc efforts in assisting colleagues. These include consulting 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 or collaborating on research projects. Semester of service should be included.

iii. **Contributions to the Department and College.** Lecturers should list their contributions to the department and college, including directing a program (IEP, ESL, undergraduate, graduate), serving as a member of or chairing a committee, planning and/or developing departmental/college activities, offering student advisement and mentoring, and any other assistance not part of committee duties. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

iv. **Contributions to the University.** Lecturers should list their contributions to the University, including serving as a member or chairing a committee or representing the University at outside functions. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

v. **Professional Service.** Lecturers should list their involvement with and work for other organizations. This includes serving as a volunteer, member, officer, or consultant for a nonprofit or business organization as GSU faculty with specialization in language learning, teaching, or analysis. This also includes volunteering or presenting at professional conferences, and serving as a regular officer, board or committee member, member of the local arrangements committee for a conference, or other administrative positions in professional associations. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

vi. **Community Service.** Lecturers should list their community activities, limited to involvement related specifically to their area of competence. These include activities such as serving as a volunteer teacher for refugee groups; organizing volunteer student groups with food banks and other groups; giving lectures, speeches, presentations, or workshops for community groups; giving media interviews; or publishing articles in newspapers in their area(s) of professional expertise. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

vii. **Public Service.** Lecturers should list any assistance related to their area of competence given to government agencies or public officials (e.g., serving on or consulting for task forces or advisory committees) or given to develop or enhance community, state, or national resources. Type of involvement, offices held, and dates of service should be included.

e. **Information on Professional Development Activities.** Lecturers may provide information on conference presentations, in-progress publications, grants applied for and/or received, and other collaborations related to lecturers’ professional area(s) of expertise. In considering a lecturer’s performance in professional development during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the department will not determine a specific level of accomplishment (unlike instructional proficiency, which is rated ‘outstanding,’ ‘excellent,’ and so forth). Instead, the review
committee will take careful account of the candidate’s professional development and use it to help determine the rating awarded in instruction.

3. All materials must be placed in 3-ring, large capacity binders. Each binder should be clearly labeled, and each section within binders should be clearly separated from the others by dividers. Staples or paper clips should not be used in the compilation of materials. Binders should not be filled to capacity.

4. Each page in the dossier must be numbered in the upper right-hand corner.
### Appendix A

**Summary of Courses Taught, 20xx (Annual)**

**Summary of Courses Taught, 20xx To 20xx (3rd & 5th year)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester / year</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>BIO 1200</td>
<td>Biology for English Majors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>BIO 1107</td>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 0013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Review Criteria & Ratings: Instruction

The specific nature of each lecturer’s instructional activities may vary as a function of the mission of the department. Thus, evaluators will assess the instructional effectiveness of the lecturer as it relates to the department’s mission. The evaluators should consider all components of the dossier (see pp.11-14) and should consider in their assessments the following:

A. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, course materials, exams, web pages, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description; however, the review committee should keep in mind that lecturers in the department are generally given standardized syllabi for their courses. Faculty may have flexibility in daily activities, daily assignments, and mode of presentation. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as customized course packs, handouts, software, and other relevant information. Credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. (NOTE: Syllabi for IEP courses are generally quite standardized)

B. New Courses, New Teaching Practices, and other Contributions to Instructional Programs: Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new instructional programs, the use of new instructional techniques and practices, and in general the faculty member’s level of commitment and contribution to the quality of the departmental program(s)

C. Instructional service: Instruction in the Department of Applied Linguistics & ESL includes teaching, advising, and serving students, both inside and outside the classroom environment. Evaluation of instruction will include the lecturer’s involvement in instructional service activities (see page 12)

D. Student evaluations: The review will include student evaluation scores and the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses within the program, if that information exists (e.g., level 1 courses in the IEP or multiple sections of IEP 0940). The information will also include other important variables, such as the response rate on the evaluations and the number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The committee will be mindful of the vagaries inherent in student evaluations; evaluations will be judged in the context of other information and cannot be the sole basis for evaluating instructional effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions. The student evaluation averages mentioned in the descriptors are given as general guidelines only. Committee members shall review the student evaluation scores in the context of the range of scores for similar courses and/or the same level within the program if that information is available.

E. Direction of undergraduate students: The extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of undergraduate independent studies, practica, honors theses, performances, and recitals will be considered. The effectiveness of these efforts will be judged by such outcomes as student success in acceptance to graduate or professional schools, scores on national examinations, and special awards or achievements.
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NOTE: Professional development activities (e.g. publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations) as they bear on the lecturer’s knowledge as it relates to instructional performance may be considered in the rating for instruction.

Based on the evidence submitted, the review committee will evaluate the lecturer’s instruction according to the College’s six evaluative categories of outstanding (6), excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), and poor (1). When considering ratings for lecturers, the review committee shall keep in mind the following:

- **Outstanding** (6). The lecturer will be judged outstanding in instruction if the clear impression garnered by the review committee from the evidence submitted is that the lecturer’s teaching and contributions to instruction were extraordinary. Normally, student evaluation scores suggest outstanding performance in the classroom (e.g., overall average is in the high-4 range), submitted materials demonstrate course organization exceptional in its design and components, courses incorporated the latest scholarship in the area, and the lecturer demonstrated highly effective mentoring of students. The lecturer may have published a textbook; received a training contract; received a college-, university-, or national-level instruction award; or the equivalent. Other items that may contribute toward an evaluation of outstanding may include study abroad development and instruction and participation and distinction in university-wide teaching initiatives such as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW), and online instruction.

- **Excellent** (5). The lecturer will be judged excellent in instruction if the clear impression garnered by the review committee from the evidence submitted is that the lecturer’s teaching and contributions to instruction were far above average. Normally, student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (e.g., overall average is in the mid-4 range), course materials show impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship, and the lecturer demonstrated highly effective mentoring of students.

- **Very Good** (4). The lecturer will be judged very good in instruction if the clear impression garnered by the review committee from the evidence submitted is that the lecturer’s teaching and contributions to instruction were highly competent. Normally, student evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom (e.g., overall average is in the low-4 range), course materials show diligent preparation, and the lecturer demonstrated effective mentoring of students.

- **Good** (3). The lecturer will be judged good in instruction if the clear impression garnered by the review committee from the evidence submitted is that the lecturer’s teaching and contributions to instruction were competent. Normally, student evaluation scores suggest effective performance (e.g., overall average is in the high-3 range), course materials presented suggest diligent preparation, and the lecturer demonstrated an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

- **Fair** (2) and **Poor** (1). The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for lecturers who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good instruction.
Appendix C

Review Criteria & Ratings: Service

The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. Contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the department, college, or university, professional service, and community and public service (pp. 12-13). Service for lecturers is dependent on the mission as defined by the department and the program, but it is generally at the departmental or college level. Some lecturers in the department may be assigned primarily service responsibilities by the department chair depending on the needs of the department and its units.

Based on the evidence submitted, the department review committee will evaluate whether the lecturer’s service is high quality with respect to the degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. A lecturer’s service will be judged as high quality if the clear impression garnered by the review committee from the evidence submitted is that the service performed by the lecturer was highly competent.