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.
I. Introduction

This document contains the general policies, procedures, and substantive standards that apply to and govern all recommendations for promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturer. It is to be used in conjunction with the relevant College and University policies. In case of conflict, College and University policies take precedence over this document.

The policies, procedures and substantive standards in this set of guidelines must be reconsidered at least once every five years and may be reconsidered at any time if so requested by the Chair of the Department or by a majority of the departmental faculty. Any changes in policies or procedures require a two-thirds vote of the Department, and any changes in substantive standards require a two-thirds majority vote of the Promotion Committee. All changes must also be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

II. Committee and Dossier

The Departmental Committee on Promotion to Senior Lecturer (hereafter "Promotion Committee") is composed of all and only those members of the Department who have hold the rank of Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor or Professor, excluding the Chair of the Department. The Chair of this committee will be elected by its members and will be a voting member of the Committee.

The candidate will submit a promotion dossier to the Promotion Committee in the form required by the College, dividing the materials submitted into two areas: Instruction and Service. The candidate is permitted to include any information in the dossier which is not specifically proscribed by the College Manual and which the candidate feels is relevant to placing her efforts in an appropriate context. For example, certain publications may be relevant to the evaluation of the candidate’s instruction or service.

III. Substantive Standards

For promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer a candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in instruction. In addition, a candidate must also be rated as having provided high quality service.
A. Instruction

The five factors listed below are the only relevant criteria with regard to instruction. The personal characteristics of a lecturer are not relevant to the promotion decision unless they impact on one of the factors listed below. The candidate is to be ranked in each factor on the following scale: poor, fair, good, very good or excellent.

1. Diligence, how much effort has the lecturer put into developing and teaching her courses and doing non-course instruction?
Examples: A course which has only one final exam and whose syllabus is merely downloaded from a web site would show evidence of poor diligence. A course with many evaluations (quizzes, papers, tests, journals, etc.) and a syllabus which shows that the instructor was putting in a lot of time teaching the course would show evidence of excellent diligence. An instructor who has only worked with students on an individual basis (e.g., directed readings, thesis committees) once in five years would show evidence of poor diligence. An instructor who has worked with students on an individual basis ten times would show evidence of excellent diligence.

2. Appropriate Rigor, how much effort do the lecturer’s courses require of the student?
Examples: A course which has only one multiple choice exam would show evidence of poor rigor. A course with many evaluations would show evidence of excellent rigor. If a lecturer chooses to include her grade distributions in her teaching portfolio, that would be relevant to rigor. It is possible for a course to be too rigorous. For example, a Phil 1010 course which required 10 papers would be too rigorous.

3. Quality of course content, how good is the quality of the materials assigned for the students to read? How well will they capture the interest of students?
Examples: A course which assigned only *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* would show evidence of poor quality of course content. A course which used a collection of cutting-edge, very high-quality work which is sure to interest many students would show evidence of excellent course content.

4. Course Organization, how well organized are the courses?
This refers both to the organization of the course as a whole and to the organization of individual class meetings.

Examples: A course whose organization would be unclear to most students or a course which was not organized at all would show evidence of poor course organization. A course with a well-thought out and clearly presented organization would show evidence of excellent course organization.
5. Student Perception, how good are the numerical and written student evaluations?
To calculate the base number, take the average of: (a) a candidate's average score on Question 17 of the student evaluation form for all courses, and (b) a candidate's average score on Questions 1-16 of the student evaluation form for all courses. Standard rules for rounding will be employed. Cross-listed courses will be treated as if they were one course. In general, evaluations for classrooms effectiveness should correspond with the following guidelines. However, the members of the committee must consider the written evaluation to arrive at their rankings. (Evidence from student evaluations may also be relevant to items 1-4 above.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Number</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 or less</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-3.6</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7-3.9</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.2</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 or better</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Service

The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of high quality service. See Section VI below for information on service assignments.

Diligence and effectiveness are the only relevant criteria with regard to service. The personal characteristics of a lecturer are not relevant to the promotion decision unless they impact on one of these two factors.

1. Diligence, how much effort has the lecturer put into the service duties assigned to her? Examples: A lecturer who never attended the meetings of a committee to which she was assigned would show evidence of low quality diligence. A lecturer who consistently attended committee meetings required of her, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner would show evidence of high quality diligence.

2. Effectiveness, how good was the work performed by the lecturer in the service duties assigned to her? Examples: A lecturer who completed tasks assigned to her with documents full of numerical, typographical and substantive errors would show evidence of low quality effectiveness. A lecturer whose documents relating to service were clear, accurate and useful would show evidence of high quality effectiveness.
IV. Procedures to be Employed in Arriving at Recommendations on Promotion

A. Initial Procedures

No later than the date specified in the relevant College policies, the Chair of the Department will remind all those who are eligible for promotion to senior lecturer that they may apply for promotion. All who wish to apply must do so in writing no later than the date specified in the relevant College policies.

The candidate must submit her dossier to the Promotion Committee no later than the date specified in the relevant College policies. The Chair of Department will call a meeting of the Promotion Committee. The only business of this first meeting of a year will be the election of a Chair of the Promotion Committee, the distribution of this document and other purely organizational matters. The Chair of the Promotion Committee will call a meeting of the Promotion Committee for the purpose of evaluating the candidate and will notify the candidate of the date of subsequent this meeting. The Chair also will invite the candidate to attend this meeting of the Promotion Committee.

Prior to the meeting, the members of the Promotion Committee will read all of the candidate's dossier as well as this document. The Chair of the Committee will compute the candidate's base number and distribute this information to the Committee.

On the date of the Promotion Committee's meeting, the Chair of the Committee will bring the candidate's dossier to the meeting. The Chair of the Department may attend this meeting but only as an observer and to answer procedural questions. The Chair of the Department may not vote or make any substantive comments. If the candidate has accepted the Committee Chair's invitation to attend the meeting, the Committee Chair will begin the meeting by asking the candidate for a statement. Thereafter the candidate will be dismissed and the Promotion Committee will begin its deliberations.

Should any issues not covered by this document arise in the course of deliberations, they will be settled by the Committee using Robert's Rules of Order Revised.

B. Instruction Procedures

The Committee will thoroughly and individually discuss each of the five factors relevant to instruction. After each factor is discussed, every member of the Committee will announce her ranking of the candidate with regard to that factor. The Chair of the Promotion Committee will note the ranking of each member. After all five factors have been discussed, the Chair of the Promotion Committee will calculate an initial overall ranking for each member of the Committee. The Chair will assign 1 point for poor, 2 points for fair, 3 points for good, 4 points for very good and 5 points for excellent and then they will weight the factors as follows: (Diligence x .1) + (Rigor x .2) + (Content x .2) + (Organization x .1) + (Student Perceptions x .4). Using standard rules for rounding, the Chair will then announce the initial overall ranking for each member of the Committee. The Committee will, in light of this information, discuss the
overall ranking of the candidate with regard to instruction. Then each member of the Committee will announce her final overall ranking of the candidate with regard to instruction. The highest ranking such that a majority of the Promotion Committee ranks the candidate at that rank or higher will determine the Promotion Committee's recommendation in instruction.

The Chair will then ask if there is a motion to rank the candidate as outstanding in instruction. If no such motion is made and seconded, then the candidate will not be ranked as outstanding in instruction. If such a motion is made and seconded, the Committee will thoroughly discuss whether the candidate should be ranked as outstanding. In this discussion, the Committee will be mindful that the rank of outstanding in instruction is not required for promotion to senior lecturer and should be reserved to honor those candidates who have shown a quality of instruction which is well above the average level found in the tenured members of the department. Passing a motion to rank a candidate at outstanding in instruction requires a two-thirds majority of those voting yea or nay.

C. Service Procedures

The Committee will thoroughly and individually discuss each of the two factors relevant to service. After both factors are discussed, every member of the Committee will announce whether she believes that the candidate's service is of high quality. The view of the majority of the committee will determine the Promotion Committee's recommendation in service.

D. Post-Assessment Procedures

The Chair of the Committee will draft a letter to the Chair of the Department which reports and recommendation of the Committee and the reasons for the recommendation. This letter must be approved by all members of the Committee who endorse its recommendation. Every member of the Promotion Committee will sign this letter or submit a minority letter. All letters will be given to the candidate and to the Chair of the Department by the deadline indicated in the relevant College policies.
V. Third Year Review

The Department of Philosophy reviews all lecturers during their third year of employment. The purpose of this review, which accesses the faculty member's effectiveness in instruction and service, is to ensure that lecturers have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual consideration for promotion.

While the faculty member under review should be familiar with this document and use it as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion process. While extremely important, the third year review is more informal; it is meant to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, the faculty member's achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion decision, the Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, she will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion.

1. By January 1 the Chair will ask third-year faculty in writing to prepare and submit, by March 1, a dossier for third-year promotion review.

2. The faculty member under review should assemble a brief dossier (including such materials as annual reports, a curriculum vita, publications, and evidence of teaching effectiveness) and containing a two-page statement of goals and accomplishments in the areas of instruction and service.

3. The tenured faculty of the Department will elect a committee of at least three tenured faculty members to serve on the Lecturer Third-Year Review Committee. After due deliberations, committee members will prepare a summary report on the dossier and will vote on a positive or negative recommendation.

4. The Chair will hold a conference to inform the faculty member of how well she is progressing toward a positive promotion decision. The Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of the committee's written evaluation and a copy of the Chair's own independent report.

5. The Chair will forward to the relevant Associate Dean of the College all relevant reports, and the Associate Dean will meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.
VI. Service Assignments

At the time of appointment, the Chair will, in the initial letter of appointment, state the basic, or generic, types of assignments for which the lecturer is responsible. The statement will be simple and somewhat open-ended to allow for flexibility. It might look something like this:

As a lecturer, you will typically be required to teach X sections of courses Q or R or S, to attend meetings and complete other tasks related to these courses, and to advise students. It is possible that your instructional or service assignments may change, in which case you will be informed of this by the chair who will indicate in your annual evaluation that this change was made or will be made in the future.

In each year’s annual evaluation, the Chair will indicate what the service responsibilities of current lecturers have been and will be.