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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.
INTRODUCTION

This document describes the process for the review of lecturers and for the promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer in the Department of Psychology. 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 re-appointed after five years of consecutive service will be promoted to senior lecturer, to begin in their seventh year of service. Lecturers not re-appointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

There are two types of reviews specific for lecturers; these are the third-year review and fifth-year review of lecturers, with promotion to senior lecturer. In these reviews, 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, and is typically performed at the departmental and college levels, but may include university service. Professional service, as well as public service involving professional expertise, is also relevant.

This document does not cover the annual review and annual contract renewal review that occur for all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. The process for these annual evaluations, including the composition of the contract renewal committee, will follow the established departmental policies as specified in other documents. 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 fifth-year review.

INSTRUCTION

Categories of Instruction

The quality of instruction of lecturers is of paramount importance; indeed, it is the heart of what lecturers do. Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer should submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the following categories: (a) syllabi and list of courses taught, (b) teaching portfolio, (c) student evaluations; (d) description of new courses and instructional programs developed, (e) instructional funding, (f) published materials, (g) honors, and (h) lists of independent studies, practica,
honors theses. Candidates may not solicit letters to include in any of these categories.

1. Syllabi and List of Courses Taught

Candidates must include the most recent syllabus for each course taught in the last eight semesters. They may include earlier versions of a syllabus if they wish. Candidates must list the courses taught in the format specified by the College Manual. In keeping with the College Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty, the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will review syllabi “for conformity with university guidelines … reading/assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description.”

2. Teaching Portfolio

The portfolio is described in the college’s Teaching and Assessment Policy. Candidates may include supplementary materials to document the quality of course content. Candidates may include materials that demonstrate teaching preparation, effectiveness of pedagogical methodology, and pedagogical creativity, such as: course handouts and assignments; descriptions of learning exercises; tests; outstanding student papers or other written/visual evidence of course-generated student projects. The College Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty specifies that “course materials should . . . be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field.” The policy further states that faculty should be rewarded for “enhancing creativity and independent critical thinking,” and for structuring courses “in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students.” Candidates should submit supplementary material (in addition to syllabi) for two courses per year, in keeping with the procedures for Annual Review. Supplementary materials should demonstrate the range and variety of levels of courses the candidate has taught.

3. Student Course Evaluations

Candidates must include standardized course evaluations for every course they taught during the last 8 semesters in tabular format consistent with that detailed in the College Manual. Written comments other that the ones required in the teaching portfolio should not be included.

4. New Courses Taught

Candidates may provide material that demonstrates effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new instructional programs, and the use of new
57 instructional techniques and practices.

58 5. Instructional Funding

59 If appropriate, candidates should provide a list of all grants and contracts received and all
60 scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and personal development awards that supported the candidate’s
61 instructional activities and professional development. This list should include the title of each project
62 supported, the awarding agency, the amount and period of the award, and the precise role of the candidate
63 in the project. Candidates also should provide copies of official letters of award for funded projects.
64 Candidates may, if they wish, provide copies of reviewers’ comments for unfunded proposals.

65 6. Published Materials and Professional Presentations

66 If appropriate, candidates should provide a list of published textbooks, articles, chapters in books,
67 monographs, or book reviews relevant to instruction, and those accepted for publication. This list should
68 include for each work the title, publisher (or journal and volume), date (or projected date) of publication,
69 and a brief description of the work and its contribution to psychology. In addition to the lists, candidates
70 must provide copies of all publications. Work in progress and work submitted but not yet accepted for
71 publication may not be included. Candidates should also provide a list of presentations at professional
72 meetings. This list should include the title of the presentation, the type of presentation (paper, invited paper
73 or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion), the name, location, and date of the meeting,
74 and a one- or two-sentence description of the presentation.

75 7. Honors

76 Honors or other special recognition of the quality of a candidate’s teaching should be listed in
77 tabular form. A candidate also should submit evidence of honors his or her students have achieved that are
78 directly connected with the candidate’s teaching or mentorship (such as papers presented, accepted for
79 publication, or published, fellowships or other rewards received, and acceptance to graduate programs).
80 Honors, such as fellow status, and awards from scholarly and professional associations that result from the
81 candidate’s instructional activities should be listed. Invitations received for presentations or workshops at
82 professional associations or other universities will be considered. Candidates should provide a list of titles,
83 locations, and dates for invited presentations.

84 8. Evidence of Instructional Service beyond the Classroom
Candidates should provide lists of the following types of instructional service: organizing or presenting in departmental seminars on pedagogy; pedagogical mentoring of junior faculty in the department; supervision of directed reading or independent study courses; direction of honors theses; advisement of students; and evidence of students’ successful endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship.

**Evaluation of Instruction**

The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of instruction in keeping with the College Manual’s evaluative categories (*outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor*) based on the evidence submitted. To be considered for promotion to senior lecturer, one must be judged at least excellent in instruction.

A candidate will be judged to be *outstanding* in instruction if, in all of the categories above, the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is impeccable. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest inspirational performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show exceptional preparation; the candidate must demonstrate a very high level of involvement in mentoring undergraduate students; and there is other evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the candidate may have published a textbook or received one or more teaching awards.

A candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is superb. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show impressive preparation; and the candidate must demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring undergraduate students. The candidate may also have published a textbook or won one or more teaching awards.

A candidate will be judged to be *very good* in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is highly competent. For instance, the applicant’s student evaluation scores must suggest very effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show diligent preparation; and the candidate must demonstrate a moderate level of involvement in mentoring undergraduate students.
A candidate will be judged to be *good* in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is competent. For instance, the student evaluation scores suggest effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented suggests diligent preparation; and the candidate demonstrates a moderate level of involvement in mentoring undergraduate students.

The evaluation categories *fair* and *poor* are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for *good* performance.

**SERVICE**

In addition to being rated as excellent in instruction, a candidate must also be rated as having provided high quality 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 assigned service activities (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them and who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner), and who have also completed their service assignments thoughtfully and effectively, qualify for a rating of high quality service.

Expectations regarding types of service activities expected will be detailed at the time of appointment in writing and may be modified at the annual evaluation.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

The process and schedule for applying for promotion to Senior Lecturer is governed by the College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Review of Lecturers and Promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers. Applications for promotion to Senior Lecturer will be evaluated by a committee of departmental faculty, including Senior Lectures and tenure track faculty. Each committee will elect its own chair and, after deliberation, report its evaluation and recommendation by letter to the department chair.