

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
LECTURER REVIEW AND PROMOTION POLICY**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Approved by Department of History:
October 25, 2005**

**Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences
Promotion and Tenure Review Board:**

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.

A. Overview

This document describes the process for the review of lecturers and for the promotion of lecturers to senior lecturers in the Department of History. 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 will be promoted to senior lecturers, to begin in their seventh year of service. Lecturers not reappointed 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 lecturers. 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 program administration, advising, and serving the academic needs of students. Service is normally at the departmental and college levels, but may include university service. Professional service as well as public service involving professional expertise is also relevant. Other activities, such as publications of their research and scholarship, are not required; however, the department will consider such activities in the reviews, particularly as they bear on instructional performance.

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 departmental contract renewal committee, will follow the established college and 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.

B. Components of the Third-Year Review of Lecturers and Fifth-Year Review with Promotion to Senior Lecturer:

B.1. Dossier. The dossier will contain the following sections:

a. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department/school, and date of appointment at Georgia State University.

b. Curriculum Vitae

c. Information on Instruction

- **Statement of Instructional Interests, Goals, and Qualifications:** Each lecturer should briefly (no more than three double spaced pages) describe an educational philosophy and a set of goals and objectives in instruction and service projects, and a list of courses and/or areas they have taught.
- **Courses Taught During the Last Eight Semesters:** Each lecturer must provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught during the time period. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. Using the following format, the candidate must provide a list of courses taught:

SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX TO 20XX		
SEMESTER/ YEAR	TITLE AND COURSE NUMBER	NUMBER OF STUDENTS
Fall/02	U.S. History Survey/HIST 2110	45

- **Teaching Portfolio**: Each lecturer will compile a teaching portfolio, as described in the College's *Teaching Assessment Policy* and as further specified by the relevant departmental policy. Teaching portfolios will include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year. In consultation with the Chair, faculty members will vary the courses in the portfolio so that over a three-year period it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught.
- **Student Evaluations**: Summary of questions 1-17 on the student questionnaire must be provided for courses taught during the last 8 semesters. Written comments other than the ones required in the teaching portfolios should not be included.
- **Description of New Courses and Instructional Programs Developed**: (if appropriate).
- **Instructional Funding**: (if appropriate). Describe all intramural and extramural funding of instructional initiatives.
- **Program Administration**: (if appropriate).
- **Published Materials**: (if appropriate). Articles, textbooks, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate's instruction.
- **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction**: (if appropriate).
- **Independent Studies, Practica, Theses**: (if appropriate). Describe all supervision of internships, student academic advisement, and directed readings.

d. **Information on Service**

- **Instructional Service**: Give a list of instructional service beyond the classroom. Examples of instructional service may include participating in developing instructional materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on instructional methodology, and supervising and/or mentoring faculty.
- **Assistance to Colleagues**: List all guest-lectures, consultation on educational and instructional issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, or assistance with new instructional technology), and advisement on or reviews of manuscripts or grant applications.
- **Contributions to the Department and College**: List all student advisement and mentoring, memberships on departmental/college committees, and development of instructional and service programs.
- **Contributions to the University**: (if appropriate).
- **Professional Service**: (if appropriate). List memberships on professional societies, advisory boards, etc.

- **Community and Public Service:** (if appropriate). List lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to governmental agencies.

e. **Information on Professional Development Activities:** (if appropriate): A faculty member may provide information on professional development activities, such as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the lecturer's knowledge of the field or instructional performance.

B.2. Review Criteria for Third-Year Review of Lecturers and Fifth-Year Review with Promotion to Senior Lecturer.

a. **Instruction:** Evaluation of instructional effectiveness will use the criteria of the College's policy (<http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwcas/policy/teach.html>). Among the factors that evaluators should consider in their assessments are the following:

- **Quality of Course Content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. 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 texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. Lecturers whose primary responsibility is for survey courses will provide syllabi for two of the three survey courses, evidence of how they are using writing assignments in their survey classes to assist students in learning history, and indications of how they are using new instructional techniques and practices to facilitate student learning. These lecturers will also provide syllabi and evaluations from courses they have taught for the major, the graduate program, and other university programs. Lecturers whose primary responsibility is for graduate instruction will provide course syllabi for all courses with indications of how they are using new instructional techniques and practices to facilitate student learning.
- **Development of New Courses or Instructional Programs:** Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new instructional programs, and the use of new instructional techniques and practices. Faculty who direct study-abroad programs will provide syllabi and other course materials for each of these programs.
- **Teaching Portfolios:** See above for description.
- **Student Evaluations:** The review will include student evaluation scores, in the context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary area. The information will also include other important variables, such as grade distribution, class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged

in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating instructional effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

- **Direction of Students**: For lecturers with primary responsibility for survey instruction, evidence of strategies to recruit history majors and minors from survey courses will be provided. For lecturers whose primary responsibility is in graduate instruction, evidence of student program completion and placement will be provided.
- **Assessment Methods**: The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of instruction in keeping with the College Manual's categories (*outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor*) based on the evidence submitted. The committee will be mindful of the vagaries inherent in student evaluations; the student evaluation averages mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to reify the numbers.

The candidate will be judged to be *outstanding* in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is impeccable. For instance, the candidate must exhibit inspirational performance in the classroom (as indicated by overall averages on student evaluations in the high-4 range); the candidate must show exceptional preparation (as exhibited in the course materials presented); the candidate must demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students; and the candidate must have published a textbook or received one or more teaching awards.

The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in instruction if performance in the classroom is exceptional (as indicated by overall averages on student evaluations in the mid-4 range) and all of the criteria for outstanding are satisfied except for having published a textbook or received one or more teaching awards.

The 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 overall average is in the low-4 range) and the course material presented must show diligent preparation.

The evaluation categories *good, fair, poor* are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards set by the History Department for reappointment or for promotion to senior lecturer.

- b. **Service**: The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of service by the College's standard of high quality.

Assessment Methods:

The candidate will be judged to be *of the highest quality* in service if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is impeccable. Candidates for senior lecturer with primary responsibility for survey instruction demonstrate excellent service by giving assistance to graduate teaching assistants and other non-tenure-track instructors. Assistance in departmental advising and service on Freshman Studies Committee is also to be judged with respect to degree of

diligence and level of effectiveness evidence of which will be provided by colleagues in the department and the department chair. For lecturers with primary responsibility for graduate instruction, program direction, student advisement, and departmental committee service will be judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness, evidence of which will be provided by colleagues in the department and the department chair. If candidates provide both excellent departmental service and college or university service, they will be judged to be outstanding.

The candidate will be judged to be *of high quality* if all of the above criteria are met but the service is to the department only.

The candidate will be judged to be *of good quality* in service if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly competent. For example, the degree of diligence and level of effectiveness in service in advisement or assistance to colleagues is moderately helpful.

The evaluation categories *fair and poor quality* are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards set by the History Department for reappointment or for promotion to senior lecturer.

c. Role within the Department: Since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the College or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department and the ability of the lecturer to effectively fulfill changing needs of the department.

d. Other: Professional Development Activities: (if appropriate). Professional development activities (e.g. publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, collaborations) as they bear on the lecturer's knowledge and as it relates to instructional performance, will be considered with special attention to how they bear on instructional performance.

B.3. Ratings. The third-year and fifth-year reviews will employ the following categories for the evaluation of instruction: outstanding (6), excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), poor (1). The History Department considers an evaluation of at least *very good* in instruction and service of **good quality** to be necessary for reappointment following the third-year review. The History Department considers an evaluation of at least *excellent* in instruction and service of **high quality** to be necessary for promotion to senior lecturer.

C. Third-Year Review of Lecturers.

The third-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of instructional and service contributions. Lecturers in their third year will provide all required materials to the chair by the fourth week of the spring semester. The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee by the sixth week of the spring semester. This will be the tenured members of the elected executive committee. If the executive committee does not have at least 3 tenured faculty the chair will appoint additional members from the tenured faculty to have a minimum committee of 3 tenured faculty. This committee will use appropriate manuals to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in instruction and service to the departmental chair by the tenth week of the spring semester. The 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 all

materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office by the thirteenth week of the spring semester. 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.

D. Fifth-Year Review of Lecturers with Promotion to Senior Lecturers.

The fifth-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis towards identifying lecturers who have a sustained record of excellence in instruction and high-quality service. Lecturers in their fifth year will provide all required materials to the chair by the fourth week of the spring semester. The chair will provide the departmental fifth-year lecturer review committee with this material by the sixth week of the spring semester. This committee will consist of all tenured faculty and senior lecturers in the department. The final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole. This committee will use this policy to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in instruction and service to the department chair by the tenth week of the spring semester. The 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 all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office by the thirteenth week of the spring semester.

A College Lecturer Review Committee will then review these materials and make a recommendation to the Dean. This committee will write a letter of assessment to be submitted to the Dean's Office by June 15. 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.