

Department of Human Development and Family Science
Guidelines for
Lecturer/Senior Lecturer

These policies and procedures identify guidelines and expectations for quality in teaching, service-related to teaching, and leadership for the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer position. This document is meant to articulate departmental standards and expectations and will be revised and amended on a regular basis. In the case of Lecturer positions, evaluations and developmental plans shall focus exclusively in instruction, service, and collegiality as defined by the Department.

Hiring

Recruitment into Lecturer/Senior Lecturer positions will follow University Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity (AA/EEO) policies and be approved by the Office of the Provost and the AA/EEO Office. Appointments are for one academic year (9-month appointment). Renewal is typically on an annual basis and will require a new letter of appointment.

Department Governance

The primary role of the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer in the Department of Human Development and Family Science (HDFS) is focused on instruction and on service-related to instruction. Since leadership must also be demonstrated for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, those who aspire to this rank must also demonstrate leadership qualities that surpass routinely assigned teaching and service in both quality and impact. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers shall be eligible to vote on all matters related to departmental governance with the exception of tenure and promotion decisions on tenure track faculty. In accordance with department by-laws, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers may not serve as department head.

Assignment

Lecturers/Senior Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions are subject to approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching as stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in the HDFS Department includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attending departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life, and engaging students.

Teaching Criteria

Because of Auburn University's "concern for good teaching", teaching effectiveness is an important consideration in the review process. More than adequate teaching is expected, and each Lecturer/Senior Lecturer is expected to work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with department colleagues in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the Department, College, and University.

Documentation of strong teaching may include but is not limited to:

- Number, type of courses taught, and enrollment over last three years: including lectures, seminars, studios, practica, and directed studies.
- Course effectiveness: Demonstrated by aggregate student evaluations from the previous three years.
- Course syllabi and assignments
- Student advising:
 - Identify number of students per semester
 - Student internships
 - Sponsorship of student organizations
- Honors readings or theses: Students directed
- Teaching innovations:
 - Special topics courses developed
 - Revision of existing course material (e.g. incorporating service learning)
 - Use of web based and/or industry standard instructional technologies
 - Certification in recognized training system (e.g. Alexander or Fitzmaurice)
 - Software / technical / workshop training
 - Development of distance learning courses
- Collaboration with other disciplines, universities, museums, institutions, and clients
- Teaching awards and grants
- Student outcomes: Evidenced by student achievement in professional programs, conference presentations and performances, placement in graduate programs, or industry employment with a specific focus on a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer's area of expertise
- Integration of scholarly activity into teaching: Cite and document [syllabus, class assignments, etc.] examples where scholarly work was incorporated into class materials.

Annual Review

The annual review process is one component of assessing Lecturers/Senior Lecturers for promotion and merit pay. Performance evaluations of all Lecturers/Senior Lecturers are required and conducted annually by the Department Head. The following scale will be used in annual reviews as mandated by the Department.

Rating	Definition
--------	------------

- 4 Exemplary Performance – *Exemplary Performance* in teaching is the highest rating of instructional effort. This rating is assigned to Lecturers/ Senior Lecturers who always teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and occasionally take on voluntary overloads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; who regularly include substantive and methodological renewal; advise students effectively and accurately; participate effectively and innovatively in the curriculum development process; and consistently receive outstanding student and peer teaching evaluations.
- 3 Exceeds Expectations – *Exceeds Expectations* is a rating assigned to Lecturers/Senior Lecturers who teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; who remain pedagogically current in the discipline, and/or receive teaching awards; participate effectively in the instructional program in accordance with their teaching assignments; receive solid student and peer teaching evaluations; and regularly advise students effectively.
- 2 Meets Expectations – *Meets Expectations* is a rating assigned to Lecturers/ Senior Lecturers at the lower limit of qualification or acceptability. Lecturer/Senior Lecturers receiving this rating teach designated loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; receive student and peer teaching evaluations that meet the basic threshold of acceptability (defined as 2.5 on a scale of 5.0); sometimes include substantive and methodological renewal in classes; adequately advise students; and participate as assigned in the instructional program.
- 1 Marginal - *Marginal* teaching ratings do not meet the lower limit of qualification or acceptability. This rating is assigned to Lecturers/Senior Lecturers who do not fulfill their teaching loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; receive marginal student and peer teaching evaluations (defined as below 2.5 on a scale of 5.0); seldom include substantive and methodological renewal in classes; rarely advise students; and contribute marginally in the instructional program as assigned.
- 0 Unacceptable - *Unacceptable* teaching performance consistently fails to meet established expectations. This rating is assigned to Lecturers/ Senior Lecturers who do not fulfill their teaching loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; receive deficient student and peer teaching evaluations; irregularly include substantive and methodological renewal in classes; rarely advise students; and are ineffective in the conduct of their assigned duties in the instructional program.

1. By February 15 of each year, each Lecturer/Senior Lecturer should submit to the Department Head in writing a comprehensive year-end report, following the department template attached, to be placed on permanent file that details the individual's work in the areas of instruction and service-related to instruction.
2. The Department Head will meet individually with each Lecturer/Senior Lecturer, generally no later than April 15 of each academic year. The annual review meeting will consist of:
 - Discussion of the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer's performance as noted in the year-end report, focusing on strengths and areas of improvement
 - Discussion of a development plan for the next academic year geared toward strengthening efforts in instruction, service-related to instruction, and leadership.
3. The Department Head will provide the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer with a written report, to be placed on permanent file, generally no later than April 15 of each academic year. This report will:
 - Summarize discussion from the performance evaluation meeting
 - Classify the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer's overall performance as Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable
4. Following the receipt of the written performance evaluation, the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer shall return a signed copy of the annual review including any written comments they wish to add in response to the Department Head's written assessment, generally no later than April 15 of each academic year. A signature on the written annual review acknowledges that the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer has read the document; it does not necessarily signify their agreement.

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, a Lecturer must have demonstrated a record of sustained outstanding performance in teaching and teaching related service and leadership within the university, the discipline and/or the community. Evidence of the candidate's leadership may come from any time during his or her academic career but must include leadership contributions while a Lecturer at Auburn University.

Teaching and Service

Outstanding teaching and service are documented by annual performance evaluations and other evidence including peer reviews, teaching evaluations, contributions to teaching beyond the classroom setting, teaching or advising awards, recognition of outstanding contributions to the instructional program as assigned, and a regular record of service on teaching related committees.

Leadership

Leadership accomplishments are defined as contributions that form a pattern of continuing engagement with measureable impact. The following lists are illustrative only and are intended as a guide to determine whether a Lecturer has met the requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer. All items on the lists will not be of equal value. Some factors that might impact the value are:

- The impact of the effort expended,
- The relative prestige (of awards, publications, etc.), or
- The differing levels of responsibility.

The candidate's combined activity and achievement must be of high quality, must exceed routinely assigned teaching and service, and must include demonstrated leadership.

1. **Major initiatives** with substantial and ongoing impact include, but are not limited to, the following types of activities or the equivalent:
 - Developing and sustaining a study abroad experience for students;
 - Spearheading a major university project;
 - Coordinating a major campus event involving several units within the university and continuing for multiple years;
 - Advising a significant organization or student activity that results in regional and/or national recognition;
 - Developing and editing a professional periodical; and
 - Writing and publishing a text book or ancillary materials adopted by multiple universities.
2. **Significant leadership contributions** should include a variety of the following types or activities or the equivalent:
 - Developing internships or service learning courses, projects and partnerships;
 - Advising an Honors project;
 - Receiving a university or community honor or recognition;
 - Effectively heading an active department, college or university committee;
 - Actively serving on a college or university committee that is highly engaged and productive;
 - Promoting alumni relations; and
 - With proper institutional approval, exercising leadership that draws on professional expertise outside the university.

Information to be Supplied by the Candidate

A. Information that the candidate seeking promotion submits to the Department Head summarizing his or her case for promotion consisting of the following items:

1. Standard Biographical Data Sheet
2. Candidate's CV
3. Statement of Teaching Philosophy
4. Courses taught over the last three years with student enrollments and contact hours for each
5. Evidence of outstanding teaching and teaching related service during the candidate's career at Auburn University
 - a) Annual performance evaluations for at least the three most recent years as a Lecturer.
 - b) Optional additional evidence of outstanding teaching and service. This may include internal or external letters of support that speak directly to the value of the candidate's teaching accomplishments, contributions to teaching including course innovations and development of new courses and curricula, and teaching awards received by the candidate.
6. Evidence of leadership during the candidate's career at Auburn University
 - a) List of leadership activities, including dates
 - b) At least two internal or external letters of support that speak directly to the value of the candidate's leadership contributions
 - c) Other optional evidence of leadership

External letters in regard to teaching, teaching related service, and leadership accomplishments may be solicited by the Department Head from a list of outside evaluators compiled in consultation with the candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer and members of Department of HDFS.

B. The **Promotion Dossier** consists of the information supplied by the candidate and the following items that are added during the review process:

1. A written evaluation of the candidate from the Department Head and a recommendation for or against promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer.
2. Student teaching evaluations to include all evaluations from one class per semester for each of the three preceding years covering a full range of courses taught by the candidate as follows: For each class include a copy of the questions asked, a summary indicating the spread of numerical responses to all questions, and all student comments in unedited form. If the University form is submitted, submit information on the required questions only and all student comments in unedited form. Indicate the grade distribution in each of these classes. The evaluations must reflect the candidate's teaching in the different kinds of courses he or she is assigned to teach.
3. Peer evaluations for one class for each of the three preceding years. These should include assessment of syllabi, handouts, and exams, and assessment of the candidate's conduct of

the class. Reports based on team teaching are an acceptable form of peer review.

4. A record of the department promotion committee vote.
5. Any letters submitted by department colleagues explaining why they do or do not favor promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. Letters should address the candidate's teaching effectiveness, service contributions, and leadership accomplishments. All such evaluative letters should be addressed to the Department Head, and the Department Head shall submit all letters received to the Dean.

C. **Promotion Committee** is composed of tenure track faculty members in the Department of HDFS. Whenever possible, Senior Lecturers will be included in promotion deliberations involving Lecturers seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. Only those department members listed above along with the Department Head are eligible to vote as members of the department's Senior Lecturer promotion committee.

D. **Consideration of the Candidate**

The candidate's dossier (consisting of the information supplied by the candidate and the information supplied by the Department Head) and supporting material shall be available for review exclusively by the department promotion committee. After the committee has had time to review the dossier and supporting material, the Department Head shall convene a meeting of the committee to discuss the candidate's dossier.

Confidentiality and the right of promotion committee members to express their viewpoints openly without fear of retaliation shall be the hallmarks of the discussion. Departmental deliberations shall be confidential to the extent permitted by law, as shall all documents and testimonies involved in the promotion process. All copies of a candidate's dossier shall be destroyed after the department deliberations are completed and the Dean has made a final recommendation.

E. **Recommendation of the Department and the Dean's Final Determination**

After the candidate has made a presentation of his or her credentials if he or she so wishes, and after the promotion committee has had time to discuss the candidate's qualifications in a closed meeting, a secret ballot shall be taken at the meeting to determine the final recommendation of the promotion committee. Committee members may participate in the promotion recommendation in one of the following ways:

- a) present and voting,
- b) present and abstaining,
- c) absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- d) absent and not voting (This response does not count as part of the total vote.).

If of appropriate academic rank and status, the Department Head shall vote by secret ballot with the other members of the committee. Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from voting and participation on the promotion committee.

The Department Head shall announce the vote at the meeting and communicate the department's

Approved 2/2021

recommendation to the candidate so that the candidate can make an informed decision about whether or not to continue with the process of seeking promotion. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the Department Head shall honor the candidate's request, and the vote shall be transmitted itemized as a, b, c, and d as listed above in writing, to the Dean along with the other information requested in this document.

The Dean will make a final determination on promotion and communicate the decision to the candidate in writing, with a courtesy copy to the Department Head. The determination of the Dean of the College is final.

Change of Position to Tenure-track

An appointment from a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer from the Lecture title series to tenure-track faculty may only occur through normal, faculty approved, Department Head and Dean approved, Provost approved and AA/EEO approved tenure-track recruitment. Lecturer/Senior Lecturer time will not count toward the tenure clock.

Termination

The expectation of continuous employment provides the guarantee needed to ensure academic freedom. Termination of a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer during the contract term shall be effected by the University only for lack of funding or adequate cause. If termination during the contract term is for reasons other than lack of funding then the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 3) provides that "Rights of due process shall also apply to a non-tenured faculty member dismissed before completion of his or her contractual term". Dismissal shall not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of academic freedom or other rights of American citizens.