

This document, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) Lecturer Title Series Promotion Criteria, is based on the Provost's Guidelines for Unit Specific Lecturer Title Series Promotion Criteria, referenced in section 3.5.6 of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook. In the absence of approved department-specific guidelines, these guidelines apply to all lecturers in the College, including those in interdisciplinary programs.

Provost's Guidelines for Unit Specific Lecturer Title Series Promotion Criteria

The following guidelines are provided by the Office of the Provost to all units developing specific Lecturer Title Series Promotion criteria. These Provost guidelines outline, for the units, the documentation that will be needed in order to receive Provost approval for specific unit criteria. Both the format and content should be adhered to by the units, in order to receive approval.

The Lecturer Title Series is an instructional title series. Lecturers are first and foremost undergraduate teachers with the majority of their assignment serving the instructional mission of the University. Therefore, promotion criteria **must** include:

1. Knowledge of the subject and evidence of professional growth in the field of specialization;
2. Teaching excellence as evidenced by awards and peer and student evaluations, new course and material development, teaching portfolio, independent study projects, published pedagogical material and statement of teach philosophy;

Promotion criteria **may** also include:

3. Contributions to student advising. In CLA, formal student advising is not generally a duty assigned to or expected of Lecturers. Some Lecturers may have advising duties assigned but these should be explicit in the appointment and annual review process.

Please note that all unit specific guidelines must have the written approval of the dean of the college/school before being reviewed by the Office of the Provost. The length of time allowed for consideration of promotion in the lecturer title series is not limited. However, each unit's specific guidelines must explain how candidates who fail to achieve promotion will be counseled.

Candidates who fail to achieve promotion will meet with their Unit Head and, if they wish, the Dean. After those meetings, the Unit Head will generate a Candidate

Counseling Plan, to be approved by the Dean. The Unit Head will have the primary responsibility for implementing the Candidate Counseling Plan.

Procedure for Promotion

I. Initiation of the Process

The promotion process can be initiated by the unit head or by the candidate. It is the joint responsibility of the unit head and the faculty member to see that the promotion process begins at the appropriately scheduled time. The steps delineated below are the procedures to follow for promoting a lecturer faculty member.

Candidates and unit heads should supply information necessary for evaluation in the format outlined below. This information should be made available first to eligible faculty members, a college/school committee (if appropriate), then to the dean. The information must be sufficiently detailed so that a candidate can be evaluated in terms of both potential and achievement. Unit heads and candidates who have questions about material to be submitted should feel free to contact the dean of the appropriate college/school.

II. Information on the Candidate

The outline printed below indicates the kind of information each candidate for promotion and his/her unit head should supply and describes the format to be followed in presenting that information.

Guidelines and/or criteria are subject to periodic revision with approval from the appropriate dean's office and the Office of the Provost.

A. General Instructions

All lists should be in reverse chronological order with dates clearly indicated.

Supporting material such as publications, slides, evaluative material (book reviews, published critiques, adjudicated production reviews, practice portfolio, etc.) should be made available for review by the unit head and later by the dean. The candidate and unit head should agree on the selection of material to be made available.

B. Information to Be Supplied by the Candidate:

- A Standard Biographical Data sheet (see Faculty Handbook for form).

- A percent breakdown of the allocation of time and effort as specified by the terms of his/her contract for at least the past three years.
- A list of honors and awards.
- A list of scholarly contributions in accord with the following outline. A candidate should present his/her work as informatively and accurately as possible. A candidate should cross-reference work that falls in two areas.

1. Scholarly Contributions by the Candidate

a. Teaching

1. All actual courses taught for each semester for at least the past three years. Indicate lecture/lab, hours per week and enrollment.
2. Responsibilities including supervision and evaluation of interns, GTAs, etc.
3. Advising contributions
4. Teaching students, in small group settings.
5. Courses and curricula developed.
6. Grants received related to teaching.
7. Publications pertaining to teaching. Include textbooks, manuals, and articles on pedagogy.
8. Other contributions to teaching.
9. Statement of candidate's teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values. This should be no longer than one page.

2. Service

- a University Service: Distinguish among service to the University, to the college/school, and to the department. University service as part of a previously held position may be listed here. Administrative work which reduces the candidate's teaching or research assignment should be listed here.

B Professional Service: Service to professional associations and learned societies such as offices held, committees served on, etc.

C. Information to be supplied by Unit Head

Information may be supplied in each of the following areas as appropriate:

1. Teaching: Student evaluations. Include student evaluations from at least one course per semester and at least one of each different course taught during the past three years: 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. The evaluation results should be condensed into as few pages as possible. Peer evaluations. Include a peer evaluation for one course section for at least the past three years (so a minimum of three peer evaluations). In the case of a lecturer teaching multiple course titles, this should include at least one peer evaluation of each course title (as opposed to section). 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.
2. Service: Letters invited by the candidate addressing his or her work on program, college, and University committees. A discussion of service within the unit, such as on committees pertaining to the curriculum, search committees, etc., should be included when applicable.

Consideration of the Candidate and the Unit's and College/School Recommendation

D. Consideration of the Candidate

The candidate's dossier (consisting of the information supplied by the candidate and the information supplied by the unit head) and supporting material shall be available for review exclusively by faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. Faculty eligible to vote on the candidate are determined by the department. In the case of Interdisciplinary Programs, initial consideration of the candidate occurs at the level of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. After the faculty has had time to review the dossier and supporting material, the unit head, as a non-voting participant, shall convene a meeting of all eligible faculty (as approved in written college/school guidelines) to discuss nomination of the candidate. Confidentiality and the right of faculty members to express their viewpoints openly without fear of retaliation shall be the hallmarks of the discussion. Unit deliberations shall be confidential to the extent permitted by law.

E. The Unit's and College/School's Recommendations

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

1. present and voting,
2. present and abstaining,
3. absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
4. absent and not voting (This response does not count as part of the total vote.).

The unit head, dean, and any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall not vote at the department level (if applicable). Faculty members who serve on committees at the school/college level may choose to vote at the department level or at higher levels, but they may vote only once on candidates from their departments. Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from voting.

The unit head shall announce the vote at the meeting. The vote shall be transmitted itemized as a, b, c, and d as listed above in writing, to the dean of the candidate's college or school and the College/School Committee (if applicable) along with the other information requested in this document.

The eligible unit faculty who voted on a candidate's promotion will write a summary letter that reflects the vote and represents all aspects of the discussion leading to that vote. The department head will also write an evaluative letter with a recommendation for or against promotion. In addition to these two required letters, individual faculty members may write letters explaining why they do or do not favor promotion. Where there are fewer than three faculty members in a department who are eligible to write letters of evaluation, the head may ask for letters from faculty members in other departments who have knowledge of the candidate's professional performance. In the case of Interdisciplinary Programs, the Unit Head may solicit letters from program affiliates and other faculty knowledgeable of the candidate's work in the interdisciplinary program. Letters should address the quality of the lecturer work and the candidate's potential for continued work, teaching effectiveness, as well as advising and service contributions if applicable.

Faculty should bear in mind that letters are an important source of information. Letters can help all involved to make an informed judgment about the candidate by addressing the candidate's performance of his or her duties within a department. Letters can also help others who may not come from the candidate's field, understand the significance of the candidate's work and make a fair appraisal of it. Faculty, department heads, and chairs should note that, unlike letters from outside reviewers that remain confidential, their letters will be made available to and may be rebutted by the candidate.

The unit head shall communicate the unit's vote to the candidate and also make available to the candidate all letters submitted by the committee, the unit head, and individual faculty members. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a rebuttal if desired. The candidate can also 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 unit head shall honor the candidate's request.

If there is a college committee, its members will review the dossier, letters, and the candidate's rebuttal (if submitted), and they will vote by secret ballot. The committee will write a summary letter that reflects the vote and represents all aspects of the discussion leading to that vote. The college/school committee will communicate the college/school committee vote and make available to the candidate the college/school committee's letter. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a response letter if desired. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the committee shall honor the candidate's request.

F. Submission of the Candidate's Dossier to the Dean

Units will submit dossiers in PDF format to the Dean's office in an approved electronic format. Dossiers are to be collated as follows and separated with a title page for each section:

1. Standard biographical data sheet.
2. Information supplied by the candidate.
3. Information supplied by the department head.
4. Evaluations and recommendations from: the college committee (if applicable), the unit head, the director of any relevant funding source (e.g.: the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott Ritchey Research Center, etc.), faculty members, and outside referees and any response letter from the candidate.

G. Schedule

Nominations for promotion shall be transmitted to the dean by the deadline. The specific date shall be announced in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. The candidate's dean and/or College Committee shall request material early enough to allow for recommendations from the faculty, the department head and the dean and rebuttals from the candidate to be forwarded with the candidate's dossier. The final decision must be reported to the Provost's Office by the deadline noted in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. As the Chief Academic Officer of Auburn University, the Provost retains the right to review all promotions and act appropriately.

H. The Dean's Final Action

After the department and college/school review, all dossier materials, including optional letters of response, must be submitted to the Dean for a final action. The dean must inform the candidate, by letter, his/her decision to grant or deny promotion within 15 business days of receiving approval from the Provost. The letter must also include a counseling/development plan for candidates who are denied promotion.

I. Appeal of Promotion Decisions

Grounds for appeal exist when, in the opinion of the candidate, one or more of the following occurred:

1. The denial of promotion resulted from the fact that all evidence in support of the candidate was not presented at the time of the original consideration.
2. The denial resulted from procedural irregularities concerning advisement and periodic review or a failure to follow promotion procedures of the department, college, school, or University.
3. The denial was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom.
4. The denial was based significantly on discrimination as described in the [University's EEO Policy](#). In these cases, the appeal should begin with the candidate immediately contacting the Office of Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity at 334.844.4794 as well as following the appeals process below.

A faculty member who contends unjust denial of promotion may choose to discuss the reasons for denial and the appeals process with the Dean. Appeals should be made in writing through the unit head and dean within 14 calendar days of the date of the faculty member's receipt of

written notification of denial.

If the faculty member bases his/her appeal on alleged violation of academic freedom or discrimination, the appeal must include a statement of the grounds on which the allegation is based and evidence to support his/her case. If the faculty member succeeds in establishing a prima facie case, it is incumbent upon those who made the decision against continuation to come forward with evidence in support of their decision. Statistical evidence of discrimination may be used by the candidate in establishing a prima facie case.

The Dean shall respond promptly to the faculty member's appeal by forming an Appeals Committee and setting the date, time, and place for the hearing of the appeal.

The Appeals Committee shall be comprised of the following:

1. One current member of the College/School Promotion Committee (if applicable), selected by the Promotion Committee.
2. Five members of proper rank who represent the college, but not department, of the appealing candidates. If more than five members are needed to represent the appellants, more than five members will be chosen as needed. If the college/school has a college/school level Promotion committee, then past members of that committee should be utilized, if available.

After the merit of the appeal has been judged, the recommendations of the Appeals Committee and all supporting documents shall be submitted to the Dean for final action.

In the appellate process, appeals must be taken and decisions rendered so as to prevent postponing a promotion decision to the next year.