Consistent with the procedures for review for faculty outlined in Article 210 of the CLASS Policies and Procedures Manual, the Department of Writing and Linguistics conducts a performance evaluation for lecturer faculty during the faculty member’s third year. The exact year for evaluation depends on the faculty member’s contract and will be determined by the department chair in consultation with the lecturer.

The CLASS Policies and Procedures Manual recognizes the diverse group of disciplines within the college and therefore mandates that the “precise nature of the performance evaluation will be determined by each department” (page 15).

The department chair of Writing and Linguistics will meet with each lecturer faculty member before April 1 of a lecturer faculty member’s second year to describe procedures and policies for the review. The department chair will provide copies of the system’s policy on lecturer review, the university’s policy on lecturer review, the college’s policy on lecturer review, and the Writing and Linguistics’ policy on lecturer review. The department chair will specify how and by whom the evaluation will be conducted, how information will be sought from other individuals, and the specific criteria for review. The department chair shall remind the faculty member that excellence in teaching will receive the highest priority.

It is recommended that regular and frequent conversations occur between lecturer faculty and the department chair regarding the two criteria specified in the BOR Policy Manual (Section 8.3.8.1) for possible reappointment after six consecutive years of employment as a lecturer: “exceptional teaching ability” and “extraordinary value to the institution.”

In the Department of Writing and Linguistics, exceptional teaching ability will be assessed on the basis of multiple measures, including but not limited to:

- Teaching Observations: these should include narrative evaluations and observations of the candidate’s teaching. Classroom observations, which can be performed by members of the lecturer’s advisory committee and/or other departmental faculty, will be conducted per the guidelines in the Department Constitution, By-Laws & Collected Policies.

- Instructional Materials: these should include syllabi, sample assignments, and other materials (for example, samples of student papers with faculty response, instructional materials used in
training colleagues and fellow professionals, evidence of student learning and/or performance, or artifacts showcasing teaching excellence and/or innovations). In the teaching section of the narrative, lecturers are expected to discuss these materials, explaining how they relate to course objectives and reflect specific course outcomes (e.g., the First Year Composition outcomes currently published on the departmental Web site).

- **Student Evaluations:** the compiled mean scores on end-of-term student ratings of instruction (SRIs) are required, but are not the most effective way to evaluate excellence in teaching. Written student comments on the back of SRI's may be included and referenced in the narrative to contextualize SRI scores. Students’ narrative reflections, testimonials, or other artifacts may also be added.

In order to help Lecturers construct an argument about the quality of their teaching, Writing and Linguistics recommends that they refer to the definition of “superior teaching,” found in Section 205.01 of the GSU Faculty Handbook: “Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including the development of online courses. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on measures such as examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, critical review and dissemination of teaching products, performance of students in subsequent venues, follow-up of graduates in graduate school or in their employment, and student ratings of instruction.”

Because the above definition of “superior teaching” includes the phrase “critical review and dissemination of teaching products,” Lecturer faculty may wish to provide evidence of “exceptional teaching ability” through publication of scholarly/creative work; presentations at regional, national, and international conferences; and commitment to maintaining currency in the discipline (through conference and/or workshop attendance or specialized training). In terms of “superior teaching,” Lecturer faculty should provide evidence of a commitment to maintaining currency in the discipline (through activities such as conference and/or workshop attendance or specialized training). Because the above definition of “superior teaching” includes the phrase “critical review and dissemination of teaching products,” Lecturer faculty may also wish to provide evidence of “exceptional teaching ability” through publication of scholarly/creative work and presentations at regional, national, and international conferences. The Department is fully cognizant that scholarship and scholarly publications are NOT criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer, but Lecturers’ independent efforts in this regard may deserve recognition as significant contributions to their professional development as teachers.

**Extraordinary Value to the Institution**

Extraordinary Value to the Institution is a requirement for promotion. The Department of Writing and Linguistics will gauge lecturers’ “extraordinary value” in terms of the contributions they make to the institution beyond fulfilling their teaching duties.

As defined by CLASS Policy 302, “Evaluation and Promotion of Lecturers,” “extraordinary value to
the institution” is shown through “annual reviews [that] show a sustained commitment to service, demonstrating an active involvement in the operation and governance of the department, College, and/or University.” While the CLASS Policy requires service only to the department, College, and/or University, the Department of Writing and Linguistics understands that service may encompass “the application of one’s expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution” (GSU Faculty Handbook, Section 205.01). Thus, Lecturer faculty who wish to provide additional evidence of “extraordinary value to the institution” may fulfill the requirement through service to the profession or community that enhances the mission of Georgia Southern University. As with scholarly activity, the Department realizes that service to the profession and/or community is NOT a criterion for promotion to Senior Lecturer, and it should not supplant nor replace service to the institution, but Lecturers’ independent efforts in this regard may deserve recognition as significant contributions to their demonstration of “extraordinary value to the institution.”

Contributions which can provide evidence of extraordinary value include (but are not limited to)

- Service to the department, college, and/or university (required)
- Professional development as an instructor via workshops, specialized training, attendance at discipline-related conferences, etc.
- Commitment to maintaining currency in the discipline
- Service to the profession or community
- Leadership or initiative related to the discipline, demonstrated on campus, in the wider profession, or in the community.

Procedures for Preparation of Third Year Review Folder

At the time of each annual evaluation, the department chair should give the faculty member a clear idea of progress toward possible promotion, indicating specifically any performance areas in which the faculty member needs to improve.

By September 1 of the review year, each lecturer undergoing departmental review shall submit the names of (a) two tenured, tenure-track and (b) two lecturer or senior lecturer faculty members in the department of Writing and Linguistics, as possible members of their advisory committee. The department chair, in consultation with either the Assistant Chair or the Coordinator of First-Year Writing, will select each lecturer’s three-member advisory committee. At least two members of this committee will come from the lecturer’s list; at least one of the committee members will have the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer.

No later than December 1st of the review year, each lecturer undergoing departmental review will submit to the department chair a written narrative of his or her contributions in the areas of teaching and extraordinary value to the institution. The faculty member will also submit materials in support of the narrative self-evaluation to the department chair. Required materials are the following:

College requirements:

1. A current *curriculum vitae* in standard format, highlighting the review period
2. Copies of annual performance reviews for the review period
3. A copy of third-year review documents.
4. Summary of student ratings of instruction for the review period
5. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction
6. Evidence of service activities during the review period

Departmental requirements: in addition to the above documents, a candidate shall also submit:

7. A written narrative of his or her contributions in the areas of teaching, service, professional development, and overall value to the institution. The teaching section of the narrative should refer to specific syllabi, assignments, innovations, pedagogical approaches, etc.
8. Statement of teaching philosophy
9. Teaching Observations, Instructional Materials, and Student Evaluations (see above)
10. Evidence of commitment to currency in the discipline

Materials should be submitted as a single portfolio, preferably in a 1” or 2” binder by December 1st of the review year. Materials should be comprehensive yet selective, representing the faculty member’s teaching and other professional activity during the review period.

By January 15th of the review year, the advisory committee will review these materials and submit a written evaluation to the department chair. The committee may consult the department faculty as part of its review.

By February 1st of the review year, the department chair of Writing and Linguistics will forward to the dean of CLASS the department chair’s written evaluation, the committee’s evaluation, and a cover memorandum specifying one of these four results:

a) The faculty member is performing at a level that meets departmental expectations for promotion and no specific recommendations for improvement are necessary.
b) The faculty member is performing at a level that meets departmental expectations for promotion, but it is recommended that improvements be made.
c) The faculty member is not performing at a level that meets departmental expectations for promotion, but improvements may yet be made.
d) The faculty member is not performing at a level that meets departmental expectations for promotion, and it is recommended that additional employment contracts not be issued.

By February 1st of the review year, the department chair will give each lecturer completing departmental review a written summary of recommendations, a copy of the advisory committee’s evaluation, and any suggestions for continued progress. The department chair will then meet with each lecturer undergoing review to discuss these materials and conclude by offering him or her an opportunity to provide a written response to be appended to the report. The written response is due to the department chair by February 10 of the review year.

N. B. Departmental review is to be candid and future oriented. Although a positive review is not a guarantee of reappointment and/or promotion, this together with annual evaluations can indicate of candidate’s progress.