Department of English policies and practices regarding lecturers

1. Hiring
From our 2011-2012 departmental policy statement:
Lecturers are hired on a contingent basis, usually by the semester, to teach courses that cannot be covered by continuing faculty. Contracts specify either a per-course stipend or a percentage appointment, e.g. 50% or 100%.

2. Development and mentoring
Presently, the department has no written policy regarding development and mentoring of lecturers.

To date, lecturers have received support from the Director of Lower Division Studies, who supplies model syllabi, learning outcomes, goals, and policies that govern the teaching of first-year courses at Texas State. In addition, the Director makes available to lecturers an extensive library of materials for the teaching of lower division courses and a compilation of model syllabi, exercises, assignments, and handouts.

Beginning Fall 2012, we have approval to hire a Coordinator for Lecturers in English. This position (25% assigned time), will allow an experienced faculty member to perform the following duties: 1) develop an orientation meeting for new lecturers in order to review the goals, purposes, outcomes, model syllabi, textbooks and policies pertaining to lower division courses; 2) provide ongoing support and mentoring for the more than 30 lecturers we expect to hire for 2011-2012; 3) inform lecturers of the necessity, rationale, and models for annual review; 3) observe classes of each lecturer annually, write a formative assessment, and share it during a meeting with each lecturer; copies of the assessment will be shared with Director of Lower Division Studies and departmental chair; and 4) conduct a review of student evaluations each semester.

3. Merit and performance for adjunct faculty: highlighted sections pertain specifically to lecturers

All English Department faculty—whether full time or part time, continuing or non-continuing, on leave or not—are reviewed annually by March 1 for the preceding calendar year. The department follows the provisions of PPS 8.09 (Performance Evaluation of Faculty and Post-Tenure Review) and of PPS 8.11 (Performance Evaluation of Non-Continuing Adjunct Faculty), both of which are incorporated into this policy by reference. Faculty submit review materials using the online Faculty Annual Review and Reporting System (FARRS). Submission deadline is the first class day of the spring semester. Annual faculty review is entirely separate from review for tenure and/or promotion.

Reviewers
The annual review of faculty is the responsibility of the chair and departmental personnel committee. Three different review committees—one for full professors, one for associate and assistant professors, and one for senior lecturers and lecturers—make recommendations to the departmental personnel committee, which recommends to the chair. Faculty on phased retirement are reviewed for teaching by the review committee appropriate to their rank. The chair makes an independent review of all faculty. The chair also reviews any faculty who do not submit materials using the FARRS system (e.g., faculty teaching in the fall who do not return in the spring); in such cases, the evaluation is based on course syllabi, student evaluations, and other available
The department chair, in consultation with the departmental personnel committee, appoints a committee to review the associate and assistant professors and another committee to review senior lecturers and lecturers.

Each of the three review committees reports evaluation results to the department chair and to the appropriate members of the personnel committee. The department chair and all full professors, except for the faculty member under review, consider the recommendations for full professors. The department chair and the full professors consider recommendations for associate professors. The department chair, professors, and associate professors consider recommendations for assistant professors on the personnel committee. The personnel committee reviews recommendations for all other faculty members.

**Criteria for Review**

All faculty are reviewed for teaching. Depending on their rank and workload assignment, faculty are also reviewed for scholarly/creative activity and service. Using the criteria given below, reviewers determine whether a faculty member “meets expectations,” “exceeds expectations,” or “does not meet expectations” in each category of review. If a faculty member is not expected to perform in a particular category, reviewers assign “NA” (“not applicable”).

A. Teaching. Good university teachers have the following characteristics: competent and growing in their discipline; articulate; accessible to students; disciplined in their work habits; skillful in motivating students; effective in organizing courses; and careful in maintaining high academic standards. In general, faculty who exceed expectations in teaching provide the review committee with detailed, thoughtful comments in sections 2F and 2G of the FARRS report. In section 2F (Comments on Teaching), faculty discuss information such as the following: development of new courses or modification of the content, format, organization, or use of technology in existing courses; development of teaching knowledge and skills through independent study, attendance at workshops, or other professional development activities; mentoring that extends beyond the classroom, such as training IAs, helping students revise work for presentation/publication, or advising students about graduate study or career options. In section 2G (Comments on Student Evaluations), faculty indicate what they have learned from evaluations and explain what changes, if any, they have decided to make in light of students’ responses.

**Categories of Evaluation**

All full-time faculty—except senior lecturers and lecturers—are ordinarily expected to be evaluated in all three categories—teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. If a faculty member wishes not to be evaluated in a particular category, this should be negotiated with the chair well in advance so that appropriate adjustments in workload can be discussed and approved outside the department. Senior lecturers are evaluated for teaching and service. Lecturers and faculty on phased retirement are evaluated only for teaching. If faculty members are uncertain about which categories of review apply in a given situation, they should consult the chair.

**Preparation of Materials and Review Procedures**

All English faculty—part-time or full-time, tenured or non-tenured—must submit an annual review report using the FARRS system. A sample FARRS report is available on request to any member of the English faculty. Tenure-track faculty include a paper copy of their CVs with their documentation. For other faculty, the CV posted on the HB 2504 website is sufficient so long as it is up to date. The FARRS report should identify specifically those factors the faculty member believes necessary to a full and fair assessment. On their reading of the FARRS report
(or report and documentation in the case of tenure-track faculty), the departmental review committees will determine that a faculty member is meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations. (The committee may call for supporting material relevant to the FARRS report; faculty are expected to keep such material on file.) After completing their work, the three review committees report to the personnel committee. Any personnel committee member who seriously questions a committee's assessment of a faculty member may announce his or her intention to review the FARRS report and any supporting material and, within five days, give the committee possible reasons for reassessment. Such challenges must be based on reference(s) to specific information in the FARRS report and to any relevant material previously submitted. Anecdotal evidence will not be considered. The committee takes any written suggestions into consideration before presenting its final report to the chair. All discussions of the personnel committee are confidential.

The department uses an anonymous student evaluation form to evaluate the performance of all faculty in all classes at least one long semester each year. In the semester selected, before the week of final examinations, each faculty member distributes evaluations, leaving the room while students complete them. A designated student takes the completed evaluations to the department office to be held until semester grades are turned in. Then the evaluations are available to the faculty member to be used in completing the FARRS report. Any faculty member may request evaluations more often. In addition to the department’s student evaluation form, instructors are required to administer in all undergraduate courses every semester an evaluation mandated by the State of Texas—Student Perception of Instructor (SPI). Results of the SPI are posted on the university website for public access.

**PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING PERFORMANCE AND MERIT RAISES**

*Performance*

Performance funds are distributed in accord with university policy, usually as an across-the-board increase for all eligible faculty. The university administration determines the amount of funding, if any, and the basis for eligibility. Barring instructions to the contrary, English faculty will be eligible for performance raises if they meet expectations in annual review (as determined by the evaluation of the personnel committee and the chair in sections 7 and 8 of the FARRS form).

*Merit*

Merit raises are also awarded in accord with university policy, which has typically defined the basis for merit as faculty accomplishment during the preceding three calendar years. Merit awards should make clear, meaningful, significant distinctions. The faculty review committees recommend to the personnel committee and to the chair an evaluation of a faculty member's performance, in the context of departmental criteria, during the annual review process. Reviewers' evaluations (as approved by the personnel committee) indicate who is eligible to be considered for merit, namely, all faculty who have exceeded expectations in at least one-third of the individual annual review ratings made by the PC during the period of merit review. The chair determines merit but is required to consult the personnel committee before making decisions. Basic merit amounts have generally been linked to annual review results, with additional amounts added, if available, based on exceptional achievement (see below). In consulting the personnel committee, the chair will indicate approximately what the range of merit raises will be (e.g., high, medium, low) for a given level of annual review performance. Merit decisions are based on exceptional achievement. In teaching, exceptional achievement might be a major teaching award or development effort.

4. Pay scale/compensation for per course faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers

Pay scales vary in all categories due to the experience and evaluation of individual faculty.
Beginning pay scales that the Provost authorizes English to offer are approximately as follows:

Lecturers (teaching 4 courses each, fall and spring semesters, no expectation of scholarly/creative activity or service): $24,300. Per course faculty receive 1/8 of the 100% salary ($3,037) for each course taught.

Senior Lecturers (4 courses each, fall and spring semesters, no expectation of scholarly/creative activity): $38,000

Assistant Professor (3 courses and 1 research assignment each fall and spring semester): $51,000 for a 9-month contract.