

LECTURER PROMOTION POLICIES AT MOST OF ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY'S PEER  
INSTITUTIONS

A REPORT PREPARED BY:

Shari Collins, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Philosophy

UAC West Campus President, Arizona State University

August, 2014

**Peer Institutions Studied:**

This report is based upon lecturer promotion policies at the following ASU peer institutions:

University of California, Los Angeles; University of Connecticut; Florida State University;  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa;  
University of Maryland-College Park; University of Minnesota-Twin Cities; The University of  
Texas at Austin, University of Washington, Seattle; and the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

**Summary of Policies:**

The overwhelming majority of policies detail promotion practices that do not require that lecturers be hired in a competitive search to be eligible for multi-year contracts or promotion. The University of Iowa requires a search, though is vague about the criteria. The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities allows for a formal search, as well as omitting same depending upon the

position. The University of Washington, Seattle's Provost Cauce assigned a Work Group to address lecturer appointments and promotion. In their report they recommended a competitive search to hire a lecturer, as well as a prerequisite to potential multi-year contracts, and promotion. I will first summarize the common practices of ASU's above-named peers, then turn to each of the above-named peers, to detail their policies and practices.

For all of the above peers except for Iowa, Minnesota, and Washington there is no mention of a competitive search in order to be eligible for multi-year contracts, or promotion. The criteria for promotion explicitly address teaching records, with higher than average teaching scores expected, as well as other evidence of teaching excellence. Other evidence includes teaching awards, student evaluations, peer reviews, and on occasion research that addresses pedagogy or the lecturer's area of expertise. Service may also be considered, though overwhelmingly the lecturer's teaching record is paramount. Teaching loads were 3-3 on average.

A multi-year contract is a prerequisite for promotion at most peer institutions in this study. Multiple years of teaching (from three to five or more) are most often required for promotion.

### **Peer Institution Policies:**

The following excerpts are the crucial sections of ASU's peer institutions' policies. At the University of California, Los Angeles, promotion with "Security of Employment" (SOE) is warranted after the following:

In order to be appointed as Lecturer (SOE) or Senior Lecturer (SOE), assuming appropriate allocation of the FTE for the position, an individual must have demonstrated

teaching ability of exceptional quality. Superior intellectual attainment as evidenced in the candidate's teaching ability is an indispensable qualification for appointment as Lecturer (SOE) or Senior Lecturer (SOE). It is incumbent upon the departmental chair to provide convincing evidence of such attainment. Pro forma statements will not suffice. Because candidates drawn from professional environments may often have had exceedingly limited experience in formal lecturing, the review committee has a special obligation to assure that the candidate possesses superior abilities in the classroom, and in other aspects of the organization and presentation of the subject.<sup>i</sup>

There is no mention of a competitive search in order to be eligible for a multi-year contract (with SOE) or a promotion.

Florida State University has "Teaching Faculty" eligible for promotion according to:

meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position., since these positions have assignments in specific areas (e.g., assignment in research or teaching only, rather than an assignment in all three areas of teaching, research, and service), in addition to degree and time in service. Performance is reviewed in the annual evaluation process, which determines salary actions, retention, and recommendations for promotion.

Promotion decisions for specialized faculty will take into account the following:

- annual evaluations
- annual assignments

- fulfillment of the department/unit written promotion criteria in relation to the assignment
- evidence of sustained effectiveness relative to opportunity and according to assignment

### **Teaching Faculty track**

- evidence of well-planned and delivered courses
- summaries of data from Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) questionnaires
- letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching
- ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major
- other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction<sup>ii</sup>

At the University of Connecticut, multi-year contracts are *required* after lecturers complete six years of employment. After this precedence is set all future contracts must also be multi-year unless there is "just cause" given, and this is "grievable." Here they use the same teaching evaluation criteria for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, and that criteria is department-specific.<sup>iii</sup>

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the promotion policy is as follows:

When lecturers and instructors have made significant contributions to the department's teaching mission, including contributions to the curriculum, appointment or promotion

to a senior title is appropriate. Each department must define the specific substantive criteria for the “senior” level but its fundamental characteristic is that it denotes a higher level of contribution to the unit. The senior modifier should NOT be used simply because a person has been in a title for a certain amount of time, although length of service and contribution to the department should be a factor that is evaluated. In consultation with their colleges, departments should develop clear promotion policies that identify the criteria governing the advancement of individuals to senior instructor and senior lecturer titles. Appointment to a senior instructor or senior lecturer title must be supported by a candidate-prepared dossier that demonstrates that the individual’s experience and qualifications meet the departmental criteria. College-level approval must be obtained for promotion or appointment to senior instructor or senior lecturer. Promotion to a senior-level appointment should ordinarily be accompanied by a uniform promotional increase in base salary, as set and funded by the department. Similarly, as a general matter, departments should consider offering a multi-year contract with senior-level appointments.<sup>iv</sup>

Indiana University at Bloomington states the following regarding criteria for evaluating and promoting lecturers:

Initial Lecturer and Clinical appointments should be at the level appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual and approved by the faculty of the unit. Standards and procedures for contracts during the probationary period and after shall conform to the relevant sections of the Academic Handbook (2008 edition, pp. 84-

86). The design of the long-term contract shall be determined by the school, or may be left by schools to units within schools, but shall be uniform within a single administrative unit.

The University of Iowa College of Liberal Arts & Sciences requires an Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity approval *before a search* for a lecturer may begin. Then:

Although they are not tenure-track, renewable lecturers are considered regular (not temporary) faculty. Typically, the lecturer position is authorized for a three-year period. Because of University policy, the CLAS model offer language states that the appointment is for one year, renewable on an annual basis for additional specified years (for instance, appointed for the 2009-10 academic year, renewable for 2010-11 and 2011-12). The lecturer signs and returns to letter to the DEO, who initials it, files the original and sends a copy to Wendy Evans in the Office of the Dean. The appointment form is submitted once and specifies a three year period with an end date that matches the offer letter.<sup>v</sup>

The University of Maryland-College Park has the following criteria:

The title Lecturer will ordinarily be used to designate appointments, at any salary and experience level, of persons who are serving in a teaching capacity for a limited time or part-time. This rank does not carry tenure. Initial full-time appointments normally should not exceed one academic year, while initial part-time appointments should not exceed one semester. Subsequent appointments to this rank may be for terms not to exceed three years and are renewable.<sup>vi</sup>

And per Senior Lecturer:

In addition to having the qualifications of a lecturer, the appointee normally shall have established over the course of six years a record of teaching excellence and service.

Appointment to this rank requires the approval of the departmental faculty. This rank does not carry tenure. Appointments may be for terms not to exceed five years and are renewable.

The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities refers to lecturers as “contract faculty” under the category of “term faculty.” However,

Subject in some instances to approval by the Dean of the College, departments and programs may appoint individuals to term faculty positions, including contract, adjunct, visiting, and temporary faculty positions. Proposed individuals may be chosen with or without a formal search process, as appropriate for the specific position.

During the course of their appointments, term faculty members serving for one or more years will receive annual performance reviews. Term faculty members eligible for promotion will be provided specific criteria governing promotion decisions associated with their positions....

Promotion criteria for contract faculty should be designed such that individuals might reasonably be expected to be qualified for promotion after having been in rank for 5 years. Promotion will not be based on time in rank, but to the extent that merit includes the maintenance of a sustained level of contributions to unit activities these time

frames may be regarded as guides. Exceptional merit may be the basis for more rapid promotion decisions.<sup>vii</sup>

The University of Texas at Austin has the following criteria for lecturer promotion:

Recommendations for promotion of lecturer or senior lecturer may be considered after the individual has served in his or her current rank at the university for at least six years.

Cumulative service in rank may be either full time or part time. Recommendations for early promotion should be explained and justified.

The principal role of faculty in the lecturer titles is providing instructional service that augments and complements that of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Thus, exceptional teaching performance is expected and a well-documented record of teaching excellence is required for all such candidates for promotion. The budget council statement for each department or academic unit should describe the local rating criteria and service norms for teaching and demonstrate that the candidate's level of teaching service is above the departmental average.

In addition, an adequately documented record of significant accomplishment in at least one of the other areas of contribution consistent with the terms of employment is required for promotion to senior lecturer.

The title of distinguished senior lecturer is reserved for individuals who, in addition to teaching excellence, have a sustained record of significant accomplishment adequately



documented in at least one of the other areas of contribution consistent with the terms of employment.<sup>viii</sup>

The University of Wisconsin, Madison, lists the following criteria for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer:

According to its prefix definition, a **(no prefix) Lecturer** has 1) *experience and academic qualifications needed to develop and teach a course(s) subject to broad guidelines describing the scope of the subject matter to be covered. However, the specific topics to be covered and the degree of topic emphasis is left to the independent judgment of the (no prefix) Lecturer. At this level 2) may be involved in various instruction related activities. These may include undergraduate advising, assisting in developing lab safety protocols, course scheduling, curriculum development, participating in departmental outreach programs, or other instructional activities.*

According to its prefix definition, a **Senior Lecturer** has 1) *extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise in an academic discipline. A lecturer at this level 2) has gained a reputation among his or her peers for demonstrably sustained superior contributions to teaching within a department or division. At this level, the 3) independent selection, organization and development of course contents and instructional materials and approaches used is expected. 4) Involvement with committees engaged in supporting this development is typical. However, the direct delivery of instruction is the primary responsibility of this title.*<sup>ix</sup>

The University of Washington, Seattle's College of Arts & Sciences has criteria for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer that may include not only teaching, but also service, and research (the latter appropriate to pedagogy or the teaching specialty). The teaching criteria are as follows:

The University expects consistently high quality teaching from Senior Lecturers. This alone, however, is not sufficient for consideration for promotion to Principal Lecturer. The promotion case must provide evidence of the faculty member's sustained excellence in instruction by the faculty member's unit, College, University, and/or discipline. In general, quality and breadth of contributions are more important than quantity.

Some examples of evidence of recognition of teaching excellence may be:

- *A departmental teaching award.* A departmental teaching award distinguishes the faculty member in his/her own unit.
- *A discipline-specific teaching award.* A discipline-specific teaching award represents acknowledgement of the faculty member's teaching by his/her scholarly community.
- *A university teaching award* (at the University of Washington, the relevant awards are the Distinguished Teaching Award and the James D. Clowes Award). A university-level teaching award demonstrates a recognized pattern of excellence in instruction at the university.

- *Participation as a planner or facilitator in programs including, but not limited to, the Large Class Collegium, Faculty Fellows, Institute for Teaching Excellence, Provost's Workshops, the TA Institute, Bridge programs, early start programs, OMA, and Athletic Academic Services.* Involvement in these programs indicated the faculty member's contributions to the University's teaching community.
- *Membership in or chairing of faculty councils related to teaching.* Participation in faculty councils related to teaching indicates the faculty member's involvement in University-level teaching issues.
- *Participation in university-level advisory groups or selection committees related to teaching.* Involvement in University-level groups or committees related to teaching demonstrates the faculty member's engagement in the broader teaching mission of the University.<sup>x</sup>

Perhaps the most provocative of all documents (in that it addresses competitive searches) is a University of Washington, Seattle, Provost's work group on lecturer appointments report. The Charge was as follows:

The Provost's charge to the work group (3/8/13) is to make policy recommendations to Provost Cauce about hiring processes and policies for full-time lecturers and senior lecturers, including offering multi-year contracts, and focusing on policies for new hires. The goal is a predictable path for full-time lecturers.<sup>xi</sup>

The work group was formed to address lecturer concerns about promotion, especially those who were not hired after a competitive search, and were therefore limited in the acquisition of a multi-year contract. The work group was guided by the following:

a long-term goal for the UW of being a world leader in undergraduate and graduate education, through appointing and retaining the highest quality of instructional faculty, and rewarding excellence in instructional positions.<sup>xii</sup>

The work group recognized that lecturers are essential faculty and critical to meeting UW's mission, and

should be afforded the professional standing in the University community commensurate with their expertise and responsibilities, and be incorporated into the life of the campus and academic unit to the fullest extent possible.<sup>xiii</sup>

The work group had the following goals for the recommendations:

The recommendations should address:

- Clear, consistent, fair, predictable employment processes and pathways
- Opportunities for advancement
- Respectful treatment of current lecturer faculty
- Advancement of diversity of the UW faculty
- Recognition and promotion of flexibility among academic units with differing circumstances and needs.<sup>xiv</sup>

The policies that they recommended are as follows:

1. Promote deliberative faculty workforce planning in academic units. Academic units and campuses should engage in academic planning regarding instructional and scholarly needs. This planning would guide the faculty hiring plans and types of positions filled.

Academic units should review currently appointed faculty for fit between job title and position responsibilities. [i.e., Lecturer titles are instructional titles and faculty holding those positions should be involved primarily in instructional roles]

2. Promote faculty diversity through increased use of open, competitive hiring practices.

Beginning no later than Autumn 2013, full-time lecturers should be hired through an open, competitive process (job class 0179). Noncompetitive hires (job class 0115) should be the exception, under urgent and/or very temporary conditions.

We believe the principle behind an open, competitive search is one of fairness to and equal opportunity for all potential applicants and that such a search process is important to promote diversity among the faculty.

Attributes of an open search include:

- a. The position is advertised as widely as possible both internally ( within the academic unit and within the UW), and externally (beyond the UW ) as is appropriate to the position qualifications, for a minimum of 30 calendar days. Postings may also be placed in disciplines' listservs, newsletters, and other venues.

b. Policies and procedures for new and continuing appointments should adhere to those for all faculty, outlined in the Faculty Code, Chapter 24, and Academic Human

Resources:

<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>

[http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/prospective\\_new/index.html](http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/prospective_new/index.html)

### 3. Enable opportunities for job predictability/stability for lecturers

Noncompetitively hired lecturers should be hired for no more than three years without a review of the needs for the position within the academic unit. For example, if a unit hires a full-time lecturer for the first time on an annual basis in Autumn 2013, the person could be renewed non competitively for 2014-15 and perhaps 2015-16.

However, at the latest, the academic unit must conduct a competitive search in 2015-16 for a lecturer (job classes 0179) or professorial position, or eliminate the temporary position.

Competitively hired full-time lecturers should be given the opportunity to be considered for multi-year appointments as academic unit needs and resources allow. We recommend that no later than after the fourth re-appointment to an annual position (five years in the position), the unit faculty review the lecturer's portfolio and consider recommending the lecturer for a multi-year appointment. If a multi-year appointment is not made, the lecturer's portfolio shall, at the request of the lecturer, then be reviewed annually for consideration for a multi-year appointment.

#### 4. Promote career advancement for lecturers

Competitively hired lecturers should be given the opportunity for consideration for promotion. We recommend the first consideration for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, or senior lecturer to principal lecturer, should occur five years after the initial appointment to lecturer or senior lecturer, respectively. If the unit faculty decide not to recommend the promotion, the faculty member shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion annually by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedures described in the Faculty Code, Chapter 24-54.

Each unit should consider developing criteria for promotion to senior titles consistent with the specific expectations within their unit and with the descriptions in the Faculty Code.

Upon retirement, eligible competitively hired lecturers should be considered for appointment as lecturer emeritus, senior lecturer emeritus, principal lecturer emeritus. Non-competitively hired lecturers would be ineligible for this title due to limited length of service.<sup>xv</sup>

There is no recommendation for a “grandfathering” of existing non-competitively hired lecturers in the UW report. It seems that fairness should require some such procedure with criteria that could be met regarding existing lecturers hired non-competitively. A competitive search is expensive and time-consuming, and both resources (money and time) exist in a zero

sum situation. The rigorous criteria listed by many peers for promotion could serve as criteria for promotion of non-competitively hired lecturers. It should further be noted that it is not uncommon that lecturers are spousal or partner hires, and may contribute to diversity directly or indirectly.

## **EPILOGUE:**

After many attempts to connect with someone from the University of Washington, Seattle, I finally heard from the co-chair of the committee assigned to produce the above discussed report. Professor Killien, the co-chair of the committee responded to my email and provided me with further reports (attached to this in PDF files) and the following information:

- The recommendations of the report have yet to be implemented. (The competitive searches, etc.)
- The report recommendations were only to apply to *new* lecturer hires.

---

<sup>i</sup> <https://www.apo.ucla.edu/policies/the-call/appendices-1/appendix-9-procedures-and-criteria-for-the-review-of-lecturers>

<sup>ii</sup> <http://facultyhandbook.fsu.edu/Section-5-Faculty-Development>

<sup>iii</sup> <https://uconnclas-departmentheads.pbworks.com/w/page/58093073/Guidelines%20for%20Reappointment%20and%20Promotion%20of%20Lecturers%20and%20In-Residence%20Faculty>

<sup>iv</sup> [http://provost.illinois.edu/communication/25/ProvostCommNo25\\_SpecializedFaculty.pdf](http://provost.illinois.edu/communication/25/ProvostCommNo25_SpecializedFaculty.pdf)

<sup>v</sup> <http://clas.uiowa.edu/deos/administrative-manual-faculty-rank-lecturer>

<sup>vi</sup> [http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/ntt\\_titles.html](http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/ntt_titles.html)

<sup>vii</sup> [https://cse.umn.edu/admin/deansoffice/cse/policies/CSE\\_CONTENT\\_467905.php](https://cse.umn.edu/admin/deansoffice/cse/policies/CSE_CONTENT_467905.php)

<sup>viii</sup> <http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/TTT+NTTGuidelinesFall2014.pdf>

<sup>ix</sup> <https://kb.wisc.edu/lis/page.php?id=22078>

<sup>x</sup> <https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-senior-lecturer-principal-lecturer>

<sup>xi</sup> [http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/uws\\_lecturer\\_0513.pdf](http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/uws_lecturer_0513.pdf)



---

xii Ibid.

xiii Ibid.

xiv Ibid.

xv Ibid.