

2026-2027 Lecturer Review Guidelines

1. Procedures for Appointment

It is the responsibility of the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences to approve the creation of every full-time Lecturer in [Discipline] [Language]¹ position. A department wishing to appoint a new Lecturer in [Discipline] [Language] must make such a request in writing to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences as part of the unit's annual Hiring Request Form.

2. Terms of Appointment

The initial appointment letter specifies whether the appointment is renewable or not as well as the course load of the lecturer. Only renewable lecturers are reviewed, and the following guidelines therefore do not refer to non-renewable appointments. If a lecturer assumes additional responsibilities (for example directing an instructional program) and receives additional compensation or course release in return, these arrangements, including their expected duration, should be agreed upon between lecturer and chair and communicated in writing to the lecturer, with their signed acceptance. The same goes for any changes made to such arrangements at a later time, including if a lecturer gives up an administrative responsibility for which they have previously received additional compensation or course release.

3. Statutory Terms of Appointment

By university statutes, all initial appointments are for one year only. Subsequent appointments may be for a term of one, two, or three years. Passage of the major review and subsequent continuing reviews carry the opportunity for reappointment for a term of up to five years.

The University may choose not to renew an appointment beyond its stated term because of budgetary considerations, changes in staffing or curricular needs, or less than optimal performance on the part of the officer. In such cases, the University must give written notice in advance of the expiration of the appointment as follows:

- 1) not later than **March 1** of the first academic year of fulltime service
- 2) not later than **December 15** of the second academic year of full-time service, if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year;

¹ Those members of the Special Instructional Faculty appointed with modified titles in Arts and Sciences departments where the discipline is language pedagogy are also referred to as Associates in [Language], Lecturers in [Language], and Senior Lecturers in [Language].

- 3) at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two and up to seven years of full-time service
- 4) at least eighteen months before the expiration of an appointment after seven and up to twelve years of full-time service
- 5) and at least twenty-four months before the expiration of an appointment after twelve or more years of full-time service

4. Review Schedules

Associates in [Discipline] [Language] are reviewed for renewal of appointment in the first, second, fifth, and eighth year of service. Promotion to Lecturer in [Discipline] [Language] is possible at the time of the second-year review.

Lecturers in [Discipline] [Language] are reviewed for renewal of appointment in the first, second, fifth, and eighth years of service. Promotion to Senior Lecturer in [Discipline] [Language] is possible at the time of the eighth-year review.

Senior Lecturers in [Discipline] [Language] undergo a major review prior to appointment or during their first year of service, and continuing reviews every five years thereafter.

5. Types of Reviews

Confirming Review (First Year)

The first year of service for all full-time lecturers, regardless of rank, serves as a probationary period. A decision must be made whether to extend the statutory initial appointment. Those who successfully complete the probationary period will be extended for an additional year. Those who do not should be notified in writing by **March 1, 2027** that their appointment will not be renewed beyond **June 30, 2027**.

Developmental Review (Second Year)

This review takes place before the end of the second year, at which time a department may decide to make a third year terminal or to recommend continuation for three years. In the case of an Associate, promotion to the rank of Lecturer may be considered at this time.

Critical Review (Fifth Year) The second professional review takes place the end of the fifth year, at which time a department may decide to make the sixth year terminal or to recommend continuation for three more years into the eighth year.

Major Review (Eighth Year)

The third professional review takes place before the end of the eighth year, at which time a department may decide to make the ninth year terminal or to recommend extension for

an additional five years. At this time, the department should also review whether they deem the candidate ready for promotion to Senior Lecturer. A lecturer who wants to be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer at this review can also request in writing to the chair to be reviewed for promotion. This letter will become part of the review dossier. If the department does not consider the candidate ready for promotion, written feedback must be provided regarding the (candidate-specific) departmental expectations for future promotion. Departments or lecturers can initiate a review for promotion to Senior Lecturer at any time after the Major Review (for details see 6, *Types of Promotion*).

Continuing Reviews (Every Five Years)

All subsequent reviews are to be conducted at the end of each five-year cycle, with either a recommendation for an additional five years, or a recommendation for non-renewal after a terminal year.

6. Types of Promotion and Review Criteria

Types of Promotion

To recognize strong performance of an Associate in Discipline the university will consider conferral of the title Lecturer in Discipline. Promotion to Lecturer does not alter the review schedule. Proposals to promote an Associate to Lecturer may not be made before the end of the second year. The completion of a successful second-year review does not necessarily entail promotion to Lecturer.

To recognize high performance of a Lecturer in Discipline the university will consider conferral of the title Senior Lecturer in Discipline. No promotions in rank or title are possible beyond Senior Lecturer in Discipline. Proposals to promote a Lecturer to Senior Lecturer in Discipline may not normally be made before the eighth year of service. The completion of a successful eighth-year review does not necessarily entail promotion to Senior Lecturer in Discipline. Candidates not promoted at the eighth-year review may be brought up at the time of the continuing review. If a department elects to bring a candidate up prior to the next continuing review, the next review after the review for promotion will be a continuing review five years after the review for promotion.

Departmental Guidelines for Review and Promotion

Each department shall specify in departmental guidelines the criteria for the developmental review, critical review, major review, continuing review, promotion to Lecturer (if applicable), and promotion to Senior Lecturer. Departmental guidelines must be approved by the Arts and Sciences. They will be included as an enclosure, together with this document (Lecturer Review Guidelines), in all offer letters.

Departments can co-ordinate with each other and specify shared guidelines (e.g. for all lecturers) and submit them jointly to Arts and Science for approval. Such shared guidelines will serve as guidelines for each participating department.

The review criteria are listed below. The following criteria shall be specified by departments for the different types of review:

- 1) For the Developmental Review and/or promotion to Lecturer, the teaching criterion is required and the others (2 to 4 in the list below) may be optional, as specified by departmental guidelines
- 2) For the Critical Review, the teaching criterion is required and at least one of the optional criteria (2 to 4 in the list below) is required, as specified by departmental guidelines
- 3) For Major Review, the teaching criterion is required and the minimal expectations for all three of the optional criteria (2 to 4 in the list below) must be met in a satisfactory way, as specified by departmental guidelines.
- 4) For promotion to Senior Lecturer, minimal expectations for all criteria listed below must have been exceeded in a consistent way, as specified by departmental guidelines.

Departments (or group of departments) may specify these criteria further. More advanced reviews or promotions should not have fewer criteria than previous reviews or promotions. Departments may further distinguish required review criteria according to the main tasks assumed by a lecturer. For example, the review criteria for lecturers who are responsible for an MA program might differ from those who do not assume such responsibility.

Criteria for Review and Promotion

- 1) Teaching (required for all reviews and promotions):
 - A documented record of excellence in classroom teaching, based on student evaluations, classroom observations, teaching philosophy, and teaching materials.
- 2) Instructional development: Contributions to the design, pedagogy, syllabi, and organization of courses, such as:
 - creating teaching materials or teaching methodologies
 - developing new courses
 - leading or coordinating sections or courses
- 3) Service to the department, Arts and Sciences, or the University such as:
 - one-on-one academic advising (e.g., of senior thesis or independent studies)
 - directing programs
 - contributing to the training and supervision of colleagues, part-time associates, graduate students, etc.
 - serving on departmental/Arts & Science/university committees

- collaboration with program colleagues and the department administration to ensure the effectiveness of the program
- 4) Professional growth and/or scholarship: General contributions to scholarship, pedagogy, or creative activity in the subject area, such as:
- demonstrating leadership in the subject area within and outside of the University (e.g., organizing workshops/conferences, being invited as guest speaker, reviewing outside departments, serving on boards, reviewing textbooks)
 - presenting or publishing pedagogical, scholarly, artistic or professional works in the subject area

7. Procedures for Review

7.1 Departmental Level Review Process and Committee

The First Year Confirming Review is conducted according to departmental procedure. It is a decision on reappointment. The department should examine the performance of the faculty in their first semester. Less than optimal performance would constitute grounds for non-renewal. The Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences only requires a copy of the notification letter that is sent to the candidate, which indicates the new appointment end date, and the year of the next review (see Appendix E for faculty notification template).

Beginning with the second-year review through promotion to Senior Lecturer, the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences requires evidence of a full and complete departmental review of the candidate's work. Reviews must include evaluation by a three-person review committee (except where specified in section 7.2.4), appointed by the department chair to conduct a review and make a recommendation to the department for renewal or non-renewal.

It is required that at least one member of the review committee be trained in language pedagogy or be knowledgeable in the lecturer's area of pedagogy, scholarship or creative activity. It also required that at least one member of the review committee be external to the department, but not to the University. Where needed, the divisional deans and the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning will assist the chair in identifying and enlisting the participation of suitable external committee members. Lecturers serving on review committees must have passed the review point for which the reviewee is being considered. For example, lecturers serving on committees considering promotion to Senior Lecturer must be Senior Lecturers.

Lecturers teaching in programs located in centers or institutes are reviewed by the department in which they are appointed. In these cases, the department chair should, if possible, delegate a professorial rank faculty member of the department who is affiliated with that center or institute to serve as chair of the departmental review committee. In consultation with the chair of the review committee, the department chair will constitute a

three-person review committee with at least one professorial rank faculty member of the department and at least one professorial rank faculty member of the institute or center. The chair of the review committee will compile and prepare the materials for the dossier (including assisting with a draft of the chair's letter of transmittal, see 7.2 and 7.4 below).

The review committee's recommendation is made available to the department, which will deliberate on the committee's recommendation and vote. The outcome of those deliberations and vote will be communicated to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences in a letter of transmittal prepared by the chair of the department (see 7.4 below).

The review process is slightly different for continuing reviews of Senior Lecturers, which will not require classroom observations unless requested by the faculty member under review, the review committee, and/or department chair, in consultation with the divisional dean (see below 7.2 below).

7.2 Department Level Review

The review process entails

- 1) examination of the candidate's dossier, which includes the following material provided by the candidate: an outline of the lecturer's course load and other responsibilities (to be prepared by the candidate), an updated curriculum vitae, a statement of teaching philosophy, a statement of professional/scholarly work in progress, and not more than five samples of instructional materials (such as syllabi, handouts, and supplements) as well as evidence of service and/or professional growth/scholarship, as mandated by departmental review criteria. Course materials and samples of professional work should be representative samples, created since the last review and comprising not more than twenty five pages each.
- 2) a review of student evaluations for all classes taught by the candidate (evaluations with 3 or few responses will be excluded). For continuing reviews only student evaluations since the last review will be provided. The Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs office will provide to the department copies of all student evaluations along with the summary data page for each set of student evaluations (see attached format of summary data page in Appendix D). The department must also provide these evaluations to the review candidate(s) so that the candidate has access to them when preparing their dossier.
- 3) Evaluations of classroom performance based on the **observation of a minimum of two different classes by at least two reviewers per class**. Reviewers should contact the lecturer in advance and tell the lecturer when they will be coming to class. Departments are required to adopt existing or develop their own standard observation forms, which are already used in some divisions and departments (such as the American Language Program and School of Professional Studies, attached to these guidelines as Appendix C). These forms should define the criteria for evaluating classroom performance and be made available to reviewers before

the class visit. Reviewers shall meet with the lecturer for a post-observation discussion to ask questions about the class, give the lecturer an opportunity to provide background information, etc. The reports of the classroom observations prepared by the reviewers shall be attached to the departmental review committee report.

- 4) The review process for continuing reviews of Senior Lecturers proceeds along the same lines as outlined above (in 7.1), except that (1) the committee may consist of only two members, and (2) classroom observations are not required unless requested by the faculty member under review, the review committee, and/or department chair, in consultation with the divisional dean. The two member committee may consist of two departmental faculty, if both the chair and the senior lecturer agree, or it may consist of one departmental faculty member and one faculty member external to the department if either the chair or the senior lecturer elect to have a committee member external to the department. Requests for classroom observations must be made in a timely manner to ensure the completion of the review on schedule and the Senior Lecturer must be given appropriate notice.

The following will be assessed through a review of the statement of teaching philosophy, classroom observations, student evaluations, and representative samples of instructional materials: 1) strategies used to promote target language communication or student involvement/attentiveness; 2) strategies used to meet the needs of all learners; 3) reflection on the pedagogical goals underlying the work assigned to students; 4) strategies for engaging students in activities within and outside the classroom; and 5) consonance between pedagogical practices and the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy.

The following will be assessed through the examination of the curriculum vitae, the statement of professional work in progress, and representative samples of instructional development materials as well as professional work/scholarship: 1) evidence of instructional development (if mandatory), according to the criteria defined by the department; 2) evidence of service (if mandatory), according to the criteria defined by the department; 3) evidence of professional growth and/or scholarship (if mandatory), according to the criteria defined by the department.

7.3 Chair Notification of Candidate of Negative Decision.

In instances of a negative vote by the department, no letter of transmittal will be prepared and the candidate's dossier will not be sent to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences. Rather the chair of the department notifies the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences of the departmental decision. The chair will then notify the candidate in writing of the negative decision no later than **May 15, 2027**. Candidates not being recommended for renewal will be given a terminal period of appointment.

7.4 Transmittal to the EVP

In instances of a positive vote by the department, the chair of the department will prepare a letter of transmittal and the candidate's full dossier to be sent to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences.

1) The letter will:

- speak to the department's recommendations for improvement in performance at the last review as well as to the candidate's responses to them;
- record the result of the departmental vote detailing voting eligibility, faculty who voted, and explanations for any opposition or abstentions, and summarize the basis for the department's positive recommendation;
- discuss the candidate's teaching load and other responsibilities (if applicable);
- discuss the course enrollments and analyze the available data on teaching evaluations and reports of classroom observations as they reflect both the instructor's strengths and areas in need of attention;
- discuss the candidate's service and any additional responsibilities, if applicable, instructional development, and/or professional growth/scholarship as mandated by the departmental criteria.

2) The letter should be accompanied by the candidate's full dossier, containing (see Appendix B below for instructions on submitting the dossier in PDF files): 1) an outline of the basic responsibilities of the lecturer including course load and other responsibilities; 2) a written report by the chair of the review committee based on classroom observations, teaching evaluations, as well as the dossier submitted by the candidate; 3) Reviewer 1's Classroom Observation Form; 4) Reviewer 2's Classroom Observation Form; 5) an updated curriculum vitae; 6) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy and professional work in progress; 7) not more than five samples of instructional materials (such as syllabi, handouts, and supplements); 8) as well as a description of service and samples of professional work and/or scholarship produced since last review (as mandated by departmental review criteria); 9) student evaluation summary sheet and student evaluations. All materials should be representative samples, created since the last review and comprising **not more than twenty five pages each**. To ensure that readers attend to the most important material in the dossier, samples of instructional material and of professional work and/or scholarship over the twenty five page limit will be removed.

Departments must submit their recommendations to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences by **March 1, 2027 for first year, fifth year, major, and continuing reviews, and by April 15, 2027 for second year reviews.**

7.6 Review by Divisional Deans or PTC

The Executive Vice President will then seek input from the Divisional Deans for Lecturers in Discipline undergoing the second year review, or the Promotion and Tenure Committee for Lecturers in Discipline undergoing all other reviews. The relevant dean or committee will review the dossier and make a recommendation to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences. The Executive Vice President will write a memo to the chair of the department regarding the outcome of the review.

7.7 Post-Decision Meeting with Lecturer

Once the chair has received the memo from the Executive Vice President regarding the outcome of the review:

- 1) the chair will send the candidate a letter informing them of their continuing status and the next year's salary no later than **June 30, 2027** or, in the case of non-renewal, informing them of their renewal for a terminal year and the next year's salary, no later than **May 15, 2027**. A copy of this letter should also be provided to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences.
- 2) the chair or their delegate will hold meetings with candidates who have successfully passed their reviews to discuss the outcome and specific recommendations (if any) of how the candidate should improve to meet A&S wide and department-specific evaluation criteria in the future. This meeting will be summarized in writing and provided to the lecturer with a copy to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences, no later than **May 15, 2027**. The letter should also include the new appointment end date and when the next review will take place as stated in the EVP letter to chair. *This letter is separate, and in addition to, the salary/reappointment letter prepared at the same time of year.*
- 3) the chair or their delegate will hold meetings with candidates who have not passed their reviews to discuss the outcome and to provide the candidate with a copy of their non-renewal letter. This meeting will take place no later than **May 15, 2027**. This letter is separate, and in addition to, the salary/reappointment letter prepared at the same time of year.

APPENDIX A

Review Schedule for Associates, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in [Language] [Discipline]

Review Schedule

Consequences

End of year one
(internal)

- A) Recommend for one more year
- B) Notify will not be renewed

End of year two
(internal and external)

- A) Decision to make third year terminal
- B) Recommend for three-year contract and promote to lecturer if relevant

End of year five
(internal and external)

- A) Appoint only 1 more year
- B) Appoint 3 more years and consider promotion to lecturer if relevant

End of year eight
(internal and external)

- A) Appoint only 1 more year
- B) Renew for 5 more years
- C) Consider promotion to lecturer or senior lecturer if relevant

End of thirteenth and subsequent
five-year intervals (internal and external)

- A) Appoint only 1 more year
- B) Renew for 5 more years

Submission of the Lecturer in Discipline/Language Review Dossier

The dossier should be submitted to the X:\Drive in the “Non-Tenure Reviews” folder that can be found in the “Academic Affairs” folder. The materials submitted electronically should be put into a “.pdf” file with no protection or security restrictions. The nominating unit should follow the checklist below for the contents and name of each file and for the order in which they should be included. Avoid using scanned copies of the materials when possible because such materials are generally not searchable. Once the dossiers have been uploaded to the X:\Drive, please notify Jessie Tong at jt2622@columbia.edu.

1. Chair’s Letter of Transmittal	Last name, First name Transmittal Letter.pdf
2. Departmental Review Committee Report (if any)	Last name, First name Internal Reportreport.pdf
3. Classroom Observations <i>A minimum of two different classes by at least two reviewers per class</i>	Last name, First name Classroom Observations.pdf
4. Outline of Lecturer’s Course Load and Other Responsibilities	Last Name, First Name Responsibilities
5. Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae	Last name, First name CV.pdf
6. Candidate’s Teaching Philosophy and Professional Work in Progress	Last name, First name Statments.pdf
7. Candidate’s samples of course materials (3-5) <i>Do not exceed 25 pages, material above the limit will be removed</i>	Last name, First name Course Materials.pdf
8. Candidate’s Representative Samples of Instructional Development and Professional Growth/Scholarship (if mandated by departmental criteria) <i>Do not exceed 25 pages, material above the limit will be removed</i>	
9. Student Evaluations	Provided by Arts and Sciences

APPENDIX C

Example 1 of Standard Observation Forms for Classroom Observations: Language Lecturers

Full-Time Teacher Observation Form (revised July 2018)

Name: _____ Date/Time: _____
 Class/Level: _____ Number of Students: _____
 Observer: _____ Location: _____

1. Lesson plan (to be completed by the observer) (may include all or some...)

Desirable features; check as appropriate:

√- does not do so / does not do so consistently
 √ succeeds in doing so
 √+ excels in doing so

√-	√	√+	
			Original, teacher-created materials; or appropriately adapted, teacher-enhanced materials
			Appropriate for students' proficiency level
			Appropriate for students' educational needs
			Designed with a clear language objective
			Designed with a clear communicative focus
			Designed with engaging, intellectually-stimulating content
			Developed for critical thinking (inference/logic/personal reflection)

BELOW STANDARD	AT STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD
Comments:		

2. Language Focus and Feedback (to be completed by the observer) (may include all or some...)

Desirable features; check as appropriate:

√- does not do so / does not do so consistently
 √ succeeds in doing so
 √+ excels in doing so

√-	√	√+	
			Appropriate error correction (meaning, form, pronunciation)
			Variety of error correction techniques used
			Clear explanations of new or unclear language
			Appropriate exploitation of "teachable moments"

BELOW STANDARD	AT STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD
Comments:		

3. Teaching Skills and Delivery (to be completed by the observer)

Desirable features; check as appropriate:

√- does not do so / does not do so consistently

√ succeeds in doing so

√+ excels in doing so

√-	√	√+	
			Clear directions for tasks and activities
			Appropriate variety of tasks and activities
			Effective sequencing of activities and time management
			High student engagement
			Appropriate variety of student groupings and interactional patterns (T→C, T→S, S→S, S→C, etc.)
			Appropriate ratio of teacher talk / student talk
			Effective questioning and comprehension-checking (type, frequency, variety, wait time)
			Effective handling of student questions / comments
			Effective use of teaching resources (board, computer, other media)
			Natural language use by the teacher

BELOW STANDARD	AT STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD
Comments:		

4. Overall Evaluation (to be completed by the observer)

Approximate weighting:

Lesson Plan & Materials 20%

Language Focus & Feedback 40%

Teaching Skills & Delivery 40%)

BELOW STANDARD	AT STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD
Comments on strengths and weaknesses:		

Example 2 of Standard Observation Forms for Classroom Observations: Non-Language Lecturers

Instructor name: [insert name here]

Course name and number: [insert name and number here]

Start time/end time of class: [insert start time/end time here]

Observer name: [insert name here]

Date of observation: [insert date here]

Number of students present: [insert # here]

Instructions:

Under separate cover, please take detailed field notes about what you observe in your classroom visit. We would like you to record your observations of the design and delivery of the lesson, the classroom culture, and the learner characteristics. Use your notes to inform your synthesis rating of the lesson for each of the categories below. You do not need to submit your notes to the school, but we do ask you to provide excerpts of your notes to evidence your ratings.

I. Lesson Content and Design

As you observe the class, reflect on how well you think your colleague has designed the lesson (in terms of content and learning activities).

- The lesson content was consistent with the stated purposes of the course/unit.
- The instructional content contributes to the achievement of the stated learning objectives.
- The instructional content has sufficient breadth, depth and currency for the students to learn the subject. For example, the instructional content references relevant or up to date theory or evidence-based research to support learning
- Learning activities help students reach the stated instructional goals of the lesson.
- Learning activities foster instructor-student, content-student, and if appropriate to the course, student-student interaction.

Circle/highlight a number below to provide a synthesis score for how well your colleague performed:

Lesson content and design was not at all reflective of current standards for graduate education				Lesson content and design was extremely reflective of current standards for graduate education
1	2	3	4	5

Provide supporting examples that evidence your synthesis rating. Draw examples from your field notes.

[Insert supporting evidence here.]

II. Delivery

As you observe the class, reflect on how well you think your colleague has delivered the lesson.

- Instructional approach is consistent with the stated purposes of the course/unit.
- Instructional approach is consistent with programmatic standards and current standards for graduate level education.
- The pace of the lesson was appropriate for the developmental levels/needs of the students and the purposes of the lesson.
- The instructional approach used in this lesson reflected attention to students' experiences, preparedness, proficiency levels and/or learning styles.
- The teacher was able to "read" the students' level of understanding and adjusted instruction accordingly.
- The teacher's classroom management style/strategies enhanced the quality of the lesson.
- The teacher displayed an understanding of the challenges students were facing as they participated in the lesson (e.g., her dialogue with/feedback to the students).

Circle/highlight a number below to provide a synthesis score for how well your colleague performed:

Lesson delivery was not at all reflective of best standards in graduate level instruction				Lesson delivery was extremely reflective of best standards in graduate level instruction
1	2	3	4	5

Provide supporting examples that evidence your synthesis rating. Draw examples from your field notes.

[Insert supporting evidence here.]

III. Classroom Culture

As you observe the class, reflect on how well you think your colleague has established the classroom culture.

- Active participation of all was encouraged and valued.
- There was a climate of respect for students' ideas, questions, and contributions.
- Interactions reflected collegial working relationships among students (e.g., students worked together, talked with each other about the lesson).
- Interactions reflected collaborative working relationships between teacher and students.
- The climate of the lesson encouraged students to generate ideas, questions, conjectures, and/or propositions.
- Students were engaged in reporting, expressing, clarifying, and justifying their ideas.
- Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were evident.

Circle/highlight a number below to provide a synthesis score for how well your colleague performed:

Classroom culture interfered with student learning.				Classroom culture facilitated student learning for all.
1	2	3	4	5

Provide supporting examples that evidence your synthesis rating. Draw examples from your field notes.

[Insert supporting evidence here.]

IV. Overall Ratings of the Lesson

Here we would like you to provide a written summary of the overall quality of the lesson you observed. Consider all available information about the lesson, its context and purpose, and your own judgment of the relative importance of the ratings you have made above. Please describe what you think may be the likely impact of instruction on students' understanding of lesson concepts, ability to apply or transfer skills and concepts, interest in and/or appreciation for the course concepts.

[Insert written summary here.]

APPENDIX D

Summary of Teaching Evaluations - Name

Course evaluations with 3 or fewer responses are not included

Description of the scale used to evaluate the course and instructor.

Excellent: 5 Very Good: 4 Good:3 Fair: 2 Poor: 1

Course and Questions	Semester Taught	Enrollments	Responses Received	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Course 1	CLASSX1234 - Title of Course				
	Spring 2025	25	18		
Question 1	Overall teaching effectiveness of instructor			5.00	0.00
Question 2	Overall assessment of course			4.67	0.59
	Fall 2024	25	15		
Question 1	Overall teaching effectiveness of instructor			4.93	0.26
Question 2	Overall assessment of course			4.40	0.91
Course 2	CLASSX5678 - Title of Course				
	Spring 2024	20	10		
Question 1	Overall teaching effectiveness of instructor			4.80	0.45
Question 2	Overall assessment of course			4.80	0.45
	Spring 2023	28	18		
Question 1	Overall teaching effectiveness of instructor			4.78	0.55
Question 2	Overall assessment of course			4.56	0.62

APPENDIX E

First Year Review Faculty Notification Template

Professor _____
Department of _____
[office address]

[date]

Re: First-year Review

Dear _____

I am pleased to inform you that the department has [enthusiastically] decided to recommend your reappointment as lecturer in discipline of _____ through June 30, 20XX. Your next review will take place during the 20XX-20XX academic year.

Yours sincerely,

Chair, Department of

cc: Amy Hungerford, Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences