

**Salaried Lecturer Performance Evaluation Memo Part One:
Annual Performance Evaluation**

March 20, 2023

(to be shared with all salaried lecturers)

This memorandum addresses the first part of this process by laying out the principles that should guide departmental and programmatic evaluation of salaried lecturers.

This memo will be posted on the CAS website; all lecturers should be familiar with its contents so they understand the norms and structure of this process. Please contact Richard Wright, Alex Bellan, or your appropriate divisional Associate Dean for further information or assistance.

General principles

Our annual review is based on work over the past year and should be framed by these general principles:

The annual evaluation process provides both the College and lecturers with an opportunity to consider a lecturer's performance over the past year. It allows the College to explicitly acknowledge its assessment of a lecturer's level of performance, and it is thus an opportunity both to recognize outstanding work and to advise lecturers on areas that may need improvement. While evaluations are for the past year, they are intended to encourage formative communication regarding lecturers' performance going forward. In rare circumstances, the performance evaluation can also be an occasion for the College to notify lecturers whose performance it deems unsuccessful of that judgment.

Each lecturer should be notified about his or her evaluation in writing by the end of the spring semester. Although the approach may differ by unit, this notification should at a minimum include the lecturer's performance rating (i.e., superior, successful, needs improvement, or unsuccessful) and a brief summary of their individual evaluation.

Full-time lecturers will receive salary increases as outlined in the union contract. The contract details an Automatic Annual Wage Adjustment, and two additional merit pools that go beyond the Automatic Annual Wage Adjustment (Excellence in Teaching fund and Distinguished Service pool). The Distinguished Service pool was completely allocated during the last cycle. Information on the distribution of the Excellence in Teaching fund is included in the second memo provided to Chairs and Directors.

Guidelines for evaluation

Departments and programs will create and communicate unit-specific norms and practices about annual expectations.

In all cases, assessment must be based on evidence of performance. Evaluations should

draw on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), External and International Activity Report (EIAR), and curriculum vitae, as well as other forms of evidence relevant to the unit and the role of the lecturer. These may include peer and student teaching evaluations; evidence of the impact of scholarly work, especially as it relates to teaching and learning; professional honors; and evidence of the quality of institutional citizenship. The FAR and EIAR are required reports on a faculty member's activities for the year; failure to complete the FAR and EIAR may result in ineligibility for all relevant merit funding pools and/or disciplinary action.

In general, effort in the form of teaching, institutional citizenship, and leadership should be recognized in the year it occurs. With the specific case of publications, the major credit for a publication should be given for the year in which the actual publication occurred, not in advance while it is being written or while it is "in press."

Although evaluations are submitted by lecturers' home departments or programs, lecturers should be evaluated on the full range of their professional contributions to the university. Home departments and programs should ensure that they are aware of their lecturers' contributions to other departments and programs, to the College, to other schools or colleges, and to the wider University. Departments and programs should request input from other units that have had an opportunity to observe or benefit from the contributions of their faculty. The chairs and directors of those programs and departments, in turn, should provide brief evaluations of these contributions to lecturers' home departments or programs.

Criteria for evaluation

Annual evaluation should be based on the following criteria, organized into tiers based on their importance and breadth of applicability. These criteria are applied as appropriate given expectations based on the individual's discipline(s) and department/program, job title and expectations, rank and time in rank, and other institutional roles and obligations.

These criteria are not weighted equally in the annual evaluation process: each department or program that is the home unit of a lecturer will be asked to submit an explanation to the College of its processes indicating the weight assigned to each criterion.

First Tier: Teaching at Boston University

- Contributions to teaching and curriculum development, including teaching effectiveness, number of students taught, curricular and pedagogical innovation, and contributions to institutionally-defined teaching needs both inside the home department or program and across the College and University. Lecturers should document all of their efforts and contributions, including those for units beyond the home department or program, in the Faculty Annual Report.

Second Tier: Institutional Citizenship and Professional Development at Boston University

- Institutional citizenship that contributes to the home department or programs or to the College or University, including institutional service or administrative/leadership responsibilities other than teaching and research;
- Professional development activity that contributes to lecturers' continued growth as teachers, as well as professional-development activities that contribute to growth of others.

Third Tier: Additional Professional Accomplishments

When appropriate, additional criteria may include:

- Professional recognition, honors, and awards;
- Advising, counseling, and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students;
- Professional service and contributions beyond the University;
- Success in generating external funding in support of research or other programs;
- Other contributions and activities as appropriate, including those called out for specific focus by the Provost;
- Research, creative, and other scholarly productivity, as evidenced by both published work and significant progress toward publication.

Evaluation blurbs and ratings

Your unit should assign each lecturer one of four ratings and provide a brief statement of the rationale for assigning it. This blurb should be provided to the lecturer in writing before the end of the Spring semester. The four possible ratings are:

- **Superior:** Performance exceeds the high standard BU expects from its lecturers in teaching, institutional citizenship, and professional development. Lecturers receiving this rating will generally have excelled in all three areas and can serve as models for others.
- **Successful:** Performance meets the high standard BU expects from its lecturers in teaching, institutional citizenship, and professional development.
- **Needs Improvement:** Performance requires improvement in one or more areas to be regarded as fully successful.
- **Unsuccessful:** Performance in one or more areas is sufficiently problematic to potentially affect the possibility of renewal should performance not significantly improve.

The rationale and ratings should be communicated to the College and also to the lecturer

to recognize strengths and encourage improvement where needed.

Cc: CAS Department/Program Administrators

Arianne Chernock, Associate Dean of the Faculty, Social Sciences

Alice Tseng, Associate Dean of the Faculty, Humanities

John Byers, Associate Dean of the Faculty, Mathematical and Computational Sciences

Sean Mullen, Associate Dean of the Faculty, Natural Sciences

Joseph Bizup, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Policies

Juliana Walsh Kaiser, Sr. Associate Dean of Finance & Administration

Paula Wasson, Executive Director, Financial Administration, Business Office

Margaret Bolter, Associate Dean of Strategic Initiatives

Vincent Stephens, Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion

Richard Wright, Assistant Dean, Faculty Actions

Alex Bellan, Director, Faculty Actions