Second Language Research & Practice
ISSN 2694-6610

December 2024, Volume 5, Issue 1
pp. 1-14

REPORT

Practitioner Perspectives on Evaluating the Work of Language Program Directors

Cori Crane, *The University of Alabama*
Laura Rubio, *The University of Alabama*
April Stevens, *The University of Alabama*

Abstract

As administrators responsible for overseeing multi-section university language programs, language program directors (LPD) play an important role in the life of modern language departments. Their administrative work in developing curricula and mentoring teachers, however, can be challenging to evaluate in higher education where faculty productivity is still by and large measured in terms of traditional teaching, research, and service categories. Despite long-standing recognition of the unique contributions that LPDs make in collegiate language departments (e.g., Guthrie, 2001; Lee & VanPatten, 1991; Lord, 2014; Paesani & Barrette, 2005; Ryan-Scheutz, 2010; Schulz, 2005), little guidance exists to help those involved in the review process of LPDs' work.

To address this gap, this article reports on guidelines that were developed and used to assess the work of non-tenure-track (NTT) LPDs in a modern language department at a large R1 public university in the United States. In 2021-2022, the guidelines were developed collaboratively by the authors, three NTT LPDs leading French, German, and Spanish programs, and were approved with minor revision by the LPDs' department and college. The article describes the process of creating the guidelines, the evaluation criteria the authors settled on, and experiences in using the guidelines in two recent retention reviews.

Keywords: *Language Program Directors, Faculty Evaluation*

APA Citation: Crane, C., Rubio, L., & Stevens, A. (2024). Practitioner perspectives on evaluating the work of language program directors. *Second Language Research & Practice*, *5*(1), 1-14. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/69889

Introduction

As administrators who oversee multi-section university language programs, language program directors (LPD) play an important role in the life of world language departments. Their administrative work in developing curricula and mentoring teachers, especially graduate student instructors, however, can be challenging to evaluate in higher education where faculty productivity is still by and large measured in terms of traditional teaching, research, and service categories. Despite long-standing recognition of the unique contributions LPDs make in collegiate language departments (e.g., Guthrie, 2001; Lee & VanPatten, 1991; Lord, 2014; Paesani & Barrette, 2005; Ryan-Scheutz, 2010; Schulz, 2005), little guidance exists to help those involved in the review process of LPDs' work.

Addressing this gap, this article reports on guidelines used to assess the work of non-tenure-track (NTT) LPDs in a language department at a large R1 public university in the United States. In 2021-2022, guidelines were developed collaboratively by the authors, three NTT LPDs leading French, German, and Spanish programs, and were approved with minor revision by the LPDs' department and college. In the following, we describe the process of creating the guidelines and our experiences in using them in two retention reviews in fall 2023. The report is intended to serve as a resource for individuals tasked with

Copyright © 2024 Crane, Rubio, & Stevens

creating or revising guidelines to assess LPDs, and/or are involved in the review process. A major theme emerging in our experiences is the importance of having support for a fair and transparent process at multiple faculty and administrative levels.

Structural Issues and Challenges in Evaluating LPD Work

Any evaluation of work performance requires an agreed-upon understanding of the responsibilities associated with one's position, as well as indicators of success across that work's key domains. In evaluating LPDs, the nature of this multifaceted work can be difficult to define with duties informed by specific program, departmental, and institutional needs, as well as the expertise and interests that LPDs themselves have and bring to their daily work. Moreover, despite often inhabiting highly visible leadership positions within language departments—not unlike that of department chairs (Ryan-Scheutz, 2010), LPDs often engage in service that is invisible to others (AAUSC, 2017; UC Consortium, 2009).

Over the past 30 years, the LPD position in university language departments in the United States. has evolved significantly, with organizations like the AAUSC (American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Language Programs) playing an instrumental role in professionalizing language program administration work and making it more visible within academia. An ongoing goal of these efforts is to recognize program coordination as "an integral part of a language department" (Katz & Watzinger-Tharp, 2005, p. 500) and program directors as fulfilling a wide range of administrative responsibilities that are not simply an "add on" to a traditional faculty role. One indicator of the role's reconceptualization can be seen in greater attention devoted to preparing individuals for LPD work, reflected in practically-oriented books (e.g., Lord, 2014), graduate courses (e.g., Enkin, 2015), and online professional learning such as CARLA's Language Program Direction Interactive Modules (https://carla.umn.edu/lpd/modules/index.html).

At the same time, LPDs have reported difficulties in communicating the value of their work to non-expert audiences (see, e.g., discussions in Guthrie, 2001; Harris-Schenz, 1993; Katz & Watzinger-Tharp, 2005; Lord, 2014; Moyer & Gonglewski, 1998; Ryan-Scheutz, 2010; VanPatten, 2015), a situation especially critical for NTT LPDs, whose positions tend to be more precarious in general.

Survey research on the professional profile of LPDs (Katz & Watzinger-Tharp, 2005; Lord, 2014; Paesani & Barrette, 2005; Schulz, 2005) has brought to the fore certain labor-related issues associated with the position. Schulz (2005), for example, found a third of LPDs (n=116) cited a lack of faculty support, cooperation, and respect while perceiving greater workloads compared to other faculty members in their units. Historically, the LPD position has been filled by junior faculty members (Moyer & Gonglewski, 1998; Paesani & Barrette, 2005; Schulz, 2005), an uneven power dynamic that has complicated how LPDs' work is understood and appreciated. As Lord (2014) notes, lower faculty ranks that LPDs increasingly occupy (both as junior and NTT faculty) do not reflect the high level of responsibility expected of them, potentially contributing to negative perceptions of LPDs' contributions and a "lack of satisfaction LPDs may feel with their professional treatment" (p. 11). Reflecting on Schulz's (2005) study in which 75% of the LPD respondents identified as women, Ryan-Scheutz (2010) further considers the consequences of language program direction as a gendered profession, with a "caretaking function ... structurally and functionally built into the job" of LPDs (p. 97). To support her argument, Ryan-Scheutz identifies and interrogates key responsibilities in the position that may be coded as maternal and secretarial and involve multitasking.

Scholars have also noted the undervaluing and misunderstanding of the work itself, particularly as an applied field. Writing on the role of applied linguists in LPD positions, Katz & Watzinger-Tharp (2005) note the stigma attached to "being the *practical* and *applied* members of a given department" (p. 498, emphasis in original). Schulz (2005) likewise remarks on the "catchall" function some LPDs are given in their departments, such that they end up taking on "all those duties required by the university administration that other faculty members find tedious or do not wish to perform" (p. 37).

Writing on evaluation practices for applied linguists in world language departments, the UC Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching (UCCLLT) Steering Committee (2009) references a lack of understanding of this scholarship as a major impetus for the creation of their white paper. Similarly concerned with the role of applied linguists within language departments, VanPatten (2015) highlights the limited representation of language faculty recognized as authorities in language acquisition. While some language departments may have experts in language and language learning, their presence is often not in the form of traditional TT positions. Consequently, the influence wielded by NTT personnel is confined by the parameters of their duties, thereby constraining their impact on both language programs and the broader curriculum.

Overall, the situation described above underscores the importance of having a common, established understanding of language program administration work. Well-conceived guidelines rooted in professional standards are crucial for ensuring fairness in evaluations of LPDs and can protect them in doing the work they were hired to do.

Towards a Conceptualization of LPD Work: A Review of the Literature

1. Identifying Responsibilities and Roles

Scholars (e.g., Moyer & Gonglewski, 1998) have long noted that the multifaceted work of LPDs does not map neatly onto the typical tripartite faculty evaluation framework of teaching, research, and service prevalent in U.S. higher education. LPDs' responsibilities can correspond to more than one domain of work, "blurr[ing] the distinctions between the three categories" (p. 90), while others can be difficult to classify as they may not be readily apparent to those not directly involved in program coordination (Ryan-Scheutz, 2010). The construct of service can be especially challenging to define for LPDs, since "so many of their [administrative] duties lie outside of the realm of official scholarship and classroom teaching, while they are also intricately connected to it" (Ryan-Scheutz, p. 92). Administering a multi-section language program involves complex intellectual work that draws on interconnected subject areas such as linguistics, education, and second language acquisition. More than mere managers of language programs, LPDs regularly engage in highly collaborative, creative, and entrepreneurial work (Moyer & Gonglewski, 1998; Ryan-Scheutz, 2010).

Various descriptions of language coordination responsibilities in post-secondary language departments have been offered over the years, each providing conceptualizations of the work from different vantage points and with different emphases (e.g., practical, administrative, pedagogical, academic, interpersonal, managerial). Table 1 below summarizes some of these efforts, revealing how duties (e.g., Lee, 1989; Schulz, 2005) and larger areas of responsibility (e.g., AAUSC, 2017; Guthrie, 2001; Ryan-Scheutz, 2010) have evolved over time.

Table 1. *Duties and Areas of Responsibility for LPDs*

Lee (1989) (cited in Lord, 2014)	1. Discuss course offerings 2. Discuss the TA budget and projected new graduate student enrollment 3. Organize and conduct the TA orientation 4. Decide which courses each TA will teach 5. Decide on grading criteria, teaching strategies, and book and material choices 6. Deal with student complaints 7. Edit exams written by supervisors 8. Serve on departmental committees

Guthrie (2001) (cited in Lord, 2014; Paesani & Barrette, 2005)	1. Teaching and program direction 2. Training and supervision 3. Professional engagement within and beyond the home institution
Schulz (2005) (as cited in Paesani & Barrette, 2005)	Most frequent duties (beyond teaching and research) noted by at least 50% of respondents (n=116), listed in order of frequency: 1. Evaluate teaching performance of instructors 2. Select books 3. Conduct coordination meetings 4. Conduct pre-service workshops 5. Conduct class observations 6. Develop course syllabi 7. Schedule courses 8. Teach methods courses, participate in the selection of graduate students 9. Recruit graduate students 10. Offer in-service development workshops 11. Coordinate placement testing, develop achievement tests for classes supervised 12. Develop websites for classes supervised
Ryan-Scheutz (2010)	1. TA training and professional development 2. Course supervision 3. Research mentorship/professional development 4. Curriculum design 5. Co-curricular program
AAUSC (2017)	1. Research 2. Graduate student education 3. Hiring/staffing 4. Curriculum and assessment

A common theme arising in these different conceptualizations is the heavy administrative workload that transcends curriculum, assessment, teacher supervision, and personnel matters. Not surprisingly, administration has been proposed as a possible fourth category of responsibility to encompass program administrative duties (Ryan-Scheutz, 2010).

2. Guidelines from Professional Organizations on Evaluating LPD Work

While to the best of our knowledge no empirical research exists on the evaluation of LPDs in language departments, attempts at establishing fair evaluation practices have come in the form of statements written by professional language education and linguistics organizations.[i]

The UCCLLT's (2009) white paper represents one of the few attempts to present evaluation guidelines that address the work of LPDs. Their recommendations, while centered on applied linguists, contains a short section devoted to the administrative work LPDs do and recommendations for compensating this additional labor (e.g., course relief). Three categories for evaluation are noted: teaching, professional activity (defined as publications, presentations, and service to the profession), and on-campus administrative service (e.g., LPD and language center director service work). Regarding the review committee's composition, a "jury of peers" is recommended that includes "an expert in the candidate's field, e.g., language pedagogy, and not simply a departmental member who knows the language" (p. 4).

The 2019 report "Promotion & Tenure Guidelines" by the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) also devotes a section to LPDs. Noting "the extremely time-consuming nature of these positions," the statement recommends "that they be (a) treated as 'administrative responsibilities', distinct from service, (b) compensated with stipends or course reductions, and (c) evaluated through specifically designed criteria that ensure rigor and accountability."

Moyer & Gonglewski (1998) recommend "LPDs request early on a specific description of the administrative responsibilities and the terms by which effectiveness will be measured" (p. 55). Having established evaluation guidelines from the outset of an appointment—not merely expectations noted in job announcements—can help LPDs direct their energy towards work that counts, identify goals and opportunities for professional growth, and cultivate a mentoring network that can help them flourish in their roles and programs. In the following section, we turn to our own experiences in developing and using such evaluation criteria.

Developing the LPD Evaluation Guidelines

Shortly after starting our initial appointments in fall 2021, our chair shared information about the faculty retention reviews expected to take place over the next three years. As our LPD positions were conceptualized for the first time as NTT Renewable Contract Faculty (RCF), the college asked us to create new guidelines to assess our work. Not wanting to reinvent the wheel, we began by reaching out to colleagues at other institutions in our network for ideas and models and looked for guidance from our professional organizations (e.g., AAAL, AAUSC, ACTFL, MLA). Two statements were particularly helpful in framing LPD work (i.e., AAUSC, 2017; UCCLLT, 2009), which we referenced in our guidelines' introduction as a way to highlight key professional standards to non-experts (see Appendix).

Several colleagues generously shared retention and promotion guidelines from their institutions (some represented general NTT faculty guidelines not specific to LPDs). In studying these documents, we noted aspects we thought could be helpful in our own context, such as evaluation criteria, the organization of the criteria, and specific language used. We drew particular inspiration from the University of Chicago's "Senior Instructional Professor (SIP) Job Framework" used to evaluate NTT faculty with managerial and supervisory roles, a category to which LPDs belong at the institution. Though our own categories differed in scope given the specific LPD focus we took (see Section 1 below), we largely adopted University of Chicago's SIP format, finding their presentation of well-defined, distinct evaluation categories to be clear, concise, and helpful.

Once our draft was complete, we circulated the guidelines to colleagues who had previously served in the LPD roles for our respective language programs for initial feedback. In February 2022, the guidelines were submitted to the chair, and in May 2022 approved by departmental faculty, followed by the college dean. At the department level, minor word changes were requested, while at the college level, more significant changes were made. Most notably, the college increased research expectations under the promotion criteria such that both publications and presentations were now expected.

1. Criteria for Evaluating LPDs

As noted above, determining categories for evaluating LPDs is challenging given their substantial administrative responsibilities. As each language program possesses unique requirements and academic emphases, the duties of LPDs may vary in scope and significance. Nonetheless, certain core areas of work have been acknowledged as indispensable. While these domains are not exhaustive and may intersect somewhat, they typically reinforce one another. The five categories we ultimately decided on reflect not only established professional standards (e.g., from scholarship and peer institutions[ii]) but also our particular institutional positions:

1. **Curriculum Development:** Developing intellectually grounded curricula is one of the most critical contributions LPDs can make to departments. In spearheading educational advancements, such as integrating new pedagogies and instructional technologies, LPDs are continuously revising programs to align with evolving theories and research on language teaching and learning.
2. **Program Management and Teacher Supervision:** LPDs oversee and supervise language programs and the individuals who teach within them. They offer professional learning opportunities, evaluate instructors, and handle student issues, among other tasks. Overall, they play a critical role in ensuring effective program operation and supporting teaching staff's professional growth and well-being.
3. **Teaching:** LPDs also teach and design their own courses, including the language teaching methods course and courses across the curriculum.
4. **Scholarly and Professional Activity:** LPDs' commitment to scholarly and professional growth ensures their effectiveness in guiding teaching practices and shaping the field's understanding of language education. Participation in professional organizations and conferences enables LPDs to direct language programs, bring contemporary perspectives to graduate student teacher education, and inform the department of significant field developments.
5. **Service to Institution, Community, and Profession:** LPDs engage in service roles within their language programs, departments, universities, and the broader profession. Their contributions underscore their commitment to enhancing academic and professional communities locally and beyond and strengthen their roles and expertise within their home departments.

Additionally, our guidelines included recommendations for suitable materials that candidates under review could offer as evidence of their work. We felt this was important for both reviewers and those being reviewed, as it would ensure an evidence-based evaluation and thereby also begin to unhide the "invisible" work to all involved.

2. Promotion Criteria

Considering that the LPD position at our institution was now a RCF position further necessitated reflection on how LPDs would and should be evaluated for promotion. Whereas impact for TT promotion is considered primarily in terms of published research and sphere of influence, we recognized that our intellectual labor as NTT LPDs is often categorized differently. We therefore sought to acknowledge the different expectations of scholarly production and foreground meaningful opportunities for advancement (see Moyer & Gonglewski, 1998, and Schulz, 2005, for similar arguments). In the guidelines (see Appendix), we defined exemplary work for each category as particular to the LPD position.

The promotion criteria were one area where our guidelines were revised during the upper administration's review. Initially, we had conceived of scholarship broadly so as to offer a range of professional learning opportunities for NTT LPDs to engage with research but not place unreasonable demands on their workload (for similar discussions, see, e.g., Guthrie, 2001; Harris-Schenz, 1993; Lord, 2014). While retaining this broad scope, the administration required publications and presentations and specified their number.

Reflections on Using the Guidelines

Below, we describe our unique experiences using the evaluation guidelines to prepare dossiers for review (Rubio and Stevens) and formally evaluate LPDs for retention purposes (Crane). Given the sensitive and confidential nature of this work, our narratives do not reveal specific content from these reviews, but rather attempt to draw a picture of our experiences that may help readers understand what to expect in either of these roles.

1. Transitioning from Language Program Assistant to Director (Rubio)

Before assuming the Spanish LPD role, I assisted the former LPD for three years in conjunction with my duties as an instructor. In my previous capacity as an LPD assistant, my duties included overseeing courses, observing Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA), and developing course materials, always under the former LPD as a guiding resource for any queries or uncertainties. Once I stepped into my current position, I encountered additional challenges, including administrative tasks, scheduling, and face-to-face and online courses' (re)design. Additionally, the responsibility of training GTAs and contributing to the overall service of the Spanish language program became part of my agenda. Today, my primary focus remains on program management since my colleagues know the significant demands in directing the Spanish Basic Program, and they have supported me in successfully executing these diverse tasks.

Approaching my three-year appointment, our college requested a retention review process, a procedure previously mentioned by the department chair upon my appointment. Despite its novelty, the process proved manageable, primarily due to the comprehensive guidance provided by the LPD guidelines. Drafting this dossier was initially challenging, as I was unfamiliar with such tasks, but I was fortunate to collaborate with my more experienced colleagues. The college's associate dean also played a crucial role, proactively convening a meeting before the dossier submission deadline to outline the procedures for the dossier completion within our university's "Faculty Success" portal. Her hands-on instruction and prompt responses to our inquiries were invaluable.

The uniqueness of the guidelines served as a cornerstone in facilitating a structured and stress-free review process. By adhering to the delineated criteria in the framework, I could compile and present my dossier materials effectively, and the guidelines' clarity and specificity allowed me to showcase my contributions and accomplishments within the LPD role effectively. When faced with gaps in documentation, I refrained from undue stress, as I viewed the review as an opportunity for growth and learning. The most notable challenge, however, was the time constraints for dossier preparation, coinciding with the start of the fall semester, one of the busiest periods of the academic year.

I remained receptive to feedback, recognizing that any areas for improvement highlighted by the committee would serve as valuable insights for professional development and my next retention review. Their prompt and constructive feedback, which closely mirrored the structure outlined in the guidelines, reaffirmed the importance of their role in this process.

2. Anxieties Abated by Structured Guidelines (Stevens)

When we created the guidelines, my primary concerns were conveying the breadth and depth of the work within an academic system that prioritizes classical TT roles, and ensuring the review committee would truly understand the work of an LPD. Prior to becoming LPD, I had assisted our former director for five years and saw firsthand that many faculty in our department were only aware of the most high-level administrative duties of LPDs.

While preparing my retention dossier, it was comforting to know that the metrics I would be measured by had been developed by myself and other LPDs specifically for LPDs. Knowing that the retention committee had a detailed but flexible description of LPD responsibilities allowed me to focus on highlighting the work I was most proud of, rather than trying to explain my role to a group who may not understand it. The framework we created also helped me capture my work within a rigid computer system designed to evaluate traditional TT faculty roles. In my cover letter, I organized my activities in the same categories as the guidelines, allowing me to show how seemingly disparate tasks contribute to larger goals. For example, developing new assessments is part of a greater plan to align curriculum to research-supported pedagogical methods. I was thankful that the guidelines highlighted the non-research aspects of the LPD role that other faculty may not be as familiar with.

During the review process, I appreciated that the guidelines accommodated differences between programs as well as evolutions within a program over time. For instance, our program underwent a transition from three to over 20 graduate students (mostly international students) in less than three years. The flexibility of the guidelines allowed me to explain the workload and intellectual labor entailed in managing this transition. Rather than feeling I must justify my work, I could simply demonstrate the work that I had done and why my work focused on certain areas during that time period.

Reflecting on the review process, I wish I had allocated more time to make my dossier feel more cohesive and polished. Being our first review, I was unfamiliar with the process and had not considered requesting letters of support or peer teaching reviews. However, when I received the committee's feedback, it seemed that my letter and dossier were sufficient for them to see the bigger picture. On the whole, I felt the guidelines served their purpose well and the review committee valued the work I had been doing. The committee was able to offer specific and helpful suggestions for growth because they had the guidelines to guide their comments.

3. An LPD Perspective on Evaluating Colleagues' Work (Crane)

Having served in both NTT and TT LPD positions at other institutions, I was familiar with the challenges in communicating the nature and value of the work LPDs do. When my LPD colleagues and I were thus tasked with developing guidelines to evaluate current and future LPDs in our department, I welcomed the opportunity to help construct a grounded picture of this complex service role.

In fall 2023, I was asked to chair a four-person committee to review the work of two Assistant Professor LPDs for retention purposes. Each committee member represented a different language section from our department. I served as the only NTT faculty and the sole applied linguist and individual with LPD experience.

Before the committee convened, the chair shared guidelines to ensure fairness and transparency (personal communication, August 29, 2023). Three pieces of advice were especially helpful. First, our review was not meant to "rehash what is already in the materials but bring out some details to help the College Committee, Dean, and Provost understand better the role of the LPD and how the candidate fulfills it." Additionally, we were encouraged to "add elements of standards and norms in the profession that would not necessarily come out in the other materials." Second, brevity was key ("only a page or two or [the College] will send them back"). Third, the review was to be conducted based on the established criteria ("facts only, and no comments on personality or things like that"). I was thankful the chair recognized the unique work of LPDs and saw communicating professional standards as part of the committee's charge.

At the first of two meetings, the committee discussed the evaluation criteria outlined in the guidelines and the evaluation process itself. We found the guidelines were sufficiently detailed to serve as their own rubric in determining whether the faculty member had met, exceeded, or needed more work to meet expectations in a given area. Our second meeting involved discussing the candidates' work across the five evaluation areas. While we converged on many points, each of us observed unique things in the dossiers: Those members who worked in the same language section as the colleague under review could talk about specific contributions in their programs. As the sole LPD on the committee, I was able to contribute additional contextualization, e.g., noting work and initiatives I found especially innovative, challenging, or in line with best practices in post-secondary language education.

While writing the letter, we focused on providing concise, clear, and evidence-based feedback. In addition to discussing the candidates' work across the five criteria (a paragraph devoted to each area), we provided feedback as they look ahead to the next retention and promotion mark. Once the report was circulated to the committee for feedback and submitted to the faculty reporting site, it was immediately available to the candidate to read and, if desired, respond to within the platform, before it moved on to the chair and eventually the dean.

Overall, the review represented the type of evaluation process I would have liked to have experienced as an LPD in previous positions, particularly when I served in NTT roles. The criteria were developed collaboratively with input from all LPDs in our program, the review process was fair and transparent, and both colleagues had space to demonstrate what they had achieved in their roles. This was particularly important given that they had different scholarly profiles, distinct challenges within their respective language programs, and unique accomplishments to show in building and managing their programs.

The LPD review additionally offered a learning opportunity for the entire committee. Some committee members remarked during our deliberation that they now understood their colleagues' work much better. I, too, learned more about my colleagues and their contributions. The experience not only strengthened our relationships, but also allowed me to see areas I could work on in my own program administration work. In addition to providing departmental and institutional leadership with important information about the candidates' work, the review offered colleagues meaningful feedback to help them assess to what extent their job-specific goals had been met and consider how they could work towards old and new goals. Importantly, the review felt like an opportunity for all stakeholders (reviewers and those reviewed alike) to develop a better understanding of what LPDs do.

Discussion

In this article, we set out to share our experiences in developing and using evaluation guidelines to assess the diverse work of LPDs in our university department. Tasked with designing the guidelines ourselves, we were positioned to take a proactive (rather than defensive) approach to preparing our review dossiers and serving on the retention committee.

Having support on multiple levels—from departmental and university leadership to colleagues in our language programs and wider department—was key to the success of this review experience. The prior LPDs in our department had already established a strong tradition of collaborative work and collegial support (see, e.g., Drewelow et al., 2019), while additional colleagues in our department had served in coordination roles over the years. This collective experiential knowledge base of language program administration work, we believe, was important in creating the level of trust and supportive departmental culture needed for these faculty evaluations to work.

For those involved in the evaluation process, we offer two recommendations for fostering equity in the review process. First, LPDs and those who have had previous experience with language program coordination should actively participate in the creation of guidelines as well as the review process. While the makeup of departments and programs may vary, drawing on the expertise of those who have similar experience is invaluable for the review committee and strengthens the likelihood that the guidelines will be adhered to. Second, reviewers and LPDs under review should consider carefully throughout the entire process how the evaluations will be used and will support the LPD's strategic plan and promotion path.

Looking ahead, the evaluation work presented here can help the field to conceptualize more concretely the nature of LPD labor, even when general areas of responsibility and promotion criteria may differ across different academic contexts. While empirical research on this topic is likely to be messy and complicated, it can also further theorize language program administration work, reveal areas of "hidden" labor, and educate the field on this unique professional profile. Our hope is that the evaluation criteria and review process presented here can offer colleagues a helpful model to begin to deconstruct tropes of LPDs as mere managers. Importantly, this work reminds us that research is still needed to identify and unpack deeply ingrained ideologies regarding how LPD work is viewed in higher education. Exploring the underlying ideological discourses about LPDs and their roles in language departments would help to further ensure fairness and equity in future evaluations.

References

American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) Executive Committee (October 2019). *Promotion and tenure guidelines*. https://www.aaal.org/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines##

American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Language Programs (AAUSC) (November 2017). *AAUSC statement of policy on the hiring of language program directors*. http://aausc.org/Policy-on

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. (n.d.). *Language program direction interactive modules*. https://carla.umn.edu/lpd/modules/index.html

Drewelow, I., Koronkiewicz, B., & Range, R. (2019). Rethinking and shifting discourses and practices of "testing": From accuracy to engagement with situated contexts. In B. Dupuy & K. Michelson (Eds.), *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education* (pp. 53-82). Cengage. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/69792

Enkin, E. (2015). Supporting the professional development of foreign language graduate students: A focus on course development and program direction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(2), 304–320. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12131

Guthrie, E. (2001). The language program director and the curriculum: Setting the stage for effective programs. *ADFL Bulletin*, 32(3), 41-47. https://doi.org/10.1632/ADFL.32.3.41

Harris-Schenz, B. (1993). Between a rock and a hard place: The position of the language program coordinator. *ADFL Bulletin*, 24(2), 45-50. https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.24.2.45

Katz, S., & Watzinger-Tharp, J. (2005). Toward an understanding of the role of applied linguists in foreign language departments. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 490-502. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00326.x

Lee, J. F. (1989). *A manual and practical guide to directing foreign language programs and training graduate teaching assistants*. McGraw Hill.

Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (1991). The question of language program direction is academic. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 113–127). Heinle & Heinle. https://doi.org/10125/69443

Lord, G. (2014). *Language program direction. Theory and practice*. Pearson Education.

Moyer, A., & Gonglewski, M. (1998). Surviving the leap from graduate student to language program director: Issues, challenges, rewards. *ADFL Bulletin*, 30(1), 52-58. https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.30.1.52

Paesani, K., & Barrette, C. M. (2005). The role of the language program director within a three-dimensional model of articulation. In K. Paesani & C. M. Barrette (Eds.), *Language program articulation: Developing a theoretical foundation* (pp. 2-20). Thomson Heinle. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/69607

Ryan-Scheutz, C. (2010). Foreign language program direction: Reflections on workload, service, and feminization of the profession. In K. Hogan & M. Masse (Eds.), *Over ten million served: Gendered service in language and literature workplaces* (pp. 89-102). SUNY Press. https://doi.org/10.1353/book1361

Schulz, R. (2005). The role of Basic Language Program Director: Result of a survey. *ADFL Bulletin*, 36(2), 32–39. https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.36.2.32

UC Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching (April 2009). *Considerations for evaluation of applied linguists in language, literature, and culture departments in the UC system*.

https://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/

VanPatten, B. (2015). Where are the experts? *Hispania*, 98(1), 2–13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2015.0011

Appendix: Guidelines for Evaluating RCF Language Program Directors

This document outlines the main roles and responsibilities of our Renewable Contract Faculty (RCF) Language Program Directors (LPD) in order to provide benchmarks for both LPDs and the Department of Modern Languages & Classics (MLC) in evaluating this work. In addition to performing their own teaching duties, LPDs in MLC are responsible for administering the elementary and intermediate language courses. As such, they oversee the curricula of these courses and have substantial responsibility for managing and mentoring the educators who teach these courses, including Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA), Instructors, and other teaching staff. These responsibilities—corresponding to the two broad areas of *curriculum development* and *language teacher education*—represent more than typical "service" in an academic unit (AAUSC, 2017; UC Consortium, 2009).

The University expects that LPDs will have the possibility to qualify for promotion. Given their leadership status as curriculum developers, program managers, and teacher-mentors, LPDs should receive similar recognition for their meritorious service and administrative workload as other tenure-track colleagues (AAUSC, 2017).[iii]

Criteria for Evaluating LPD Work

As each language program has its own specific needs, priorities, and intellectual emphases, the work of LPDs across MLC may differ somewhat in scope and scale. Nevertheless, the following key domains have been identified as major areas of responsibility for all University of Alabama LPDs. These domains are not exhaustive and to some degree overlap with each other and can be considered mutually supporting.

1. **Curriculum Development:** *Design, development, and evaluation of curriculum*

   LPDs are responsible for the planning, direction, assessment, and success of the basic language program. Responsibilities include:

   - Development of course syllabi and oversight of course sequences for beginning and intermediate language instruction (i.e., design and oversight of content, learning goals, pedagogies, instructional materials and technologies, assessment practices, and course structure)
   - Leading curricular innovations (e.g., integration of new pedagogies, assessments, and instructional technologies; redesign of new course sequences and contributions to program articulation; online course development; facilitating graduate student research via adjustment to course curriculum and syllabi)
   - Leading instructional materials development and textbook selection
   - Ongoing evaluation of language program and student learning outcomes

   Supporting documents for measuring curriculum development work include course syllabi; examples of materials development, pedagogical redesign/innovation, and assessment; program assessment reports; course evaluations, etc.

2. **Program Management and Teacher Supervision:** *Responsibility for leading or directing a program and the individuals teaching or working within it*

   LPDs are responsible for scheduling, supervising, evaluating, and mentoring teaching staff (including Instructors, GTAs, and other teaching staff where applicable).

   Responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- Organizing and facilitating pre-semester teaching orientations
- Training, supervising, and mentoring teachers in program (with the understanding that novice GTAs will need closer supervision and mentoring than more experienced teachers)
- Offering professional development opportunities for teachers in language program (Instructors, GTAs, and additional teaching staff)
- Regular evaluation of instructors of record in the LPD's program (Instructors, GTAs, and additional teaching staff)
- Administration of placement and proficiency testing, where applicable
- Academic advising (including placement, curricular, and co-curricular advising)
- Guiding teachers, where applicable, to handle student issues regarding learning differences, academic integrity, and general safety and wellbeing
- Mediating between teachers (especially GTAs) and students where necessary
- Liaison with campus units as relevant to duties (e.g., Registrar, Early College, Continuing Studies, ODS, Graduate School, ITAP)
- Providing input for instructor searches and sitting on instructor search committees

Supporting documents for measuring program management and teacher supervision work may include reports/descriptions of program management and teacher supervision work (including summaries of teaching evaluations); sample teaching evaluations/class observation reports of GTAs and Instructors (names redacted); statements on teacher training

3. **Teaching:** *Design and instruction of one's individual courses*

LPDs are also instructors of record and responsible for teaching their own courses. They typically teach the graduate seminar on language teaching methods and may teach lower-division courses that they oversee as part of their LPD responsibilities and/or contribute to more advanced courses in the undergraduate and graduate curricula.

In line with general MLC faculty teaching responsibilities, LPDs are expected to:

- Design, plan, and carry out lessons
- Evaluate student progress and provide feedback to students
- Design, plan, and carry out new courses or new topics in existing courses
- Contribute to the development of the language section's larger curricula (undergraduate and graduate)
- Support undergraduate research (where applicable)

Supporting documents for measuring teaching may include teaching statement; overview of courses taught and/or designed (outside of LPD sequence); course evaluations; sample lessons, pedagogies, and/or assessments; list of students mentored; internal class observations; recognition of teaching (e.g., awards)

4. **Scholarly and Professional Activity:** *Maintaining and developing relevant expertise through engagement in professional dialogues, classroom inquiry, or scholarly production*

LPDs are in an ideal position to contribute materials and research that impact teaching and learning at the university and beyond. Scholarly activity may take the following forms:

- Refereed journal articles, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, and digital research projects in the subjects comprised in the LPD's instructional program, i.e., applied linguistics, language pedagogy, education, teacher education, linguistics, and literary/cultural/film studies
- Practitioner research (e.g., action research, exploratory practice, lesson study) and classroom-based research
- Textbooks and instructional materials development, including online materials and Open Educational Resources (OER)

- Published works for a general audience (e.g., blogs, podcasts, essays, white papers, etc.)
- Presentations at conferences, symposia, and workshops in the field

Professional learning may include, but is not limited to:

- Developing expertise in second language learning, teaching (and teacher education), curriculum, mentoring, and program supervision through, for example, participation in conferences, workshops, professional learning communities, etc.
- Maintaining subject-area expertise in ways that affect the understanding of how the subject-area should be taught, whether by oneself or others

Supporting documents for measuring scholarly activity and professional learning work may include: statement on professional learning during LPD period; statement and list of scholarly activity during LPD period; publications; internal and external review letters

5. **Service to Institution, Community, and Profession:** *Active engagement in and service contributions to different communities and organizations in and beyond the University of Alabama*

   LPDs are expected to be part of and contribute to their language program, department, and university, as well as the wider profession. Engagement can include, but is not limited to:

   - Serving on committees and task forces and attending meetings related to work and initiatives at the university, divisional, departmental, or unit level
   - Community-based / service-learning initiatives and programs
   - Service to the profession (e.g., elected positions and committee assignments in professional associations; editorial board service for journals; manuscript and conference abstract reviews; external evaluations and committee work; consulting to external stakeholders)

   Supporting documents for measuring service contributions may include statement on service, including a list of service work on and off campus and descriptions of notable projects; letters (internal or external, as relevant)

Promotion Criteria for LPDs

All LPDs are expected to demonstrate excellence in the management, supervision, and leadership of their language programs and those working within it, and in the performance of other assigned duties. To evaluate LPDs eligible for promotion, the following criteria (drawing on the evaluation criteria described above) should be considered:

For Promotion to Associate Professor, candidates will be expected to have, or to have shown:

- experience at the Assistant Professor rank or equivalent; at least six years of relevant teaching post-PhD and professional experience at the University of Alabama or elsewhere
- meaningful contributions in the areas of course and curriculum development, and program management and teacher supervision of GTAs
- excellence in teaching
- active engagement in professional learning
- contribution to scholarship by publishing 2 articles in applied linguistics or in an area relevant to their position (see section 4)
- presentation of at least 4 papers at related conferences in the field
- participation in service at the University of Alabama, the community, and the professional field; evidence of potential for innovation and/or leadership

Up to two external reviews may be obtained by the department chair in consultation with the promotion committee covering only the evaluation period for promotion

For Promotion to Professor, candidates will be expected to have, or to have shown:

- experience at the Associate Professor rank or equivalent; at least twelve years of teaching post-PhD and related professional experience at the University of Alabama or elsewhere
- meritorious contributions in the areas of course and curriculum development, and program management and teacher supervision of GTAs
- excellence in teaching (as defined in appointment letter) and status as superior educator
- active engagement in own professional learning
- contribution to scholarship by publishing (since their last promotion) 2 articles in applied linguistics or in an area relevant to their position (see section 4)
- presentation of at least 4 papers at related conferences in the field since their last promotion
- recognition for leadership and innovation in the professional field (e.g., leadership in a relevant national organization or recognition for excellence and innovation in teaching)

Up to two external reviews may be obtained by the department chair in consultation with the promotion committee covering only the evaluation period for promotion.

About the Authors

Cori Crane is Associate Professor of German and German Language Program Director at the University of Alabama. Her research interests include language teacher education, practitioner research, systemic functional linguistics, and curriculum development. Her publications have appeared in the *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, *Foreign Language Annals*, *L2 Journal*, *Profession*, *System*, and various AAUSC volumes.

E-mail: cpcrane@ua.edu

Laura Rubio, originally from Segovia, Spain, is an Assistant Professor of Spanish and the Spanish Language Program Director at the University of Alabama. She teaches a variety of courses in Spanish language and linguistics. Her research interests are in formative assessments, teaching methodology, and heritage learners.

E-mail: lrubio@ua.edu

April Stevens is an Assistant Professor of French and French Language Program Director at the University of Alabama and founder of the FLEX Service-Learning school outreach program. Originally trained as a literature specialist, her research interests range from French and Caribbean theater of the 18th century to service learning.

E-mail: april.stevens@ua.edu

[i] Though the title of the 2017 *AAUSC Statement of Policy on the Hiring of Language Program Directors* immediately reveals its purpose for hiring, not evaluating, LPDs, the document provides helpful information in outlining broad areas of responsibility that constitute LPD work (see, e.g., Table 1).

[ii] While some institutions we surveyed included recommended percentages for division of labor, we elected not to adopt this in our framework. Given the differences in our language programs (e.g., different curricular profiles, language section cultures, and graduate programs), we wanted maximum flexibility in serving our own programs.

[iii] The 2017 AAUSC Statement of Policy on the Hiring of Language Program Directors states: "Because of their responsibilities for the curriculum, teaching staff, as well as their discipline-specific, research-based knowledge of the field, LPDs must be afforded the same visibility, acknowledgement, stability, rights, and institutional standing as other tenure-track colleagues." (http://aausc.org/Policy-on)