

**Creative Media Industries Institute
College of Arts and Sciences / College of the Arts
Georgia State University**

**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY
REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES**

Policy Title:	Creative Media Industries Institute Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review & Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Institute Approval:	10/26/2020
College Approval:	Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Review Procedures Committee, 11/09/2020
Effective:	01/01/2021

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2
3 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Creative Media Industries Institute make vital
4 contributions to the work of the University and its constituents. The policies and procedures
5 related to the review and promotion of promotion-eligible non-tenure track faculty are
6 outlined in this document (Institute guidelines), the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion
7 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia State University
8 Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual). Whereas the
9 university and college NTT manuals provide statements of the expected quality and
10 significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document articulates the Creative Media
11 Industries Institute’s criteria for the various rankings that candidates for promotion might
12 receive in the areas of teaching and service. Candidates should consult the college and
13 university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and time-in-
14 rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

15
16 The Creative Media Industries Institute employs regular, full-time NTT faculty, which
17 includes promotion-eligible faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track
18 include the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and
19 Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the
20 college manual.

21
22 **II. INSTITUTE REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER AND**
23 **PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER**

24
25 **A. Process Overview**

26
27 The primary stages of the Institute’s NTT faculty promotion review process are as follows:

- 28
- 29 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for
30 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to
31 the Institute Executive Director and Academic Director.
 - 32
33 2. The Institute Executive Director and Academic Director forward the candidate’s
34 materials to the Institute’s review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but
35 the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).
 - 36
37 3. The Institute committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports,
38 to the Institute Executive Director and Academic Director. The committee members
39 will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages. The Institute Executive Director and
40 Academic Director will provide a copy of the Institute committee’s report, including
41 any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the

option to respond directly to the Institute Executive Director and Academic Director within three business days.

4. The Institute Executive Director and Academic Director submit their jointly produced director's independent recommendation and the recommendation of the Institute committee, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The Institute Executive Director and Academic Director will provide a copy of the director's report to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days. The Dean's Office will provide to the Institute a copy of any response from the candidate to the director's report.

See sections III in the college manual and section V in the university manual for information on the evaluation processes at the college and university levels.

B. Composition of the Institute's Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee

The Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all available tenured faculty and all NTT lecturer-track faculty of senior rank and above in the Institute (Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the Executive Director and Academic Director of the Institute and any members of the Institute serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels. The Institute may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole.

The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its final recommendation. The letter from the Institute committee of the whole must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. The signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with their copy of the committee's report(s).

Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the Institute Executive Director and Academic Director, the dean will augment the Institute promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the Institute lacks a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty (or in accordance with the college manual when

82 necessary).

83 III. LECTURER REVIEWS

84

85 **A. General Considerations.** There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the
86 lecturer track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year
87 review with promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal
88 senior lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-
89 promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
90 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
91 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's knowledge
92 as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the
93 reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the
94 context of Institute expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to
95 senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

96

97 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

98 **1. Evaluation of Teaching.** As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching
99 effectiveness will use the criteria of the [College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Assessment of](#)
100 [Teaching Effectiveness for Full-time Faculty](#). Evaluators will assess the teaching
101 effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate
102 learning in classes fulfilling general education requirements. However, if a lecturer has
103 primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then their
104 assessment will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the department.

105

106 As a general rule, evaluators will consider in their assessments of teaching effectiveness the
107 following criteria:

108

109 a. **Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through
110 review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings,
111 and other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the
112 candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university
113 guidelines. Exam questions should require students to engage material that is
114 appropriate for the course level and catalog description. Writing assignments should
115 develop the students' ability to work with primary and secondary sources in
116 crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful questions. Course materials
117 should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of
118 knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as

119 customized texts, handouts, software, and other course elements that reflect the
120 faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement and success. In particular,
121 credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate
122 curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that connect
123 students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of
124 opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as
125 further evidence of successful teaching. The department also encourages faculty to
126 design courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify
127 students who are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to
128 improve their performance as the semester unfolds. The department recognizes that
129 teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or
130 exceeding promotion expectations, however, encourage student interest in the
131 material and designing assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and
132 concepts.
133

134 b. **Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
135 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective
136 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the
137 development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques
138 and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The
139 design of successful study abroad and other community- and industry-connected
140 courses is another laudable potential achievement. New courses and the
141 development of resources that affect significant numbers of students or
142 sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant achievements
143 such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate
144 research are highly valued.

145
146 c. **Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will include overall
147 student evaluation scores, which are useful indicators of student perceptions of
148 instruction. Evaluation scores, which the department will not rely upon exclusively
149 when determining minimum qualifications for ratings, will be considered in the
150 context of the normal range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses
151 (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the Institute. The review will also consider other
152 important variables such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective,
153 the response rate on the evaluations, and the number of students enrolled in the
154 course. In addition to average scores, the department will also be attentive to mean
155 and median scores and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative
156 evidence offered by the students' written comments on the student evaluation forms
157 will receive serious attention from the department as a meaningful supplement to the
158 quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these contextual
159 elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn consistently strong

160 evaluations and high scores, as defined in Section III.C below.

161
162 d. **Direction of students:** The Institute will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts
163 in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as
164 independent studies, honors theses, student research or creative work presented at
165 GSURC, as well as individual student engagement in academic projects or programs
166 hosted by other institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include faculty
167 time spent offering additional tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for
168 underperforming in CMII classes and time spent offering additional guidance to
169 students who are pursuing additional research projects connected to CMII
170 coursework. Time spent coaching, mentoring, and/or directing students in creative,
171 scholarly, and competitive extracurricular activities and performance also may be
172 considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, and should be documented for
173 assessment by the committee. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of
174 recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be viewed as
175 evidence of significant effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

176
177 e. **Development of new skills:** The Institute encourages faculty to continue to develop
178 skills and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to improve
179 teaching as appropriate. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations
180 for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt innovative practices in
181 the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new certifications and
182 competencies may present such achievements to the Institute as evidence of their
183 commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The Institute recognizes
184 that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more
185 interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and
186 writing might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

187
188 **2. Evaluation of Service.** As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service
189 include high-quality instructional service; contributions to the Institute, college, or
190 university; professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers
191 varies depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the Institute, but it is
192 generally at the Institute or college level. Because of the widely varying service roles assigned
193 to lecturers in the Creative Media Industries Institute, a candidate will be judged for
194 diligence and effectiveness based on the context of each role's specific requirements and
195 expectations. Individual candidates will receive notice from the Executive Director of the
196 Creative Media Industries Institute to define the scope of their service responsibilities
197 beyond their work with colleagues and advisement. Service assignments may include (but are
198 not limited to) overseeing Institute programs and/or facilities; implementing significant
199 Institute initiatives or strategic priorities; organizing learning outcomes assessment work;

200 mentoring new hires, junior faculty, adjunct faculty, part-time instructors, graduate
201 assistants, and staff; spearheading outreach efforts to on- and off-campus groups and
202 organizations; establishing and maintaining study abroad programs; and other duties as
203 assigned. Activities associated with these responsibilities will vary, and will need to be
204 documented and described by the individual candidate.

205
206 In addition, lecturers may document service to Institute, college and university committees
207 and student organizations, assistance to colleagues within the university in the form of guest
208 lecturing, consulting, etc.; service to academic organizations and community groups and
209 lending expertise with professional organizations, particularly those within the lecturer's
210 specific discipline; memberships on Institute, college, or university committees; professional
211 service (if appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards;
212 community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches,
213 presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

214
215 The Institute's review of candidates' records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks
216 that chairs might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should document any
217 arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to take on special
218 administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. The degree to which assigned service
219 responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be part of the consideration of
220 their service record.

221
222 **3. Additional Considerations.** Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part
223 of the lecturer review. For example, since needs of the Institute often change, the role of the
224 lecturers also may change. The review therefore might include the role of the lecturer within
225 the context of the mission of the Institute and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively
226 the changing needs of the Institute.

227
228 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review include
229 the following:

230
231 **a. Professional Development Contributions:** It is expected that lecturers will manifest
232 in their classes a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends
233 and methods in the discipline. One way (though not required for promotion) of
234 achieving such a proficiency is through a program of scholarly or creative activities.
235 Other ways include attending or participating in panels at professional conferences,
236 and remaining current on readings in the field.

237
238 In considering a lecturer's or senior lecturer's performance in professional
239 development, the department will not determine a specific level of accomplishment.
240 Instead, the review committee will take careful account of the candidate's

241 professional development and use it to help determine the rating awarded in
242 instruction. This reflects our belief that faculty members who are actively engaged in
243 professional projects will be better teachers. As a result, lecturers will be better able to
244 convey to students – as first-hand practitioners – pedagogical insights about writing,
245 research, theory, and other disciplinary matters. As teaching faculty of a research
246 university, lecturers who have an active and successful record of professional
247 development situate themselves as excellent colleagues of the tenured and tenure-
248 track faculty. We recognize that lecturers, holding advanced degrees, have been
249 trained for scholarly or creative activities, and should be fully encouraged to pursue
250 these activities, which will enhance the overall accomplishments and reputation of
251 the department.

252
253 Since a lecturer’s professional development is evaluated as a subordinate element of
254 the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate
255 how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances their
256 instructional effectiveness. One obvious way of doing this would be to show
257 connections between the specific projects undertaken and the material taught in the
258 classroom. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how a
259 lecturer’s experience in the field of professional development relates to their
260 performance in instruction.

261 The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are
262 identical to those described in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
263 (under ‘Criteria for Promotion and Tenure’): publications, editorial work, book
264 reviews, hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences, awards
265 and grants, and so forth. Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be
266 included in the ‘Instruction’ section of the dossier rather than under a ‘Professional
267 Development’ section.

268
269 **b. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role
270 of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college
271 or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will
272 include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department
273 and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

274 275 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

276
277 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
278 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
279 relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The
280 single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category for each rank is
281 defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be referenced in

282 evaluations is included as an appendix to this document.

283 1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

284

285 For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of
286 competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least *excellent*, according to
287 the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to
288 the Institute, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is
289 evaluated as at least *very good*, which meets the university standard for promotion to senior
290 lecturer.

291

292 a. **Teaching.** To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior
293 lecturer with a rating of excellent, the candidate's performance and supporting
294 material demonstrate the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty
295 member who displays evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective
296 instruction, personal intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of
297 the department. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of
298 instructional excellence, including impressive preparation, clearly demonstrated skill
299 in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a
300 foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and
301 imaginative insight. The candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be in the
302 mid-4 out of 5 range. The portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a
303 collection of syllabi, assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a
304 comprehensive, unified, and multi-faceted educational project arranged around the
305 topic of the class. The classroom learning environment is consistently positive,
306 engaging, and effective for students. The candidate should have some involvement
307 with the department's overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals and
308 course revisions, CTW, study abroad programs). Finally, the materials in the
309 candidate's dossier should demonstrate a vibrant intellectual life consistent with the
310 academic responsibilities of a college teacher, including sophisticated reading habits
311 and a demonstrated ability to keep up with scholarship in the fields taught.
312 Additionally, the faculty member demonstrates a track record of developing new
313 courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate
314 or graduate students.

315

316 b. **Service.** To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer
317 with a rating of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills
318 the faculty member's assigned roles. The candidate has consistently attended
319 committee meetings required of them, performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in
320 a timely manner, and has completed assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

321 **2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer**

322
323 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a
324 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as *excellent*,
325 according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned
326 service to the Institute, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice
327 community that is evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the university standard for promotion
328 to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer
329 will demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. This growth
330 might be in the area of teaching or service or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher
331 ranking in one of these areas, but this need not necessarily be the case so long as the
332 candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new
333 skills or has made new contributions in teaching or service.

- 334
- 335 a. **Teaching.** To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer
336 with a rating of excellent, the candidate's performance and supporting material must
337 be innovative and comprehensive. This candidate's student outcomes will be
338 consistently distinguished: papers and other course assignments will demonstrably
339 reflect students' prowess in writing, interpretation, analysis, creativity, research, and
340 other departmental assessment goals. The candidate's scores on student evaluations
341 will often be above the mid-4 out of 5 range. The candidate will be significantly
342 involved with the department's ongoing work to assess, update, and improve the
343 curriculum. There should be evidence that, over the considerable length of the
344 faculty member's teaching career, the candidate has changed, evolved, and/or adapted
345 pedagogically to reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This
346 candidate should be able to document recognition beyond the department, which
347 might be exemplified by but is not limited to teaching awards, the establishment of
348 new courses, curriculum development or innovation, grants related to teaching and
349 learning, or the development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used
350 and cited by some larger teaching community, production of a publication suitable for
351 use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches, publication of pedagogical
352 scholarship, successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical
353 initiatives, or student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.
 - 354
 - 355 b. **Service.** The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion
356 to principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if the faculty member has
357 diligently and highly effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed

358 significantly to the mission of the Institute over a sustained period. The *excellent*
359 candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to
360 Institute advising efforts, graduate teaching assistants, other non-tenure track
361 instructors, or additional individual people or aspects of the Institute appropriate to
362 that particular candidate's service role. In addition to continued growth in the areas of
363 service described above, the candidate's growth in service should take one or more of
364 the following forms: highly effective service as an Institute program director or in a
365 role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant
366 service to the profession or the community.

367 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

368
369
370 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all distinct
371 from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time periods and may
372 involve different evaluating bodies, the results of any one of these reviews should not be
373 assumed to transfer to the others.

- 374
375 1. **Annual Review of Lecturers.** Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track
376 faculty, all lecturer track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will
377 be based on the materials supplied by the faculty member, including an updated CV,
378 annual report covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other
379 appropriate materials. In consultation with the Institute executive committee, the
380 Institute Executive Director and Academic Director will jointly evaluate the lecturer
381 track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the
382 Appendix.
383
- 384 2. **Third-Year Review of Lecturers.** The third-year review for lecturers is designed to
385 assess the faculty member's effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior
386 lecturer. An Institute review committee composed of at least three faculty, which will
387 include both tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will
388 prepare an evaluation of the lecturer's record. The committee is elected by the
389 Institute's NTT review committee from its whole membership. The Institute
390 Executive Director and Academic Director will jointly provide an independent
391 assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further
392 evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point
393 scale used for promotion reviews.
394
- 395 3. **Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers** The post-
396 promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior lecturers and
397 principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy and

398 accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's
399 teaching and service records over the previous five years and will be based on the
400 criteria listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as
401 described in the college manual) for evaluation by an elected committee of at least
402 three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with
403 representation from each when the Institute has an available principal senior lecturer
404 within its ranks). The committee is elected by the Institute NTT review committee of
405 the whole. The Institute Executive Director and Academic Director will jointly
406 provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the
407 Dean's Office for response.

408 APPENDIX

409 Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be used in
410 Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

411
412
413 A. Teaching

414
415 **Poor:** The candidate displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
416 consistently low numerical scores and consistently negative comments in student
417 evaluations, ineffective pedagogy, out-of-date course materials, and little to no student
418 mentoring.

419
420 **Fair:** The candidate displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
421 through student evaluations, course materials of inconsistent effectiveness, and
422 occasional student mentoring.

423
424 **Good:** The candidate's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate, as
425 evidenced through student evaluations, minimally effective course materials, and
426 generally satisfactory but limited effort as a mentor of students.

427
428 **Very Good:** The candidate is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes
429 evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of
430 students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the
431 department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically
432 appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the candidate is an effective
433 teacher, the teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the
434 supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of *excellent*, as
435 described below, and/or the candidate's student evaluations show inconsistencies or
436 regularly fall short of Institute expectations.

437
438 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The *excellent* teacher shows consistently high
439 levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1.
440 The candidate's course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who
441 continually strives to improve their pedagogy. Normally, the faculty member earns scores
442 on student evaluations that fall in the mid-4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as
443 appropriate to the course size and level. Additionally, the faculty member demonstrates a
444 track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully
445 mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

446
447 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated expectations
448 for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the

449 rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of consistently strong student
450 evaluations, normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range, and
451 will have demonstrated successful direction of students and development new courses or
452 protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching
453 described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend into areas beyond
454 those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example,
455 successful candidates will engage in significantly notable ways in one or more of the
456 following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that
457 the faculty member teaches; publication of pedagogical scholarship; successful pursuit of
458 internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions;
459 student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

460

461 ***Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):*** The candidate's impact on students is of the
462 highest level. In excess of the expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching appropriate
463 to the faculty member's rank, as described above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a
464 mastery of instruction in an area as evidenced by at least one of the following: successful
465 pursuit of extensive external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching
466 awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

467

468 ***Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):*** In addition to the stated expectations
469 for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, the candidate for promotion to the rank of
470 principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as *outstanding* if the faculty member has achieved
471 *more than one* of the following: production of publications suitable for use in the kinds of
472 classes that the faculty member teaches; production of pedagogical scholarship; successful
473 pursuit of extensive external funding for pedagogical initiatives; notable teaching
474 awards/recognitions; notable student awards or other accomplishments of mentored
475 students.

476

477 **B. Service**

478

479 ***Poor:*** Candidates judged to be *poor* in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations and
480 are not responsible citizens of the Institute.

481

482 ***Fair:*** Candidates judged to be *fair* in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service
483 obligations or are not responsible citizens of the Institute.

484

485 ***Good:*** Candidates judged to be *good* in service do not always effectively fulfill assigned
486 service obligations or are not consistently responsible citizens of the Institute.

487

488 ***Very Good:*** Candidates judged to be *very good* in service diligently and effectively fulfill

489 their assigned roles. These candidates consistently attended committee meetings required
490 of them, perform all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and complete
491 assignments thoughtfully and effectively.
492

493 ***Excellent:*** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been diligent
494 and highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed
495 significantly to the mission of the Institute over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate
496 at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to Institute advising
497 efforts, graduate teaching assistants, other non-tenure track instructors, or additional
498 individual people or aspects of the Institute appropriate to that particular candidate's service
499 role. In addition to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the
500 candidate's growth in service should also take one or more of the following forms: highly
501 effective service as an Institute program director or in a role with a similar level of
502 responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the profession or
503 community.
504

505 ***Outstanding:*** In excess of the stated expectations to achieve a rating of *excellent* in service,
506 the candidate will be judged to be *outstanding* in service if they have not only fulfilled
507 their assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to seek out
508 best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the success of the Institute in meeting
509 its stated goals. Faculty members judged to be *outstanding* in service will have been
510 recognized by their peers, students, or university administrators as having established a
511 long track record of success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways.
512 Highly effective service as an Institute program director or in a role with a similar level of
513 responsibility, as well as extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also
514 indications of outstanding service.