

Department of Biology
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of Biology Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	2
Departmental Approval:	09/03/2021
College Approval:	09/17/2021
Effective:	09/17/2021

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Biology Department of
3 Georgia State University filling critical instructional and service roles. The Department of
4 Biology has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion
5 of faculty in non-tenure track ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general
6 requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and
7 with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and Georgia State University
8 guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University Promotion
9 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual), and (2) the College of Arts and
10 Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual). In the event of
11 a conflict between the departmental and college/university documents, the
12 college/university documents take precedence.

13 The Department of Biology employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer
14 and academic professional tracks. The ranks of lecturer (listed from most junior to most
15 senior) are: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The academic
16 professional ranks employed are Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional, and
17 Principal Academic Professional.

18 For Lecturer positions, the Department of Biology will nominate for promotion to
19 Senior Lecturer only those candidates who are evaluated as *excellent* in teaching. A service
20 evaluation of *very good* is also required for promotion. For promotion of a Senior Lecturer
21 to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, evaluations of *excellent* or better in both teaching
22 and service are required.

23 For Academic Professional track positions, the Department of Biology will nominate
24 for promotion only those candidates who present evidence of a sustained evaluation of
25 *excellent* in service. For candidates whose workload includes teaching, an evaluation of
26 *excellent* in teaching that promotes the general goals and welfare of the department and fits
27 the needs of the department is also required for promotion.

28 **II. DEPARTMENTAL NTT PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS**

29 **A. Process Overview**

30 The primary stages of the Biology Department's NTT faculty review process are
31 outlined below. These steps must be carried out following a time schedule provided by the
32 College of Arts and Sciences.

- 33 1. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Dean's office and will
34 subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
35 to the department chair according to the schedule provided by the college.
- 36 2. The department chair forwards the candidate's review materials to a subcommittee
37 of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the
38 review. The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.
- 39 3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation, including minority
40 report(s) (if any), to the department chair. The committee members will sign the
41 report(s) on a separate page/pages. The department chair will provide a copy of the
42 committee's report (including minority report(s)) to the candidate.
- 43 4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the
44 departmental committee review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean's Office.
45 The department chair provides a copy of the chair report to the candidate. The
46 candidate has the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair
47 reports, addressed to the Dean's Office, within three business days. The Dean's
48 Office will provide the department chair with a copy of any formal response the
49 candidate has to the department committee and chair's report.

50 At this point, the review process passes from the department to the college and
51 university. See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review process at
52 the college and university level.

53 **B. Departmental Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee**
54 **(Committee of the Whole)**

55 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed
56 of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above (Senior Lecturer,
57 Principle Senior Lecturer, Senior Academic Professional, and Principal Academic
58 Professional) in the department, except the chair and associate chair of the department and
59 those members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate's
60 promotion application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the
61 department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one
62 NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole, to initially review each candidate.
63 The department chair shall also appoint a committee chair (selected from the
64 subcommittee) for each candidate. All final recommendations must be made by the
65 committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a
66 majority recommendation. The vote will be in the form of signatures on the final
67 recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be signed
68 by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation.
69 Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter
70 or letters (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. The
71 signatures must appear on a separate page(s) so that they can be removed when the
72 candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's report(s).
73 NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the
74 final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the
75 department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be
76 authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean
77 may augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from
78 other departments if the Biology Department does not have a sufficient number of faculty

79 to constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a
80 tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at Senior level or above.

81 The committee of the whole shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to
82 the chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the
83 Department of Biology in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of the committee of
84 the whole shall be approved by majority vote.

85 Duties of the departmental committee of the whole include the following:

- 86 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
87 review procedures adopted by the Department of Biology.
- 88 2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate.
- 89 3. The written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of
90 the whole is delivered to the department chair.
- 91 4. Committee members who do not sign the written majority recommendation must
92 provide a signed separate letter or letters (minority report) indicating their
93 recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations. The signatures must
94 appear on a separate page(s) so that they can be removed when the candidate is
95 provided with his or her copy of the committee's report(s).
- 96 5. The written statement and all separate letters from the committee of the whole
97 must be sent to the chair of the department.

98

99 **C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service**

100

101 The rating system for all structured reviews of NTT faculty will be: *outstanding*,
102 *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Factors used in the evaluation for NTT faculty for
103 teaching are listed in Table A of the Appendix. The corresponding factors for service are
104 listed in Table B of the Appendix.

105 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

106

107 **A. General Considerations**

108 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the Lecturer track: 1) annual
109 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
110 promotion to Senior Lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to Principal Senior
111 Lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
112 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
113 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
114 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's
115 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
116 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are
117 defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered
118 for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer.

119 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

120 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

121 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
122 of the college's [Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty](#).
123 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
124 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in courses ranging from introductory survey
125 of biology to advanced undergraduate lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs,
126 and internship experiences.

127 Instruction for science majors communicates the discipline of biology to students and
128 trains them to be skilled and responsible researchers, practitioners, teachers, or other
129 professionals.

130 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
131 but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Table A for details). The candidate
132 must include such evidence in the dossier.

- 133 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 134 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 135 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
136 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 137 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially
138 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 139 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
140 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
141 as defined in the college manual (section V.E).
- 142 6. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
143 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
144 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
145 meetings).
- 146 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
147 learned societies.
- 148 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
149 teaching activities.
- 150 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
151 participation in textbook development.
- 152 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

153 **2. Evaluation of Service**

154 For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for
155 lecturers is normally at the departmental and college level and the quantity is dependent
156 upon specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the department.

157 University, college, department, professional and/or community level service can be
158 relevant.

159 Departmental service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:

- 160 (a) Ensuring the highest safety standards at all times.
- 161 (b) Maintaining and overseeing equipment. Where appropriate, it is expected
162 that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that departmental
163 equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and
164 repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use
165 of equipment.
- 166 (c) Participation on departmental committees. Effective participation on the
167 NTT Promotion Review Committee and other committee appointments,
168 including curriculum committee and grade appeal committees, is expected.
169 Other service avenues may include student advisement/mentoring,
170 assistance to colleagues, and role on college committees, etc.
- 171 (d) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.

172 The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality.
173 Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have
174 consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all
175 assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their
176 assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of *very good* in service.

177 Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
178 responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a

179 different service load than those assigned major departmental and/or college roles. Such
180 additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, direction of
181 student teams (e.g., Science Olympiads), etc.

182 Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and
183 timely manner to achieve the rating of *very good*.

184 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

185 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
186 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
187 relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. The single
188 measure for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and
189 service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in
190 both categories is included in the Appendix.

191 **1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

192 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
193 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and
194 service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
195 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated
196 as *excellent* in teaching. Table A of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to
197 obtain this. The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level
198 of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their
199 assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them,
200 who have performed all assigned tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.)
201 qualify for a rating of *very good* in service. Table B of the Appendix gives details for the
202 descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

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

204 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a
205 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued

206 growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide
207 a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college,
208 university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based
209 on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching
210 and service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
211 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must
212 be rated as *excellent* in instruction and *excellent* in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B
213 (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary to obtain this.

214 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

215 The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion reviews are all
216 distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and
217 possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

218 219 **1. Annual Review**

220 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are
221 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the
222 faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report information covering the
223 prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In
224 consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will
225 evaluate the lecturer track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria
226 described in the Appendix.

227 **2. Third-Year Review**

228 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
229 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period
230 and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. A departmental
231 review committee composed of at least three members, which will include tenured faculty
232 and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers, will evaluate the required materials and

233 provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service
234 to the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review
235 committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which along
236 with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in
237 the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and
238 service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*.
239 Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating. Split ratings such as "very
240 good/excellent" are to be avoided.

241 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion)
242 review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and
243 dialogue of the lecturer's accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In
244 addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address possible
245 deficiencies before the fifth-year review.

246 **3. Post-Promotion Review (Senior Lecturer and Principal Senior Lecturer)**

247 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every
248 five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the post-
249 promotion review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and
250 effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities
251 that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or
252 Principal Senior Lecturer (PSL) will be notified by the college in advance of the post-
253 promotion review and the materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section
254 V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the department
255 chair according to a schedule provided by the college in advance of the review. The review
256 committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee of the whole and consists
257 of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of PSL (with representation
258 from each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks).
259 This committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the categories of teaching and service using the

260 criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent
261 assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional
262 information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.

263 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

264 **A. General Considerations**

266 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track:
267 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
268 promotion to Senior Academic Professional, 4) subsequent review with promotion to
269 Principal Academic Professional (the timing for which is defined in the college manual),
270 and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews,
271 the primary considerations are contributions in service and teaching (if the faculty
272 member's workload includes teaching). Supplemental consideration will be given to
273 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's
274 knowledge and departmental responsibilities. This document defines ratings that are used
275 in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are
276 defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered
277 for promotion.

278 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

279 **1. Evaluation of Service**

280 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in
281 Section VI of the college manual, which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements.
282 Service roles are assigned by the department depending on departmental needs and

283 mission. Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties.
284 Service roles normally assigned by the department (individual assignments may include all
285 or some of these roles) include:

- 286 • Facility/Service Management
- 287 • Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- 288 • Instructional Service (laboratory coordination is one example)
- 289 • Academic Advisement and Curriculum
- 290 • Contributions to the Department, College or University
- 291 • Professional Service
- 292 • Community and Public Service
- 293 • Published Materials
- 294 • Additional Service

295

296 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality.

297 To receive an *excellent* rating all assigned tasks must be performed effectively and
298 diligently and in a thorough and timely manner. The candidate must also play a leadership
299 role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, cost effectiveness, and planning will also be factored
300 into the evaluation.

301 **2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)**

302 For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching, instructional
303 assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The
304 effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department's mission and the
305 specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary on certain
306 occasions to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly match their

307 skills/background. The candidate will be shown special consideration under these
308 conditions.

309 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of
310 the college's [Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty](#). Evaluators
311 will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates to their
312 assigned role in the department.

313 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
314 but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Appendix, Table A). The candidate
315 must provide such evidence in the dossier.

- 316 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 317 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 318 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
319 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 320 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially
321 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 322 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
323 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
324 as defined in the college manual (section VI.E).
- 325 6. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
326 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
327 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
328 meetings).
- 329 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
330 learned societies.
- 331 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
332 teaching activities.

333 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
334 participation in textbook development.

335 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
336

337 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

338 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
339 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in service and teaching (if
340 the candidate's workload includes teaching) relative to the descriptors: *outstanding*,
341 *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The single measure for achieving the standard for
342 promotion in the categories of instruction and service for each rank is defined in this
343 section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in both categories is included in the
344 Appendix.

345 **1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional**

346 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
347 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in service and
348 teaching (if the candidate's workload includes teaching) relative to the evaluative terms
349 *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank
350 of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must be rated as *excellent* in service. Table
351 B of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. If the candidate's
352 workload includes teaching, the candidate must also be rated as *excellent* in teaching using
353 the criteria listed in Table A of the Appendix.

354 **2. Promotion from Senior Academic Professional to Principal Academic 355 Professional**

356 For promotion to Principal Academic Professional, the Department will follow the
357 evaluation criteria as described in the NTT Promotion Manual for the College of Arts and
358 Sciences. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Academic Professional, the
359 candidate must be rated as *excellent* in service, using the criteria listed in Table B of the

360 Appendix, with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. If the
361 candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must also be rated as *excellent* in
362 teaching using the criteria listed in Table A of the Appendix, with continued growth in the
363 time period since the last promotion.

364 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

365 The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion reviews are all
366 distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and
367 possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

368 **1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals**

369 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional
370 track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the
371 materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report
372 information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate
373 materials. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department
374 chair will evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and teaching
375 (if applicable) using the criteria described in the Appendix.

376 **2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals**

377 As discussed in detail in Section VI.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
378 dossier containing information on service and teaching (if applicable) for the appropriate
379 review period and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. A
380 departmental review committee composed of at least three members, which will include
381 tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from each when
382 the department has one or more available senior academic professionals within its ranks)
383 will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written assessment with ranking
384 that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in service and teaching (if applicable) to
385 the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review
386 committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which along

387 with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office. As stated in
388 the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and
389 service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*.
390 Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings such as “very
391 good/excellent” are to be avoided.

392 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion)
393 review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and
394 dialogue of the academic professional’s accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to
395 that point. In addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address
396 possible deficiencies before the fifth-year review.

397 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals**

398 All Senior Academic Professionals and Principal Academic Professionals must undergo a
399 comprehensive review every five years after their last promotion or post-promotion
400 review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion Review is to assess the quality and
401 effectiveness of their long-term service and teaching (if applicable) and possibly identify
402 opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The candidate
403 will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion review and the materials
404 they are required to provide are discussed in Section VI.F of the college manual. This
405 material is submitted by the candidate to the department chair according to a schedule
406 provided by the college. The review committee is elected by the departmental NTT review
407 committee of the whole and consists of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at
408 the rank of Senior Academic Professional or higher (with representation from each when
409 the department has an available Senior Academic Professional or Principal Academic
410 Professional within its ranks). This committee evaluates the candidate in the categories of
411 service and teaching (if applicable) using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The
412 department chair will provide an independent assessment and send on both evaluations to
413 the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section VI.F of the college manual.

APPENDIX

Table A. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f): (a) update/revise courses (b) student perceptions (c) direct independent study courses (d) publications in instructional journals (e) instructional creativity as evidenced by development of new courses and/or awards for instructional innovation (f) learning outcomes as evidenced by grade distribution and drop rates, (g) involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	3 items: (a), (b), and (f)
Good	Meets obligations	2 of 7 items, including (b)
Fair	Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness	1 of 7 items

Poor	Substandard, ineffective teacher	0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints
------	-------------------------------------	---

Table B. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Candidates

Service¹ Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Major effective leadership roles	Major effective role in department. Major effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization
Excellent	Effective departmental leadership role(s)	Effective role in department. Effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization will also be considered
Very Good	Helpful citizenship. Some leadership role	Effective role in the department; meets departmental obligations effectively and is helpful; provides departmental leadership.
Good	Acceptable citizenship	Meets minimum departmental obligations/requests
Fair	Needs improvement	Does not meet departmental obligations in a timely manner
Poor	Needs major improvement; negative leader	Hinders department operations

¹Service to the department and college is expected to be minimal in the lecturer's first three years. For academic professionals, service plays a much more significant role.