

Department of Chemistry
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of Chemistry Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	2
Departmental Approval:	08/19/2021
College Approval:	09/17/2021
Effective:	09/17/2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Chemistry Department of Georgia State University filling critical instructional and service roles. The Department of Chemistry has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and University guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University PROMOTION MANUAL FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY, and (2) the College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University PROMOTION MANUAL FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY. In the event of a conflict between the departmental and college/university documents, the college/university documents take precedence.

The Department of Chemistry employs NTT faculty in the lecturer and academic professional tracks. The ranks of lecturer (listed from most junior to most senior) are: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The ranks of academic professional are Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional, and Principal Academic Professional.

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

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

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

28 **A. Process Overview**

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

- 32 1. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Dean's office and will
33 subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
34 (College of Arts and Sciences PROMOTION MANUAL FOR NON-TENURE TRACK
35 FACULTY) 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 of the
37 Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the review.
38 The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.
- 39 3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation, including minority report(s) (if
40 any), to the department chair. The department chair will provide a copy of the
41 committee's report (including minority report(s)) to the candidate.
- 42 4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the
43 departmental committee review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean's Office. The
44 department chair provides a copy of the chair report to the candidate. The candidate has
45 the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair reports, addressed to
46 the Dean's Office, within three business days. The Dean's Office will provide the
47 department chair with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the department
48 committee and chair's report.

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

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

54 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of all
55 tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank or above (senior lecturer, principle senior
56 lecturer, senior academic professional, and principal academic professional) in the department,
57 except the chair and associate chair of the department and those members of the department
58 serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or
59 university level. For each candidate, the department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member
60 subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the
61 whole, to initially review each candidate. The department chair shall also appoint a committee
62 chair (selected from the subcommittee) for each candidate. All final recommendations must be
63 made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet, discuss, and arrive
64 at a majority recommendation. The vote will be in the form of signatures on the final
65 recommendation. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may
66 not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the
67 approval of the department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank
68 can be authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean
69 may augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other
70 departments if the Chemistry department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to
71 constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a tenured TT and
72 at least one being a senior or principal senior NTT faculty member.

73 The committee of the whole shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to the
74 chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the department of
75 chemistry in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of the committee of the whole shall
76 be approved by majority vote.

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

- 78 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
79 review procedures adopted by the department of chemistry.
- 80 2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate.
- 81 3. The written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of the
82 whole is delivered to the department chair.
- 83 4. Committee members who do not sign the written majority recommendation must provide
84 signed separate letters (minority report) indicating their recommendations and the reasons
85 for these recommendations.
- 86 5. The written statement and all separate letters from the committee of the whole must be
87 sent to the chair of the department.

88

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

90

91 The rating system for all structured reviews of NTT faculty will be: *outstanding, excellent,*
92 *very good, good, fair, and poor.* Factors used in the evaluation for NTT faculty for teaching are
93 listed in Table A1 of the Appendix. The corresponding factors for service are listed in Table A2
94 of the Appendix.

95 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

96

97 **A. General Considerations**

98 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual review
99 leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior
100 lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior lecturer (the timing for which is
101 defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured

102 review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in teaching and service,
103 with consideration given to contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the
104 candidate's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that
105 are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are
106 defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for
107 promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

108 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

109 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

110 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the
111 college's [Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty](#). Evaluators will
112 assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging
113 undergraduate learning in courses ranging from introductory survey of chemistry to advanced
114 lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs, and Internship experience.

115 Instruction for science majors communicates the discipline of chemistry to students, develops
116 in them an excitement about the molecular structure of the world around them, and trains them to
117 be skilled, responsible members of a chemistry-related profession.

118 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but
119 goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must include in the dossier
120 evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as:

- 121 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 122 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 123 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials,
124 and/or effective instructional techniques.

- 125 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if
126 these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 127 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented
128 for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.
- 129 6. Results of all standardized exams given to all students (e.g., the ACS standardized
130 exams).
- 131 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
132 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations (oral
133 and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
- 134 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned
135 societies.
- 136 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
137 teaching activities.
- 138 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
139 participation in textbook development.
- 140 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

141 **2. Evaluation of Service**

142 For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for
143 lecturers is normally at the departmental and college level and the quantity is dependent upon
144 specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the Department. University,
145 college, department, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.

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

- 147 (a) Safety is always of primary concern in a chemistry department. It is expected that
148 the candidate will maintain the highest safety standards at all times.
- 149 (b) Maintenance and oversight of equipment is of vital importance in a chemistry
150 department. Where appropriate, it is expected that the candidate will take a
151 vigorous role in making sure that Departmental equipment is in working order,

152 both by overseeing equipment purchase and repair, and by training students and
153 research associates carefully in the use of equipment.

154 (c) Participation on departmental committees is an important responsibility of all
155 faculty. Effective participation on the NTT Promotion Review Committee and
156 other committee appointments is expected.

157 (d) Faculty are expected to provide limited course oversight/coordination or fulfill other
158 assigned duties.

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

164 Each Lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
165 responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term will have a different
166 service load than those assigned major departmental and/or College roles. Only service that
167 meets the Department's mission will be considered.

168 A. For Lecturers with Full Teaching Loads. Service assignments are limited to (a) safety
169 issues, (b) equipment oversight, (c) departmental committees, participation in department
170 activities, and (d) limited course oversight/coordination or limited assigned departmental tasks
171 (science fair judges, seminar related tasks, etc.).

172 B. For Lecturers with Major Assigned Obligations in Departmental and/or
173 College/University Committees/Tasks. Service assignments in addition to (a)-(d) above include
174 one or more of the following: (e) Undergraduate Director, (f) Area Committee (e.g., Freshman,
175 Organic, etc.), (g) Pre-Med Advisor (departmental), (h) College/University committee work
176 (Pre-Med. etc.), (i) course lab manual responsibilities, (j) course/area Web responsibilities, and
177 (k) Science Olympiads or other major assigned departmental tasks.

178 Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties with diligence and with quality (e.g.,
179 timely/thorough and effective performance of assigned tasks) to achieve the rating of *very good*.

180 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

188 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
189 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
190 relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. In order
191 to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* in
192 teaching. Table A1 of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. The
193 service of Lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers
194 who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have
195 consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned
196 tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) qualify for a rating of *very good* in
197 service. Table A2 of the Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the
198 service of NTT faculty.

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

200 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a
201 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued growth
202 in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high
203 standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college, university,
204 and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence

205 that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the
206 evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. In order to be promoted
207 to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* in instruction
208 and *excellent* in service. Tables A1 (for teaching) and A2 (for service) of the Appendix outline
209 in detail what is necessary to obtain this.

210 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

214 **1. Annual Review**

215 Each faculty member, TT and NTT, undergoes an annual review. The annual report of the
216 previous year (except for faculty in their first year at GSU), plus an updated curriculum vita and
217 any other appropriate material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process. The Chair
218 of the Chemistry Department in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee shall
219 evaluate performance in instruction and service using the specific standards described in the
220 Appendix.

221 **2. Third-Year Review (Lecturer)**

222 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
223 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and
224 deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental
225 committee of the whole will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written
226 assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the departmental chair. As
227 discussed in Section IIB of this document, a subcommittee shall be formed for each candidate to
228 provide an initial draft evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but the committee of the whole
229 must meet, discuss, and vote on the final recommendation and ranking. The Chair will provide
230 an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be
231 forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will

232 evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent,*
233 *very good, good, fair, and poor.* Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating.
234 Split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as “very
235 good but approaching excellent” may be appropriate.

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

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

242 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every 5
243 years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion
244 Review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and effectiveness of
245 their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the
246 candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or Principal Senior Lecturer
247 (PSL) will be notified by the college in advance of the Post-Promotion Review and the required
248 materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This
249 material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the department chair according to a schedule provided by
250 the college in advance of the review. The departmental executive committee elects an evaluation
251 committee consisting of at least three faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least one NTT
252 faculty member of rank equal or higher to that of the SL/PSL). This committee evaluates the
253 SL/PSL in the categories of instruction and service using the criteria summarized in the
254 Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment, and both evaluations
255 will be sent to the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college
256 manual.

257 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

258

259 **A. General Considerations**

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

270 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

271 **1. Evaluation of Service**

272 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in Section VI
 273 of the college manual which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements. Service roles
 274 are assigned by the department depending on departmental needs and mission. Service
 275 effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties. Service roles normally
 276 assigned by the department (individual assignments may include all or some of these roles)
 277 include:

- 278 • Facility/Service Management
- 279 • Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- 280 • Instructional Service (laboratory coordination is one example) □ Academic Advisement
 281 and Curriculum

- 282 • Contributions to the Department, College or University
- 283 • Professional Service
- 284 • Community and Public Service
- 285 • Published Materials
- 286 • Additional Service

287 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To
 288 receive an *excellent* rating all assigned tasks must be performed thoroughly and in a timely
 289 manner. The candidate must also play a leadership role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, cost
 290 effectiveness and planning will also be part of the evaluation.

291 2. Evaluation of Teaching

293 For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching, instructional
 294 assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The
 295 effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department's mission and the
 296 specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary on certain occasions
 297 to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly match their skills/background.
 298 The candidate will be shown special consideration under these conditions.

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

- 303 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but
304 goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must provide evidence of
305 teaching effectiveness, such as:
- 306 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
 - 307 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
 - 308 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials,
309 and/or effective instructional techniques.
 - 310 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if
311 these include significant revision of the current documents.
 - 312 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented
313 for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.
 - 314 6. Results of all standardized exams given to all students (e.g., the ACS standardized
315 exams).
 - 316 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
317 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations (oral
318 and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
 - 319 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned
320 societies.
 - 321 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
322 teaching activities.
 - 323 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
324 participation in textbook development.
 - 325 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

326 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

334 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
335 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in service and teaching (if
336 applicable) relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and
337 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must
338 be rated as *excellent* in service. Table A2 of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to
339 obtain this. The candidate must also be rated as *excellent* in teaching and Table A1 of the
340 Appendix outlines what this entails.

341 **2. Promotion from Senior Academic Professional to Principal Academic Professional**

342 For promotion to Principal Academic Professional, the Department of Chemistry will follow
343 the evaluation criteria as described in the NTT Promotion Manual for the College of Arts and
344 Sciences. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Academic Professional, the candidate
345 must be rated as *excellent* in service, using the criteria listed in Table A2 of the Appendix, with
346 continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. If the candidate's workload
347 includes teaching, the candidate must also be rated as *excellent* in teaching using the criteria
348 listed in Table A1 of the Appendix, with continued growth since the last promotion.

349 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

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

354 An appointment to an academic professional position is for a one-year period. Each academic
355 professional undergoes an annual review. The annual report of the previous year (except for
356 faculty in their first year at GSU), plus an updated curriculum vita and any other appropriate
357 material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process. The Chair-of the Chemistry
358 Department in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee shall evaluate
359 performance in instruction and service using the specific standards described in the Appendix.

360

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

362 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
363 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and
364 deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental
365 committee of the whole will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written
366 assessment with ranking that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in instruction and
367 service to the departmental chair. As discussed in Section IIB of this document, a subcommittee
368 of the committee of the whole shall be formed for each candidate to provide an initial draft
369 evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but the committee of the whole must meet, discuss,
370 modify, and vote on the final recommendation. The Chair will provide an independent
371 assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's
372 Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in
373 teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair,* and
374 *poor*. Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings such as
375 "very good/excellent" are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as "very good but approaching
376 excellent" may be appropriate.

377 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion) review, its
378 purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and dialogue of the
379 academic professional's accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In

380 addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address possible deficiencies
381 before the fifth-year review.

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

383 All Senior Academic Professionals and Principal Academic Professionals must undergo a
384 comprehensive review every 5 years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The
385 purpose of the Post-Promotion Review is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-
386 term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to
387 reach his/her full potential. The candidate will be notified by the college in advance of the Post-
388 Promotion Review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in
389 Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the candidate to the department
390 chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental executive committee
391 elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty (at least one tenured TT and at
392 least one NTT faculty member of rank equal or higher to that of the candidate). This committee
393 evaluates the candidate in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria summarized in
394 the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment and on both
395 evaluations to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college
396 manual

APPENDIX

Table A1. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evidence Considered in Evaluation
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	<p>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f):</p> <p>(a) update/revise courses (b) appropriate student perceptions¹, and appropriate grades/drop rates²</p> <p>(c) direct independent study and/or Chem 4160 courses, (d) pub. in instructional jour. (e) instructional creativity, and/or develop new courses (f) appropriate learning outcomes, favorable test results relative to those of other faculty teaching the same or similar courses/ACS exam results^{2,3}</p> <p>(g) involvement/participation with educationally focused grants/proposals</p>
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	Normally⁴ 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

1

Compared to the departmental 4 year average for the area and course level.

2

Department's normal statistics for each level of courses will be used as the standard. Student performance and honors are applicable.

3

Results on ACS national exams meet Departmental goals and expectations (previous results used as criteria).

⁴For Academic Professionals assigned limited teaching responsibilities (< 25% of job functions), “appropriate student perceptions, and appropriate grades/drop rates” (item (b) in “Evidence Considered in Evaluation”) is replaced with “appropriate student perceptions and/or appropriate grades/drop rates”.

Table A2. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Candidates

Service¹ Rating	Definition	Evidence Considered in Evaluation
Outstanding	Major effective leadership roles	Major effective role in department. Major effective role in College or Senate or University, or in a professional organization
Excellent	Effective departmental leadership role(s)	Effective role in department. Effective role in college or senate or university, 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.