

Department of English
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of English Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	3
Department Approval:	09/03/2021
College Approval:	09/17/2021
Effective:	09/17/2021

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The lecturers and academic professionals housed in the Department of English are vital
3 components of our faculty. The review and promotion process of these non-tenure track
4 (NTT) faculty is intended to reflect and highlight their contributions to our department
5 and their unique mission within the university, focused on their instruction within the
6 Department of English and their service within department, college, and/or university-
7 based programs. While promotion to the level of senior lecturer, principal senior
8 lecturer, senior academic professional, or principal academic professional is not
9 equivalent to tenure, such a promotion indicates the carefully adjudicated decision
10 made by our department, the college, and the university that these faculty are
11 extremely valuable and effective members of our department with whom we hope to
12 have a long-term affiliation.

13 The policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-
14 tenure track ranks are outlined in this document (department guidelines), the College of
15 Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual),
16 and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty
17 (university manual). Whereas the university and college NTT manuals provide general
18 statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments,
19 this document identifies the concrete forms these achievements should take. In
20 particular, this document articulates the department’s criteria for the various rankings
21 that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of teaching (if applicable for
22 academic professionals) and service. Candidates should consult the college and
23 university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and
24 time-in-rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

25 The following two NTT faculty positions in use in the Department of English are eligible
26 for promotion. For each position, the ranks have been listed in parentheses starting with
27 the lowest rank and ending with the highest possible rank. The general duties for each
28 position are described in the college manual.

- 29 1. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
- 30 2. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional,
31 Principal Academic Professional)

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

33 **A. Process Overview**

34 The primary stages of the department’s NTT faculty promotion review process are as
35 follows:

- 36 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for
37 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to
38 the department chair.

39 2. The department chair forwards the candidate's materials to the departmental review
40 committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be
41 made by the committee as a whole).

42 3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority
43 reports, to the department chair. The department chair will provide a copy of the
44 departmental committee's report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with
45 a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the department
46 chair within three business.

47 4. The department chair submits her/his independent recommendation and the
48 recommendation of the departmental committee, including any minority reports and
49 any responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The department chair will
50 provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that the
51 candidate has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days.
52 The Dean's Office will provide to the department chair a copy of any response from the
53 candidate to the department chair's report.

54 See sections III and IV in the college manual for information on the evaluation processes
55 at the college and university levels.

56

57 **B. Composition of Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee**

58 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all
59 tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above in the department, except
60 the chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position
61 that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels.
62 Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and
63 evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the
64 committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on
65 its final recommendation. Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank
66 may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In
67 consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment the departmental
68 promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the
69 home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a
70 committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured and one being
71 NTT faculty.

72 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

73 **A. General Considerations**

74 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual
75 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
76 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
77 lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
78 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
79 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
80 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's
81 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
82 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document
83 are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being
84 considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

85

86 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

87

88 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

89 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
90 of the college's [Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty](#).
91 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
92 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education
93 requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of
94 teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to
95 their assigned role in the department.

96 Instructional accomplishment is evaluated in terms of students' accomplishments both
97 in class and in their individually directed work with faculty; student perceptions of the
98 effectiveness of the instructor; how their pedagogy contributes to the department's
99 curricular needs, innovations and improvements, and, in some cases, on how their
100 pedagogical contributions are evaluated by external constituencies to Georgia State
101 University.

102

103 **2. Evaluation of Service**

104 Candidates should document any arrangements made upon or after their initial
105 appointment for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy
106 service loads. Examples of such duties include assistant director of lower-division
107 studies, assistant to the graduate director, and directing exchange programs. The
108 overall effectiveness of such service is evaluated based on the criteria of efficiency,
109 dependability, and innovation.

110 **3. Additional Considerations**

111 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review
112 include the following:

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

119 In considering a lecturer's or senior lecturer's performance in professional
120 development, the department will not determine a specific level of accomplishment.
121 Instead, the review committee will take careful account of the candidate's
122 professional development and use it to help determine the rating awarded in
123 instruction. This reflects our belief that faculty members who are actively engaged
124 in professional projects will be better teachers. As a result, lecturers will be better
125 able to convey to students -- as first-hand practitioners -- pedagogical insights about
126 writing, research, theory, and other disciplinary matters. As teaching faculty of a
127 research university, lecturers who have an active and successful record of
128 professional development situate themselves as excellent colleagues of the tenured
129 and tenure-track faculty. We recognize that lecturers, holding advanced degrees,
130 have been trained for scholarly or creative activities, and should be fully encouraged
131 to pursue these activities, which will enhance the overall accomplishments and
132 reputation of the department.

133 Since a lecturer's professional development is evaluated as a subordinate element of
134 the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate
135 how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances his or her
136 instructional effectiveness. One obvious way of doing this would be to show
137 connections between the specific projects undertaken and the material taught in the
138 classroom. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how a
139 lecturer's experience in the field of professional development relates to his or her
140 performance in instruction.

141 The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are
142 identical to those described in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
143 (under 'Criteria for Promotion and Tenure'): publications, editorial work, book
144 reviews, hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences,
145 awards and grants, and so forth.

146 Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the
147 'Instruction' section of the dossier rather than under a 'Professional Development'
148 section.

149 **b. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role
150 of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the
151 college or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The
152 review will include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the
153 department and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the
154 department.

155

156 **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

157 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
158 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
159 relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*.
160 The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category for each
161 rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be
162 referenced in evaluations is included as an appendix to this document (see Appendix I).

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

164 For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of
165 competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as *excellent*, according to
166 the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service
167 to the department, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice
168 community that is evaluated as *very good*, which meets the university standard for
169 promotion to senior lecturer.

170

171 **a. Teaching**

172 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
173 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's performance and supporting material demonstrate
174 the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays
175 evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal
176 intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the department.
177 Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional
178 excellence, including impressive preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the
179 classroom, successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a
180 foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative
181 insight. The candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4 out of 5
182 range. The portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of
183 syllabi, assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive,
184 unified, and multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class.
185 The classroom learning environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for
186 students. The candidate should have some involvement with the department's
187 overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals and course revisions, CTW,
188 study abroad programs). Finally, the materials in the candidate's dossier should
189 demonstrate a vibrant intellectual life consistent with the academic responsibilities of a

190 college teacher, including sophisticated reading habits and a demonstrated ability to
191 keep up with scholarship in the fields taught.

192 **b. Service**

193 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to senior
194 lecturer with a rating of *very good* if the candidate is an active colleague who serves
195 when asked, often suggests his or her own helpful service projects and roles, and
196 succeeds according to his or her own initiative above and beyond what is minimally
197 required. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the department,
198 e.g., through service to the Honors College, the Office of Student Life, or university-
199 recognized student groups. A candidate evaluated as very good in service may also have
200 some service outreach responsibilities outside of the University.

201

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

203 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, a promotion for which evaluation
204 committees assess dossiers with expectations of highly notable achievement, the
205 candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in
206 teaching that is evaluated as *excellent*, according to the college manual. Additionally,
207 the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the department, college,
208 university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as
209 *excellent*, which meets the university standard for promotion to principal senior
210 lecturer. Successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer will
211 demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. This growth
212 might be in the area of teaching or service or both. It might be growth resulting in a
213 higher ranking in one of these areas, but this need not necessarily be the case so long as
214 the candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has
215 mastered new skills or has made new contributions in teaching or service. Growth might
216 be exemplified by innovations in pedagogical approach, participation in and
217 development of departmental, college, or university initiatives focused on teaching and
218 learning, curriculum development, receipt of grants and/or awards related to teaching
219 and learning, publications in the candidate's field that enhances their expertise in their
220 field and thus in the classroom, the proposal of new courses, or significant mentorship
221 of undergraduates, perhaps in support of fellowship applications, internship or
222 assistantship direction, or direction/facilitation of independent studies or study-abroad
223 experiences.

224

225 **a. Teaching**

226 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
227 of *excellent*, the candidate's performance and supporting material must be innovative
228 and comprehensive. This candidate's student outcomes will be consistently
229 distinguished: papers and other course assignments will demonstrably reflect students'
230 prowess in writing, interpretation, analysis, creativity, research, and other departmental
231 assessment goals. The candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be above the
232 mid-4 out of 5 range. The candidate will be significantly involved with the department's

233 ongoing work to assess, update, and improve the curriculum. There should be evidence
234 that, over the considerable length of his or her teaching career, the candidate has
235 changed, evolved, and/or adapted pedagogically to reflect changes in the discipline and
236 in the practice of teaching. This candidate should be able to document recognition
237 beyond the department, which might be exemplified by but is not limited to teaching
238 awards, the establishment of new courses, curriculum development or innovation,
239 grants related to teaching and learning, or the development and diffusion of
240 pedagogical innovations that are used and cited by some larger teaching community.

241

242 **b. Service**

243 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
244 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if the candidate is an active colleague
245 who has participated in a variety of departmental and college committees. The
246 candidate may have taken on a departmental administrative role (e.g., internship
247 coordinator, assessment coordinator, associate director of lower-division studies, or
248 graduate studies, or CETL). Service might be recognized through consistent
249 participation in the instruction and/or development of Honors courses and curriculum,
250 participation in first-year book initiatives, observation of GTAs, departmental teaching
251 and learning workshops designed for graduate instructors, or participation in the
252 judgment of university-specific conferences, such as the Georgia State University
253 Undergraduate Research Conference. Significant service to national and international
254 professional organizations, too, demonstrates excellence in service.

255

256 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

257 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
258 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
259 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
260 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
261 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

262

263 **1. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

264 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's
265 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental
266 subcommittee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured
267 faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers will prepare an evaluation of the
268 lecturer's record. The department chair will provide an independent assessment before
269 forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record.
270 The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale used for promotion
271 reviews. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-
272 year review; it is meant to review the lecturer's achievements to date and provide
273 mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year
274 review.

275 **2. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers**

276 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior

277 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy,
278 and accomplished in their service profiles. Faculty under review will present their
279 dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least
280 three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with
281 representation from each). The department chair will provide an independent
282 assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

283 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW**

284 **A. General Considerations**

285 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional
286 track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year
287 review with promotion to senior academic professional, 4) subsequent review with
288 promotion to Principal Academic Professional (the timing for which is defined in the
289 college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).
290 In these reviews, the primary consideration is service contributions, while teaching
291 contributions will be considered if the candidate's workload includes teaching.
292 Supplemental consideration is given to contributions in the area of professional
293 development as they bear on the candidate's knowledge as it relates to teaching
294 performance (if applicable). This document defines ratings that are used in all of the
295 reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in
296 the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for
297 promotion.

298

299 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

300

301 **1. Evaluation of Service**

302 Service comprises at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions. The quality
303 of service of academic professionals is of paramount importance. Recognizing that each
304 academic professional position is unique, the review committee will base its assessment
305 of the candidate's quality of service on the specific duties assigned to each academic
306 professional. Candidates, with the approval of the chair and the Dean's Office, should
307 provide a summary of essential functions and responsibilities related to their program
308 and position. Candidates will be evaluated in consideration with the areas below.

309

310 **a. To demonstrate their service, candidates for promotion should**

311

- 312 i. collect and provide written evidence of their diligence and effectiveness in
313 performing the essential functions and responsibilities of their position.
- 314
- 315 ii. include in the dossier a list of programmatic duties approved by the chair and
316 the Dean's office, administrative roles, contributions to the development of their
317 university and departmental initiatives, and committees served on, with brief
318 descriptions of the work performed in each of these areas, such as reports or
319 other documents prepared by the candidate.

320

321 **b. Depending on the candidates' essential duties and job functions, the candidate**
322 **should provide evidence of**

- 323
- 324 i. assistance to colleagues and students, such as participation in teaching seminars,
325 work as a mentor, direction of internships, presentation of faculty and student
326 training sessions, guest lecturing, and advising;
327
- 328 ii. planning or participating in workshops and/or conferences connected to duties
329 as Academic Professional;
330
- 331 iii. service to university or community related to teaching or program duties;
332
- 333 iv. managing program development to foster intellectual development across
334 campus;
335
- 336 v. supervisory activities, including funding, training, and/or managing student
337 assistants and other staff related to program;
338
- 339 vi. budget management, including annual budget planning, monthly budget reports,
340 and/or distribution of resources to faculty, graduate students, and/or staff;
341
- 342 vii. facilities management, including managing physical or digital spaces for the use
343 of faculty and students;
344
- 345 viii. website development and development of online tools to improve program
346 efficiency and expand program outreach;
347
- 348 ix. development of programmatic materials, including brochures, handbooks,
349 handouts, and other educational and promotional materials;
350
- 351 x. assessment to gauge the effectiveness of departmental, college, or university
352 programs;
353
- 354 xi. serving on departmental, college, or university committees;
355
- 356 xii. collaborating with other university and departmental entities to foster
357 intellectual development across campus;
358
- 359 xiii. establishing local, regional, and/or national recognition by presenting at
360 conferences or publishing about program initiatives;
361
- 362 xiv. fund-raising and development to benefit the program and/or the department at
363 large.
364
- 365 xv. other duties in fulfillment of additional departmental requirements, as
366 necessary.

367 **2. Evaluation of Teaching**

368 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
369 of the college's [Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty](#).

370 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates
371 to their assigned role in the department.

372 Instructional accomplishment is evaluated in terms of students' accomplishments both
373 in class and in their individually directed work with faculty; student perceptions of the
374 effectiveness of the instructor; how their pedagogy contributes to the department's
375 curricular needs, innovations and improvements, and, in some cases, how their
376 pedagogical contributions are evaluated by external constituencies to Georgia State
377 University.

378 **3. Additional Considerations**

379 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the academic
380 professional review include the following:

381

382 **a. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role
383 of the academic professional also may change. For example, if student enrollments
384 shift, the college or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or
385 fewer. The review will include the role of the academic professional within the
386 context of the mission of the department and the ability of the academic
387 professional to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

388

389 **b. Professional Development Contributions:** It is expected that academic professionals
390 will manifest in their classes and in their programmatic work a rich intellectual
391 background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. One
392 way (though not required) of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of
393 scholarly or creative activities. Other ways include attending or participating in
394 panels at professional conferences, as well as remaining current on readings in the
395 field.

396 In considering an academic professional's performance in professional development
397 during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the department will not determine a
398 specific level of accomplishment. Instead, the review committee will take careful
399 account of the candidate's professional development and use it to help determine
400 the rating awarded in service and instruction. This reflects our belief that a faculty
401 member who is actively engaged in professional projects of some kind will be a
402 better teacher as a result, and will also serve better in the service role designated for
403 his or her particular appointment as academic professional: better able to convey to
404 students -- as a first-hand practitioner -- pedagogical insights about writing,
405 research, theory, and other disciplinary matters; and better able to perform
406 administrative duties because she or he has a significant professional standing.

407 Since an academic professional’s professional development is evaluated as a
408 subordinate element of the overall record in service and instruction, it is incumbent
409 on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the
410 dossier enhances his or her service and instructional effectiveness. One obvious way
411 of doing this would be to show connections between the specific projects
412 undertaken and the material taught in the classroom or service conducted on
413 campus. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how an
414 academic professional’s experience in the field of professional development relates
415 to his or her performance in instruction and service.

416 The specific forms of professional development that an academic professional may
417 produce are identical to those described at the beginning of this manual (under
418 ‘Criteria for Promotion and Tenure’): publications, editorial work, book reviews,
419 hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences, awards and
420 grants, and so forth. All such work, whether produced during or before an academic
421 professional’s tenure at Georgia State University, may be included in the dossier.

422 Scholarship directly concerning pedagogy, curriculum, and so forth, should be
423 included in the ‘Instruction’ section of the dossier rather than a ‘Professional
424 Development’ section.

425

426

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

427 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
428 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
429 using the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The
430 single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category is defined in
431 this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be referenced in
432 evaluations is included as an appendix to this document (see Appendix II).

1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional

434 For promotion to the rank of senior academic professional, the candidate must
435 demonstrate a level of assigned service to the department, college and/or university,
436 and/or the professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*. If the
437 candidate’s workload includes teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as
438 demonstrating a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is also
439 evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the university standard for promotion to the rank of
440 senior academic professional.

441

a. Service

443 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior academic
444 professional with a rating of *excellent*, the candidate should fulfill consistent, effective,
445 innovative, and dependable service in the administrative duties, as outlined in section
446 IV.B.1.a above, as well as high quality work in several of the key related job functions
447 from section IV.B.1.b.

448 **b. Teaching**

449 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior academic
450 professional with a rating of *excellent*, the candidate's supporting material
451 demonstrates evidence of diligent preparation and enthusiastic, innovative instruction
452 as well as conscientious mentoring of students and a strong commitment to the
453 pedagogical mission of the department. The candidate's scores on student evaluations
454 will often be in the mid-4 out of 5 range. There must be consistently strong evidence of
455 successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a
456 coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The
457 portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of syllabi,
458 assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive, unified, and
459 multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class. The classroom
460 learning environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for students. The
461 candidate should have some involvement with the department's overarching curricular
462 goals (e.g., new course proposals and course revisions, CTW, study abroad programs).

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

464 For promotion to Principal Academic Professional, the department will follow the
465 evaluation criteria as described in the NTT Promotion Manual for the College of Arts and
466 Sciences.

467 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

468 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
469 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
470 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
471 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
472 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

473

474 **1. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals**

475 The third-year review for academic professionals is designed to assess the faculty
476 member's effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior academic
477 professional. A departmental subcommittee composed of three faculty, which will
478 include tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from
479 each), will prepare an evaluation of the academic professional's record. The department
480 chair will provide an independent assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the
481 Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the
482 terms of the six-point scale used for promotion reviews. However, the spirit of the third-
483 year review is different from that of the fifth-year review: it is meant to encourage an
484 assessment of, and dialogue about, an academic professional's achievements to date,
485 and to generate advice about possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the
486 fifth-year review.

487 **2. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals**

488 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that academic
489 professionals at the senior rank and above remain effective and current in their service
490 and pedagogy (if applicable). Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as
491 described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty
492 who are either tenured or at the rank of senior academic professional or higher (with
493 representation from each when the department has an available senior academic
494 professional or principal academic professional). The department chair will provide an
495 independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for
496 response.

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

497 **A. Teaching**

498

499 **Poor:** The lecturer displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
500 student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in
501 departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical
502 techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient
503 transmission of the course content to students.

504

505 **Fair:** The lecturer displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
506 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in
507 departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical
508 techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient
509 transmission of the course content to students.

510

511 **Good:** The lecturer's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This
512 candidate's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and
513 pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or
514 decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of
515 a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this candidate's classroom, as
516 reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not
517 distinctly positive.

518

519 **Very Good:** The lecturer is a highly competent candidate whose supporting material
520 includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some
521 mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a strong commitment to the mission of
522 the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative,
523 resulting in proficient student learning.

524

525 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The lecturer's performance and supporting
526 material demonstrate the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member
527 who displays evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction,
528 personal intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the
529 department. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of
530 instructional excellence, including impressive preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in
531 the classroom, successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a
532 foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative
533 insight. The candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4 out of 5
534 range. The portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of
535 syllabi, assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive,
536 unified, and multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class.

537 The classroom learning environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for
538 students. The candidate should have some involvement with the department's
539 overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals and course revisions, CTW,
540 study abroad programs). Finally, the materials in the candidate's dossier should
541 demonstrate a vibrant intellectual life consistent with the academic responsibilities of a
542 college teacher, including sophisticated reading habits and a demonstrated ability to
543 keep up with scholarship in the fields taught.

544 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for
545 promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of *excellent* indicates
546 that the candidate's performance and supporting material are innovative and
547 comprehensive. This candidate's student outcomes will be consistently distinguished:
548 papers and other course assignments will demonstrably reflect students' prowess in
549 writing, interpretation, analysis, creativity, research, and other departmental
550 assessment goals. The candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be above the
551 mid-4 out of 5 range. The candidate will be significantly involved with the department's
552 ongoing work to assess, update, and improve the curriculum. There should be evidence
553 that, over the considerable length of his or her teaching career, the candidate has
554 changed, evolved, and/or adapted pedagogically to reflect changes in the discipline and
555 in the practice of teaching. This candidate should be able to document external
556 recognition: e.g., teaching awards, or the development and diffusion of pedagogical
557 innovations that are used and cited by some larger teaching community.

558
559 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The lecturer's accomplishments exceed the
560 criteria for excellent and who demonstrates a superb ability to communicate these skills
561 and accomplishments. The candidate's supporting material is impeccable: it must
562 demonstrate nearly flawless reports of teaching effectiveness, exceptional preparation
563 for classes, and extensive mentoring of students. This rare candidate must be
564 recognized among students and colleagues as one of the best -- most effective and
565 committed-- teachers in the department, a recognition that will typically include honors
566 or awards for teaching, a track record of impactful pedagogical publications, or
567 demonstrations of external validation of their superior teaching.

568
569 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for
570 promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of *outstanding*
571 characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the department's pedagogical
572 mission. He or she will have a record demonstrating that his/her classes are among the
573 very best offered by the department, and manifesting an innovative pedagogical
574 proficiency that has a positive impact on other faculty and on the departmental
575 curriculum at large. This candidate will take a leadership role in the department's
576 macrocosmic pedagogical enterprises, e.g., learning outcome assessment,
577 retention/progression/graduation initiatives, and curriculum development. There
578 should be external validation, as well, of this candidate's prowess: teaching awards and
579 prestigious pedagogical publications (which could be print or online resources) that have

580 a demonstrated national impact are examples of this.

581

582 **B. Service**

583

584 **Poor:** The lecturer may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other
585 significant service accomplishments. The candidate may serve on other departmental
586 committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

587

588 **Fair:** The lecturer may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other
589 significant service accomplishments. The candidate may serve on other departmental
590 committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

591

592 **Good:** The lecturer contributes to committees to which he or she is assigned and
593 performs dependably and professionally.

594

595 **Very Good:** The lecturer serves when asked, often suggests his or her own helpful
596 service projects and roles, and succeeds according to his or her own initiative above and
597 beyond what is minimally required. Service at this level might include some experiences
598 beyond the department, e.g., through service to the Honors College, the Office of
599 Student Life, or university-recognized student groups. A candidate evaluated as *very*
600 *good* in service may also have some service outreach responsibilities outside of the
601 university.

602

603 **Excellent:** The lecturer demonstrates a track record of leadership that has involved
604 significant departmental administrative functions (e.g., support for First-Year Studies or
605 the Writing Studio; organizing regular workshops to train colleagues how to use new
606 digital and pedagogical platforms; etc.). Such leadership is in addition to the level of
607 service described as *very good*.

608

609 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described as *excellent*, the lecturer
610 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the
611 department and throughout the college and university, as well as possibly in national
612 and international professional organizations.

APPENDIX II. Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Academic Professional-Track Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

613 **A. Service**

614 **Poor:** Not only has the academic professional not performed his or her duties, but has
615 been derelict to an extent that other departmental, college, and/or university functions
616 have been impeded.

617 **Fair:** The academic professional's responsibilities have not been fulfilled, and others
618 have had to take over the performance of those duties.

619 **Good:** The academic professional's responsibilities have been only marginally
620 performed.

621 **Very Good:** The candidate has accomplished some but not all of the assigned duties in
622 sections IV.B.1.a and IV.B.1.b above, does not present evidence of the successful
623 completion of many of these duties, or provides evidence that does not illustrate high
624 quality work or is unrelated to those duties.

625 **Excellent:** The candidate fulfills consistent, effective, innovative, and dependable service
626 in administrative duties, as outlined in section IV.B.1.a, as well as high quality work in
627 several of the key related job functions from section IV.B.1.b.

628 **Outstanding:** The academic professional fulfills impeccable service as outlined in section
629 IV.B.1.a above, as well as high quality work in as many of the job functions from section
630 IV.B.1.b as are applicable to the candidate's position.

631

632 **B. Teaching**

633 **Poor:** The academic professional displays an unacceptable record of teaching as
634 evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no
635 involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
636 pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the
637 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

638 **Fair:** The academic professional displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as
639 evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little
640 involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
641 pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the
642 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

643 **Good:** The academic professional's instructional performance minimally exceeds
644 adequate. This candidate's supporting material provides evidence of appropriate
645 preparation and pertinent content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional
646 pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and

647 intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor.

648 **Very Good:** The academic professional is a competent candidate whose supporting
649 material includes evidence not only of conscientious preparation and instruction but
650 also of some mentoring of students and effective pedagogy. Class assignments are
651 creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning.

652 **Excellent:** The academic professional's supporting material demonstrates evidence of
653 diligent preparation and enthusiastic, innovative instruction as well as conscientious
654 mentoring of students and a strong commitment to the pedagogical mission of the
655 department. The candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4
656 out of 5 range. There must be consistently strong evidence of successful mentoring of
657 students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of
658 teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The portfolios assembled for
659 each class embody more than just a collection of syllabi, assignments, exams and
660 handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive, unified, and multi-faceted
661 educational project arranged around the topic of the class. The classroom learning
662 environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for students. The candidate
663 should have some involvement with the department's overarching curricular goals (e.g.,
664 new course proposals and course revisions, CTW, study abroad programs).

665 **Outstanding:** The academic professional's performance and dossier demonstrate the
666 dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays evidence of
667 continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual
668 growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the department. Supporting
669 material must exhibit impeccable evidence of exceptional preparation, clearly
670 demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, lucid grading
671 standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep
672 thought and imaginative insight. This rare candidate must be recognized among
673 students and colleagues as one of the best -- most effective and committed -- teachers
674 in the department, a recognition that will typically include honors or awards for
675 teaching, a track record of impactful pedagogical publications, or demonstrations of
676 external validation of their superior teaching.