

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

Policy Title:	Department of Mathematics and Statistics Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	2
Departmental Approval:	05/21/2021
College Approval:	09/17/2021
Effective:	09/17/2021

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty play a significant role by making important
3 contributions in teaching and service areas to help achieve departmental goals, are a vital
4 component of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (hereafter, Department) of
5 Georgia State University. The Department has formulated these policies and procedures
6 related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks that are in
7 conformity with the minimum general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of
8 the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and
9 Sciences and Georgia State University guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the
10 Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university
11 manual), and (2) the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track
12 Faculty (college manual), along with the departmental guidelines. In the event of a conflict
13 between the departmental and college/university documents, the college/university
14 documents take precedence.

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

20 For Lecturer positions, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics will
21 recommend for promotion to Senior Lecturer only those candidates who are evaluated as
22 at least *excellent* in teaching. A service evaluation of at least *very good* is also required for
23 promotion. For promotion of a Senior Lecturer to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer,
24 evaluations of at least *excellent* in both teaching and service are required.

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

30
31 **II. DEPARTMENTAL NTT PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS**

32 **A. Process Overview**

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

- 36 1. After consultation with the department chair, if the eligible candidate intends to
37 pursue the promotion track, then the following review process begins. As described
38 in the College Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty, the Dean's office notifies the
39 candidate about their eligibility for promotion and forwards a copy to the
40 department chair. The candidate will discuss his/her qualification with the chair
41 and then subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college
42 manual to the department chair according to the schedule provided by the college.
- 43 2. The department chair forwards the candidate's review materials to a subcommittee
44 of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the
45 review. The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.

- 46 3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation with signatures to the
47 department chair, including any minority report(s). Endorsements of the specific
48 committee members should not be revealed to the candidate. Therefore, the
49 signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the
50 candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's report(s).
51 4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the
52 departmental committee review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean's Office,
53 and provides copies of these documents to the candidate. The candidate has the
54 option of responding to the departmental committee and chair reports, addressed to
55 the Dean's Office, within three business days after receiving the documents from the
56 chair. The Dean's Office will then provide the department chair with a copy of any
57 formal response the candidate has to the department committee and chair's report.
58 At this point, the review process passes from the department to the college and then to
59 the university. See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review
60 process at the college and university level.

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

63 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed
64 of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above (Senior Lecturer,
65 Principal Senior Lecturer, Senior Academic Professional, and Principal Academic
66 Professional) in the department, except the chair and associate chair of the department and
67 those members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate's
68 promotion application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the
69 department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one
70 NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole. The department chair shall also
71 appoint a committee chair selected from the subcommittee. The subcommittee has the
72 responsibility to thoroughly analyze the candidate's dossier, coordinate deliberation with
73 the committee members, and provide initial evaluation of the dossier. Final
74 recommendation regarding promotion must be made by the committee of the whole. The
75 committee of the whole must discuss the candidate's eligibility for promotion, and arrive at
76 a majority recommendation. All actions of the committee of the whole must be approved
77 by majority vote.

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

- 79 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
80 review procedures adopted by the Department.
81 2. Approve, by majority vote, an overall recommendation for each candidate.
82 3. Deliver the written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the
83 committee of the whole to the departmental chair.
84 4. Submit signed minority reports (if any) of committee members who disagree with
85 the written majority recommendation to the departmental chair. This report should
86 include recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.
87 The vote for the recommendation will be in the form of signatures on the final

88 recommendation report. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current
89 rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However,
90 with the approval of the department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty
91 of equal rank can be authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the
92 department chair, the dean may augment the departmental promotion review committee
93 with NTT members from other departments if the Department does not have a sufficient
94 number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least
95 one being a tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at Senior level or
96 above.

97 The committee of the whole must review all credentials and make a recommendation to
98 the chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the
99 Department in accord with the college and university guidelines.

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

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

105

106 **III. LECTURER TRACK FACULTY REVIEWS**

107

108 **A. General Considerations**

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

120 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

121 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

129 The purpose of this assessment is two-fold. On one hand, it is to provide clear guidelines
130 to the instructors and to reinforce our high teaching standards and our strong commitment
131 to student success. On the other hand, it is to help compare evidence of teaching
132 effectiveness across various disciplines; to identify specific challenges of teaching
133 mathematics and statistics courses and their sequential nature, limitations and advantages
134 of various instructional models (such as regular classroom teaching, teaching in emporium
135 format, online instruction, co-teaching interdisciplinary courses with faculty from other
136 departments, and others).

137 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
138 but goes beyond the results of student evaluations (see Appendix, Table A, for details). The
139 evidence provided by the candidate normally will include the following:

- 140 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 141 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 142 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
143 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 144 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals (if applicable), authored or modified by the
145 candidate, especially if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 146 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
147 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
148 as defined in the college manual (section V.E).
- 149 6. Development of supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or
150 printed materials.

151 **Additional Accomplishments** (if applicable)

- 152 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
153 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
154 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
155 meetings).
- 156 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
157 learned societies.
- 158 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
159 teaching activities.
- 160 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
161 participation in textbook development.
- 162 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

163 **2. Evaluation of Service**

164 For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for
165 lecturers is normally at the departmental and college level and the quantity depends on
166 specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the department. University,
167 college, department, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.

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

- 169 (a) Service roles assigned by the department
- 170 (b) Participation on departmental committees. Effective participation and active
171 role on committee appointments is expected.

- 172 (c) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.
- 173 (d) Assistance to colleagues
- 174 (e) Development of teaching and service programs
- 175 (f) Enhancements in undergraduate education
- 176 (g) Other contributions to the department, college and/or university

177 The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality.
178 Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have
179 consistently attended committee meetings required of them when there was no schedule
180 conflict, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.)
181 and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively, qualify at
182 least for a rating of *very good* in service.

183 Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to departmental
184 expectations and the assigned service responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full
185 teaching load each term may have a different service load than those assigned major
186 departmental and/or college roles. Such additional assigned roles may include service as
187 Undergraduate Director, course lab manual responsibilities, direction of student teams
188 (e.g., Science Olympiads), and course/area web responsibilities.
189 Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and
190 timely manner to achieve the rating of *very good* or higher.

191
192 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

193 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
194 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
195 relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*.
196 The descriptors for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction
197 and service for each rank are included below. The description of factors/items required for
198 each descriptor is included in the Appendix.

199
200 **1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

201 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
202 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and
203 service relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair,*
204 *and poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be
205 rated as *excellent* or better in teaching, and as *very good* or better in service. Table A of the
206 Appendix outlines in detail what factors/items are required to obtain this. Table B of the
207 Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

208
209 **2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer**

210 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a
211 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued
212 growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide
213 a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college,
214 university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based
215 on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching
216 and service relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good,*

217 *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each
218 candidate must be rated as *excellent* or better in teaching and in service. Tables A (for
219 teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary to obtain
220 this.

221

222 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

226

227 **1. Annual Review**

228 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are
229 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the
230 faculty member, including updated CV, annual report information covering the prior
231 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate material. In consultation with
232 the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the lecturer
233 track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

234

235

236 **2. Third-Year Review**

237 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
238 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period
239 and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The
240 departmental review committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include
241 tenured faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lectures, will evaluate the required
242 material and provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in
243 instruction and service to the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the
244 departmental review committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent
245 assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the
246 Dean's Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the
247 candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very*
248 *good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating.
249 Split ratings such as "very good/excellent" are to be avoided.

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

255

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

257 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every
258 five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the post-
259 promotion review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and
260 effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities
261 that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or
262 Principal Senior Lecturer (PSL) will be notified by the college in advance of the post-

263 promotion review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in
264 Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the
265 department chair according to a schedule provided by the college in advance of the review.
266 The departmental committee of the whole elects an evaluation committee consisting of at
267 least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of PSL (with representation from
268 each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). This
269 committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria
270 summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent
271 assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional
272 information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.

273

274 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY REVIEWS**

275

276 **A. General Considerations**

277 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track:
278 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
279 consideration to promotion to Senior Academic Professional, 4) subsequent review with
280 promotion to Principal Academic Professional (the timing for which is defined in the
281 college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).
282 In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in service and teaching (if
283 the faculty member's workload includes teaching). Additional considerations will be given
284 to contributions in the areas of professional development bearing on the candidate's
285 knowledge and departmental responsibilities, research activities, implementation of new
286 pedagogy that leads to students' success and development of supplemental resources that
287 promotes students' learning. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the
288 reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the
289 context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for
290 promotion.

291

292 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

293

293 **1. Evaluation of Service**

294 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in
295 Section VI of the college manual, which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements.
296 Service roles are assigned by the department, which depend on departmental needs and
297 mission. Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties.
298 Service roles normally assigned by the department can vary and typically include some or
299 all of the following:

300

- 300 • Facility Management
- 301 • Laboratory staff supervision
- 302 • Other Instructional Service (e.g., other curricular development, presenting on
303 teaching methodology)
- 304 • Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- 305 • Academic Advisement (if applicable)
- 306 • Contributions to the Department, College or University
- 307 • Professional Service

- 308 • Community and Public Service
- 309 • Published Materials and data analysis reporting
- 310 • Additional Service

311 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To
312 receive an *excellent* or better rating in service, all assigned tasks must be performed
313 effectively and diligently and in a thorough and timely manner. The candidate must also
314 play a leadership role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, security, cost effectiveness, and
315 planning will also be factored into the evaluation. Consideration of improvements of the
316 facility to promote better learning environment may add value to the candidate's service
317 evaluation.

318

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

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

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

331 The purpose of this assessment is two-fold. On one hand, it is to provide clear guidelines
332 to the instructors and to reinforce our high teaching standards and our strong commitment
333 to student success. On the other hand, it is to help compare evidence of teaching
334 effectiveness across various disciplines; to identify specific challenges of teaching
335 mathematics and statistics courses and their sequential nature, limitations and advantages
336 of various instructional models (such as regular classroom teaching, teaching in emporium
337 format, online instruction, co-teaching interdisciplinary courses with faculty from other
338 departments, and others).

339 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
340 but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Appendix, Table A, for details).
341 The evidence provided by the candidate normally will include the following:

- 342 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 343 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 344 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
345 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 346 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially
347 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 348 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
349 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
350 as defined in the college manual (section VI.E).
- 351 6. Development of supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or
352 printed materials.

- 353 **Additional Accomplishments** (if applicable)
- 354 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
- 355 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
- 356 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
- 357 meetings).
- 358 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
- 359 learned societies.
- 360 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
- 361 teaching activities.
- 362 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
- 363 participation in textbook development.
- 364 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

365 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

366 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence

367 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in service and teaching (if

368 the candidate's workload includes teaching) relative to the descriptors: *outstanding*,

369 *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The single measure for achieving the standard for

370 promotion in the categories of instruction and service for each rank is defined in this

371 section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in both categories is included in the

372 Appendix.

373

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

375 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the

376 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in service and

377 teaching (if the candidate's workload includes teaching) relative to the evaluative terms

378 *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank

379 of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must be rated as *excellent* or better in

380 service. Table B of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. If the

381 candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must also be rated as *excellent* or

382 better in teaching using the criteria listed in Table A of the Appendix.

383

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

385 For promotion to the rank of Principal Academic Professional, a candidate must provide a

386 high standard of assigned service and have made substantial contributions to the

387 department, college, university, and/or to the professional community during the review

388 period. If a candidate's workload includes teaching, they must demonstrate a sustained

389 level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with sustained growth in the time period

390 since the last promotion. As noted in the College manual, for the review leading to

391 promotion to principal academic professional, the dossier includes the teaching portfolios

392 from the last five calendar years (if applicable), while the rest of the dossier covers the

393 period since promotion to senior academic professional. Each candidate will be evaluated

394 based on the evidence that they have met or not met the standards for promotion in service

395

396 and teaching (if applicable) relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding, excellent,*
397 *very good, good, fair,* and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Academic
398 Professional, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* or better in service and teaching (if
399 applicable), with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion.

400

401 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

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

406 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional
407 track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the
408 materials supplied by the faculty member, including updated CV, annual report information
409 covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate material of
410 the candidate. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department
411 chair will evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and teaching
412 (if applicable) using the criteria described in the Appendix.

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

414 As discussed in detail in Section VI.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
415 dossier containing information on service and teaching (if applicable) for the appropriate
416 review period and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college.
417 Following the college guidelines, a departmental review committee shall be formed
418 consisting of at least three faculty, which will include tenured faculty and senior academic
419 professionals/lecturers (with representation from each when the department has one or
420 more available senior academic professionals/lecturers within its ranks). The review
421 committee will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written assessment
422 with ranking that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in service and teaching (if
423 applicable) to the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT
424 review committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which
425 along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's Office. As
426 stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in
427 teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair,*
428 *and poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings
429 such as "very good/excellent" are to be avoided.

430 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion)
431 review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and
432 dialogue of the academic professional's accomplishments. The third-year review should
433 point out strengths and weaknesses in teaching and service, address possible deficiencies
434 and suggest actions that could improve performance before the fifth-year review.

435

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

437 All Senior Academic Professionals and Principal Academic Professionals must undergo a
438 comprehensive review every five years after their last promotion or post-promotion
439 review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion Review is to assess the quality and

440 effectiveness of their long-term service and teaching (if applicable) and possibly identify
441 opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The candidate
442 will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion review and the materials
443 they are required to provide are discussed in Section VI.F of the college manual. This
444 material is submitted by the candidate to the department chair according to a schedule
445 provided by the college. The departmental committee of the whole elects an evaluation
446 committee consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of
447 Senior Academic Professional or higher (with representation from each when the
448 department has an available Senior Academic Professional or Principal Academic
449 Professional within its ranks). This committee evaluates the candidate in the categories of
450 service and teaching (if applicable) using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The
451 department chair will provide an independent assessment on both evaluations to the
452 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 consistent with departmental expectations ¹ (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, consistent with departmental standards (g) involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	Normally² 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	3 of 7 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

¹Compared to the departmental four-year average for the area and course level.

²For academic professionals assigned limited teaching responsibilities (< 25% of job functions), evaluation factor (f) is not required.

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 may 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.