

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

Policy Title:	Department of Physics and Astronomy Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Departmental Approval:	September 22, 2016
College Approval:	October 10, 2016
Effective:	October 10, 2016

## 1 I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

24 For Academic Professional positions, the Department will recommend for  
 25 promotion to Senior Academic Professional only those candidates who present evidence of  
 26 a sustained evaluation of at least *excellent* in service. For candidates whose workload  
 27 includes teaching, an evaluation of at least *excellent* in teaching is also required for  
 28 promotion.

## 30 II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER, 31 PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL

### 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 Principle Senior Lecturer, and Senior Academic Professional) in the department, except the  
 66 chair of the department and those members of the department serving in a position that  
 67 will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university level. For  
 68 each candidate, the department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at  
 69 least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole. The  
 70 department chair shall also appoint a committee chair selected from the subcommittee.  
 71 The subcommittee has the responsibility to thoroughly analyze the candidate's dossier,  
 72 coordinate deliberation with the committee members, and provide initial evaluation of the  
 73 dossier. Final recommendation regarding promotion must be made by the committee of the  
 74 whole. The committee of the whole must discuss the candidate's eligibility for promotion,  
 75 and arrive at a majority recommendation. All actions of the committee of the whole must  
 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  
 79 review procedures adopted by the Department.  
 80 2. Approve, by majority vote, an overall recommendation for each candidate.  
 81 3. Deliver the written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the  
 82 committee of the whole to the departmental chair.  
 83 4. Submit signed minority reports (if any) of committee members who disagree with  
 84 the written majority recommendation to the departmental chair. This report should  
 85 include recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.

86 The vote for the recommendation will be in the form of signatures on the final  
 87 recommendation report. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current

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

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

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

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

104

## 105 **III. LECTURER-TRACK FACULTY REVIEWS**

106

### 107 **A. General Considerations**

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

### 119 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

#### 120 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

121 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria  
 122 of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)).  
 123 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core  
 124 mission of engaging learning in courses at all undergraduate levels, ranging from  
 125 introductory survey courses to advanced undergraduate lecture and laboratories, study  
 126 abroad programs, and if applicable, graduate courses, directed readings and internship  
 127 experiences.

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

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

142 **Additional Accomplishments** (if applicable)

- 143 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and  
 144 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and  
 145 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional  
 146 meetings).
- 147 8. Publications and/or presentations related to instruction.
- 148 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative  
 149 teaching activities.
- 150 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;  
 151 participation in textbook development.
- 152 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

153 **2. Evaluation of Service**

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

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

- 159 (a) Service roles assigned by the department
- 160 (b) Participation on departmental committees. Effective participation and active  
 161 role on committee appointments is expected.
- 162 (c) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.
- 163 (d) Assistance to colleagues
- 164 (e) Development of teaching and service programs
- 165 (f) Enhancements in undergraduate education
- 166 (g) Other contributions to the department, college and/or university

167 The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality.  
 168 Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have  
 169 consistently attended committee meetings required of them when there was no schedule  
 170 conflict, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.)

171 and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively, qualify at  
172 least for a rating of *very good* in service.

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

181

### 182 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

189

#### 190 **1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

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

198

#### 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  
202 growth. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high standard of assigned service and  
203 play a leadership role in the department, college, university, and/or to the professional  
204 community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has met or  
205 not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative  
206 descriptors: *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* or better  
208 in teaching and in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix  
209 outline 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  
 212 distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and  
 213 possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

214

### 215 **1. Annual Review**

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

222

### 223 **2. Third-Year Review**

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

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

242

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

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

256 committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria  
 257 summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent  
 258 assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional  
 259 information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.

## 260 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL-TRACK FACULTY REVIEWS**

261

### 262 **A. General Considerations**

263 There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional  
 264 track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year  
 265 review with consideration to promotion to Senior Academic Professional, and 4) post-  
 266 promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary  
 267 considerations are contributions in service and teaching (if the faculty member's workload  
 268 includes teaching). Additional considerations will be given to contributions in the areas of  
 269 professional development bearing on the candidate's knowledge and departmental  
 270 responsibilities, research activities, implementation of new pedagogy that leads to  
 271 students' success and development of supplemental resources that promotes students'  
 272 learning. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above;  
 273 however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of  
 274 departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to Senior  
 275 Academic Professional.

276

### 277 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

#### 278 **1. Evaluation of Service**

279 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in  
 280 Section VI of the college manual, which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements.  
 281 The department assigns service roles, which depend on departmental needs and mission.  
 282 Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties. Service  
 283 roles normally assigned by the department can vary and typically include some or all of the  
 284 following:

- 285 • Facility Management
- 286 • Laboratory staff supervision
- 287 • Other Instructional Service (e.g., other curricular development, presenting on  
 288 teaching methodology)
- 289 • Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- 290 • Academic Advisement (if applicable)
- 291 • Contributions to the Department, College or University
- 292 • Professional Service
- 293 • Community and Public Service
- 294 • Published Materials and data analysis reporting
- 295 • Additional Service

296

297 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To  
 298 receive an *excellent* or better rating in service, all assigned tasks must be performed

299 effectively and diligently and in a thorough and timely manner. The candidate must also  
 300 play a leadership role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, security, cost effectiveness, and  
 301 planning will also be factored into the evaluation. Improvements of the facility to promote  
 302 better learning environment may add value to the candidate's service evaluation.

303

## 304 **2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)**

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

312 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria  
 313 of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)).  
 314 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates to  
 315 their assigned role in the department.

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

- 319 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 320 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 321 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching  
 322 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 323 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially  
 324 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 325 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be  
 326 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,  
 327 as defined in the college manual (section VI.E).
- 328 6. Development of supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or  
 329 printed materials.

## 330 **Additional Accomplishments (if applicable)**

- 331 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and  
 332 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and  
 333 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional  
 334 meetings).
- 335 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before  
 336 learned societies.
- 337 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative  
 338 teaching activities.
- 339 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;  
 340 participation in textbook development.
- 341 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

### 342 **C. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Academic Professional**

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

350

#### 351 **1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional**

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

360

### 361 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

#### 365 **1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals**

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

#### 373 **2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals**

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

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

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

395

### 396 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals**

397 All Senior Academic Professionals must undergo a comprehensive review every five years  
398 after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion  
399 Review for Senior Academic Professionals is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their  
400 long-term service and teaching (if applicable) and possibly identify opportunities that will  
401 enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Academic Professional will  
402 be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion review and the materials they  
403 are required to provide are discussed in Section VI.F of the college manual. This material is  
404 submitted by the Senior Academic Professional to the department chair according to a  
405 schedule provided by the college. The departmental committee of the whole elects an  
406 evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the  
407 rank of Senior Academic Professional (with representation from each when the department  
408 has an available Senior Academic Professional within its ranks). This committee evaluates  
409 the Senior Academic Professional in the categories of service and teaching (if applicable)  
410 using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an  
411 independent assessment on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office. For additional  
412 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	<p><b>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f):</b></p> <p>(a) update/revise courses            (b) student perceptions consistent with departmental expectations<sup>1</sup>            (c) direct independent study or research projects,            (d) publications, as related to instruction            (e) instructional creativity, as evidenced by development of new courses or awards for instructional innovation            (f) learning outcomes, as evidenced by appropriate grade distribution and drop rates            (g) involvement with educationally focused grants, proposals, or research</p>
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	<p><b>Normally<sup>2</sup> 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)</b></p>
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	<p><b>3 of 7 items: (a), (b), and (f)</b></p>
Good	Meets obligations	<p><b>2 of 7 items, including (b)</b></p>

Fair	Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness	<b>1 of 7 items</b>
Poor	Substandard, ineffective teacher	<b>0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints</b>

<sup>1</sup>Compared to the departmental four-year average for the area and course level; this information will be provided by the department on an annual basis.

<sup>2</sup>For 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**

<b>Service<sup>1</sup> Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Evaluation Factors</b>
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

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