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I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

1. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
2. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)

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

A. Process Overview

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

1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the department chair.
2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s materials to the departmental review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).

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

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

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

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

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

A. General Considerations

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

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Teaching

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the college’s policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the department.

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

2. Evaluation of Service

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the ‘Instruction’ section of the dossier rather than under a ‘Professional Development’ section.
b. **Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

C. **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

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

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

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

a. **Teaching**

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of excellent, the candidate’s performance and supporting material demonstrate the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the department. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, including impressive preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The candidate’s scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4 out of 5 range. The portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of syllabi, assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive, unified, and multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class. The classroom learning environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for students. The candidate should have some involvement with the department’s overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals and course revisions, CTW, study abroad programs). Finally, the materials in the candidate’s dossier should demonstrate a vibrant intellectual life consistent with the academic responsibilities of a college teacher, including sophisticated reading habits and a demonstrated ability to keep up with scholarship in the fields taught.
b. Service
The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to senior lecturer with a rating of very good if the candidate is an active colleague who serves when asked, often suggests his or her own helpful service projects and roles, and succeeds according to his or her own initiative above and beyond what is minimally required. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the department, e.g., through service to the Honors College, the Office of Student Life, or university-recognized student groups. A candidate evaluated as very good in service may also have some service outreach responsibilities outside of the University.

2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer
For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as excellent, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the department, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as excellent, which meets the university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. This growth might be in the area of teaching or service or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher ranking in one of these areas, but this need not necessarily be the case so long as the candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made new contributions in teaching or service.

a. Teaching
To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating of excellent, the candidate's performance and supporting material must be innovative and comprehensive. This candidate's student outcomes will be consistently distinguished: papers and other course assignments will demonstrably reflect students' prowess in writing, interpretation, analysis, creativity, research, and other departmental assessment goals. The candidate’s scores on student evaluations will often be above the mid-4 out of 5 range. The candidate will be significantly involved with the department’s ongoing work to assess, update, and improve the curriculum. There should be evidence that, over the considerable length of his or her teaching career, the candidate has changed, evolved, and/or adapted pedagogically to reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This candidate should be able to document external recognition: e.g., teaching awards, or the development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used and cited by some larger teaching community.

b. Service
The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating of excellent if the candidate is an active colleague who has taken on a departmental administrative role (e.g., internship coordinator, assessment coordinator, Writing Studio director) and has performed with distinction in
such a role. Besides serving on many departmental committees, the excellent candidate may well have chaired one or two. This candidate provides significant assistance (e.g., professional mentorship, classroom observation) to graduate teaching assistants. Significant service to national and international professional organizations, too, demonstrates excellence in service.

D. Other Lecturer Reviews

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

1. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

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

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

The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy, and accomplished in their service profiles. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each). The department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for response.
IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

A. General Considerations

There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior academic professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary consideration is service contributions, while teaching contributions will be considered if the candidate’s workload includes teaching. Supplemental consideration is given to contributions in the area of professional development as they bear on the candidate’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance (if applicable). This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to senior academic professional.

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Service

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

a. To demonstrate their service, candidates for promotion should

   i. collect and provide written evidence of their diligence and effectiveness in performing the essential functions and responsibilities of their position.

   ii. include in the dossier a list of programmatic duties approved by the chair and the Dean’s office, administrative roles, contributions to the development of their university and departmental initiatives, and committees served on, with brief descriptions of the work performed in each of these areas, such as reports or other documents prepared by the candidate.

b. Depending on the candidates’ essential duties and job functions, the candidate should provide evidence of

   i. assistance to colleagues and students, such as participation in teaching seminars, work as a mentor, direction of internships, presentation of faculty and student training sessions, guest lecturing, and advising;
ii. planning or participating in workshops and/or conferences connected to duties as Academic Professional;

iii. service to university or community related to teaching or program duties;

iv. managing program development to foster intellectual development across campus;

v. supervisory activities, including funding, training, and/or managing student assistants and other staff related to program;

vi. budget management, including annual budget planning, monthly budget reports, and/or distribution of resources to faculty, graduate students, and/or staff;

vii. facilities management, including managing physical or digital spaces for the use of faculty and students;

viii. website development and development of online tools to improve program efficiency and expand program outreach;

ix. development of programmatic materials, including brochures, handbooks, handouts, and other educational and promotional materials;

x. assessment to gauge the effectiveness of departmental, college, or university programs;

xi. serving on departmental, college, or university committees;

xii. collaborating with other university and departmental entities to foster intellectual development across campus;

xiii. establishing local, regional, and/or national recognition by presenting at conferences or publishing about program initiatives;

xiv. fund-raising and development to benefit the program and/or the department at large.

xv. other duties in fulfillment of additional departmental requirements, as necessary.
2. **Evaluation of Teaching**

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

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

3. **Additional Considerations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

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

1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional

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

a. Service

To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior academic
professional with a rating of excellent, the candidate should fulfill consistent, effective,
innovative, and dependable service in the administrative duties, as outlined in section
IV.B.1.a above, as well as high quality work in several of the key related job functions
from section IV.B.1.b.
b. Teaching
To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior academic professional with a rating of excellent, the candidate’s supporting material demonstrates evidence of diligent preparation and enthusiastic, innovative instruction as well as conscientious mentoring of students and a strong commitment to the pedagogical mission of the department. The candidate’s scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4 out of 5 range. There must be consistently strong evidence of successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of syllabi, assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive, unified, and multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class. The classroom learning environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for students. The candidate should have some involvement with the department’s overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals and course revisions, CTW, study abroad programs).

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

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

2. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Academic Professionals
The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior academic professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if applicable). Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of senior academic professional (with representation from each). The
department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for 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

A. Teaching

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

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

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

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

Excellent: The lecturer’s performance and supporting material demonstrate the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the department. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, including impressive preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The candidate’s scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4 out of 5 range. The portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of syllabi, assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive, unified, and multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class. The classroom
learning environment is consistently positive, engaging, and effective for students. The candidate should have some involvement with the department’s overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals and course revisions, CTW, study abroad programs). Finally, the materials in the candidate’s dossier should demonstrate a vibrant intellectual life consistent with the academic responsibilities of a college teacher, including sophisticated reading habits and a demonstrated ability to keep up with scholarship in the fields taught.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described as excellent, the lecturer demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as possibly in national 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

A. Service

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

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

Good: The academic professional’s responsibilities have been only marginally performed.

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

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

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

B. Teaching

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

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

Good: The academic professional’s instructional performance minimally exceeds adequate. This candidate's supporting material provides evidence of appropriate preparation and pertinent content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor.
**Very Good:** The academic professional is a competent candidate whose supporting material includes evidence not only of conscientious preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students and effective pedagogy. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning.

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

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