

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

Policy Title:	Department of English Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	09/10/2014
College Approval:	10/06/2014
Effective:	01/01/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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 promotion review process are as
34 follows:

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

38

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

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

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

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

56

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

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

72 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

73 **A. General Considerations**

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

85

86 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

87

88 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

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

102

103 **2. Evaluation of Service**

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

110 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

155

156 **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

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

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

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

170

171 **a. Teaching**

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

192 **b. Service**

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

201

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

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

215

216 **a. Teaching**

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

230

231 **b. Service**

232 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
233 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if the candidate is an active colleague
234 who has taken on a departmental administrative role (e.g., internship coordinator,
235 assessment coordinator, Writing Studio director) and has performed with distinction in

236 such a role. Besides serving on many departmental committees, the excellent candidate
237 may well have chaired one or two. This candidate provides significant assistance (e.g.,
238 professional mentorship, classroom observation) to graduate teaching assistants.
239 Significant service to national and international professional organizations, too,
240 demonstrates excellence in service.

241

242 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

248

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

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

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

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

269 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW**

270 **A. General Considerations**

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

282

283 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

284

285 **1. Evaluation of Service**

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

293

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

295

- 296 i. collect and provide written evidence of their diligence and effectiveness in
297 performing the essential functions and responsibilities of their position.
- 298
- 299 ii. include in the dossier a list of programmatic duties approved by the chair and
300 the Dean's office, administrative roles, contributions to the development of their
301 university and departmental initiatives, and committees served on, with brief
302 descriptions of the work performed in each of these areas, such as reports or
303 other documents prepared by the candidate.
- 304

304

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

307

- 308 i. assistance to colleagues and students, such as participation in teaching seminars,
309 work as a mentor, direction of internships, presentation of faculty and student
310 training sessions, guest lecturing, and advising;

311

- 312 ii. planning or participating in workshops and/or conferences connected to duties
313 as Academic Professional;
314
- 315 iii. service to university or community related to teaching or program duties;
316
- 317 iv. managing program development to foster intellectual development across
318 campus;
319
- 320 v. supervisory activities, including funding, training, and/or managing student
321 assistants and other staff related to program;
322
- 323 vi. budget management, including annual budget planning, monthly budget reports,
324 and/or distribution of resources to faculty, graduate students, and/or staff;
325
- 326 vii. facilities management, including managing physical or digital spaces for the use
327 of faculty and students;
328
- 329 viii. website development and development of online tools to improve program
330 efficiency and expand program outreach;
331
- 332 ix. development of programmatic materials, including brochures, handbooks,
333 handouts, and other educational and promotional materials;
334
- 335 x. assessment to gauge the effectiveness of departmental, college, or university
336 programs;
337
- 338 xi. serving on departmental, college, or university committees;
339
- 340 xii. collaborating with other university and departmental entities to foster
341 intellectual development across campus;
342
- 343 xiii. establishing local, regional, and/or national recognition by presenting at
344 conferences or publishing about program initiatives;
345
- 346 xiv. fund-raising and development to benefit the program and/or the department at
347 large.
348
- 349 xv. other duties in fulfillment of additional departmental requirements, as
350 necessary.

351 **2. Evaluation of Teaching**

352 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
353 of the college's policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).

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

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

362 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

365

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

372

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

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

391 Since an academic professional's professional development is evaluated as a
392 subordinate element of the overall record in service and instruction, it is incumbent

393 on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the
394 dossier enhances his or her service and instructional effectiveness. One obvious way
395 of doing this would be to show connections between the specific projects
396 undertaken and the material taught in the classroom or service conducted on
397 campus. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how an
398 academic professional's experience in the field of professional development relates
399 to his or her performance in instruction and service.

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

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

409

410 **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

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

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

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

425

426 **a. Service**

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

432 **b. Teaching**

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

447

448 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

454

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

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

468

469 **2. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Academic Professionals**

470 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
471 academic professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if
472 applicable). Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college
473 manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured
474 or at the rank of senior academic professional (with representation from each). The

475 department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both
476 evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

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

479

480 **A. Teaching**

481

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

487

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

493

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

501

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

507

508 **Excellent:** The lecturer's performance and supporting material demonstrate the
509 dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays evidence of
510 continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual
511 growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the department. Supporting
512 material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, including
513 impressive preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful
514 mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent
515 philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The
516 candidate's scores on student evaluations will often be in the mid-4 out of 5 range. The
517 portfolios assembled for each class embody more than just a collection of syllabi,
518 assignments, exams and handouts: instead, they describe a comprehensive, unified, and
519 multi-faceted educational project arranged around the topic of the class. The classroom

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

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

541
542 **Outstanding:** The lecturer's accomplishments exceed the criteria for excellent and who
543 demonstrates a superb ability to communicate these skills and accomplishments. The
544 candidate's supporting material is impeccable: it must demonstrate nearly flawless
545 reports of teaching effectiveness, exceptional preparation for classes, and extensive
546 mentoring of students. This rare candidate must be recognized among students and
547 colleagues as one of the best -- most effective and committed-- teachers in the
548 department, a recognition that will typically include honors or awards for teaching, a
549 track record of impactful pedagogical publications, or demonstrations of external
550 validation of their superior teaching.

551
552 * In the context of review for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an
553 evaluation of **outstanding** characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the
554 department's pedagogical mission. He or she will have a record demonstrating that
555 his/her classes are among the very best offered by the department, and manifesting an
556 innovative pedagogical proficiency that has a positive impact on other faculty and on
557 the departmental curriculum at large. This candidate will take a leadership role in the
558 department's macrocosmic pedagogical enterprises, e.g., learning outcome assessment,
559 retention/progression/graduation initiatives, and curriculum development. There
560 should be external validation, as well, of this candidate's prowess: teaching awards and
561 prestigious pedagogical publications (which could be print or online resources) that have
562 a demonstrated national impact are examples of this.

563 **B. Service**

564

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

568

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

572

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

575

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

583

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

589

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

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

597

598 **A. Service**

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

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

604 **Good:** The academic professional's responsibilities have been only marginally
605 performed.

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

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

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

616

617 **B. Teaching**

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

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

628 **Good:** The academic professional's instructional performance minimally exceeds
629 adequate. This candidate's supporting material provides evidence of appropriate
630 preparation and pertinent content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional
631 pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and
632 intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor.

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

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

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