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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty make important contributions to the teaching, service, and research missions of the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgia State University. The policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks are outlined in this document, the university Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and departmental guidelines.

As noted in the university manual, promotion decisions for NTT faculty are based on discipline-specific criteria as determined by department and college faculty, but satisfaction of these criteria should reflect equivalent levels of accomplishment across the college and the university. Although NTT faculty members in different departments are engaged in varied forms of teaching, service and scholarly activity, with differential emphasis on each of these activities, the quality and significance of achievement appropriate to the discipline in question should be comparable.

Whereas the university NTT manual provides a general statement of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this college manual and related departmental guideline documents identify the concrete forms these achievements should take. Additionally, the college manual provides detailed procedural information about the college NTT promotion review process, as well as related periodic NTT reviews.

The Arts and Sciences NTT manual is reviewed and periodically revised by the college Promotion and Tenure Review Board. In keeping with university requirements, if there are substantive revisions in college or University NTT manuals, the college NTT manual also must be reviewed and approved by the provost.

The promotion policies and procedures established by the college and Georgia State University for NTT faculty conform to the requirements of the Board of Regents. Specifically, these policies and procedures conform to Section 8.3 of the BOR Policy Manual (http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/policy/C245).

Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure (BOR Policy Manual Section 8.3.8).

The following three NTT faculty positions in use in the College of Arts and Sciences are eligible for promotion. For each position, the ranks used within the College of Arts and Sciences have been listed in parentheses starting with the lowest rank and ending with the highest possible rank.

1. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
2. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)
3. Research Faculty (Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor)

In addition to the NTT faculty titles listed above, the position of Instructor is also in use in the college. However, at Georgia State University there is no promotion path for NTT faculty holding the position of Instructor.
II. DESCRIPTIONS OF NTT FACULTY POSITIONS

The following is a description of each of the three NTT faculty positions listed in Section I. Within each position, the duties and responsibilities are listed in order of importance for that position. The duties and responsibilities are divided into the categories of teaching, service, and research (professional development).

A. Lecturer

1. Teaching

The primary responsibility of lecturers is teaching.

2. Service

As part of their workload, lecturers may be expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the department, college and/or university level. Service also may involve activities related to the professional and practice community.

3. Research

Lecturers are not required to engage in research, scholarly, and creative activities. Nonetheless, lecturers are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in their discipline.

B. Academic Professional

As per Board of Regents requirements, a title from the academic professional track “may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.8.3).

The designation Academic Professional would apply to a variety of academic assignments that call for academic background similar to that of a faculty member with professorial rank, but which are distinctly different from professorial positions (BOR Policy Manual Section 8.3.8.3).

The academic professional position requires an appropriate terminal degree, or in rare and extraordinary circumstances, qualification on the basis of demonstrably successful related experience, which exception is expressly approved by the institution president (BOR Policy178 Manual Section 8.3.8.3).
1. Service

The primary responsibility of an academic professional is service, which includes activities such as:

a. Managing instructional laboratories;
b. Assuming academic program management roles not suited for expectations applied to tenure track faculty members, operating instructional technology support programs;
c. Assuming professional student counseling center responsibilities, providing specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs; and,
d. Working with tenure track faculty members in course and curriculum development and in the laboratory.

2. Teaching

As part of their workload, academic professionals may be expected to engage in teaching activities.

3. Research

The College of Arts and Sciences does not require academic professionals to engage in research, scholarly, and creative activities. Nonetheless, academic professionals are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in their discipline.

C. Research Faculty

1. Research

The primary responsibility of research faculty is to conduct research.

The purpose of research Faculty appointments, based on available external funding, is to increase the research, scholarly, and creative efforts of the university. Research faculty will work either in close collaboration with other faculty and/or will carry out independent research that builds upon an explicit area of focus for the University. Research Faculty salaries are primarily from research grants or other sources of external funds (non-general state funds). Research Faculty hold a terminal degree in their discipline, have demonstrated evidence of independent research careers (non-independent investigators should be appointed at the post-doctoral level), and concentrate primarily on research. Appointments of members of the Research Faculty are renewable on an annual basis upon satisfactory review and available external funding.

2. Teaching

As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in teaching.
3. Service

As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in service activities.

III. COLLEGE NON-TENURE TRACK REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER, PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the college NTT promotion review process are described below. Specific dates will be assigned to each step in a review calendar issued in advance of the review cycle each year.

1. The Dean’s Office notifies all candidates of their eligibility for promotion (with copy to the department chair).

2. The candidate submits review materials to chair of the department.

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

4. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the department chair. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s). The candidate will receive a copy of the departmental committee’s recommendation, including any minority reports, and will have the option to respond to the department chair within three business days of receiving the departmental committee report.

5. The department chair submits his/her recommendation and the recommendation of the departmental committee, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The candidate will receive a copy of the department chair’s recommendation and will have the option to respond to the Dean’s Office (with copy to the department chair) within three business days of receiving the department chair’s report. The Dean’s Office forwards the reports from the departmental committee and the department chair, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate to the college NTT promotion review committee.

6. The college NTT promotion review committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the Dean’s Office. The candidate will receive a copy of the college committee’s report and will have the option to respond to the dean within three business days of receiving the college committee’s report.

7. The dean submits his or her recommendation and all review materials, including any prior responses from the candidate, to the Provost's Office. The candidate will receive a copy of the dean’s report. If the dean’s recommendation is negative, the candidate may appeal to the provost within ten business days, and the provost will...
provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected. If the dean’s recommendation is positive, the candidate will not have the option to respond to the provost.

See section IV below for information on the evaluation and appeal processes of the university provost and president.

B. Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committees

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above (see Appendix B) 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. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s).

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.

C. College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee

The College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee includes three representatives from each of the academic areas of the college (fine arts, humanities, natural and computational sciences, and social and behavioral sciences) and one at large representative. For each area, there should be at least one tenured faculty member and at least one NTT faculty member at the senior level or above (see Appendix B), with a simple majority of the committee’s membership being tenured faculty. The college committee 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.

The members of the committee shall be elected by the faculty at a faculty meeting. Members of the committee shall hold staggered three-year terms.
D. Written Notifications of Recommendations to Candidate

The chair will provide a copy of the departmental committee’s report and any minority reports to the candidate as soon as it is received. The chair will provide a copy of his or her report to the candidate when it is forwarded to the college Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee. The Dean’s Office will provide the candidate a copy of the college committee’s report. The Dean’s Office will provide the candidate a written notice of the outcome of the review and a copy of its report. Minority reports, if they exist, will also be included. The reports, including minority reports, should remove the signature page or section which identifies committee members by name. As outlined above, the candidate has the right to respond in writing to the departmental committee’s report, the chair’s report, and the college committee’s report, within three business days of receiving the reports, and copies of the candidate’s response(s) will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels.

The candidate’s written response to recommendations of the department committee will be submitted to the chair, who will then forward them to the Dean’s Office. The candidate’s response to the chair’s report and/or the college committee’s report will be submitted to the Dean’s Office (with copy to the department chair). Following receipt of the dean’s recommendation, if negative, the candidate has ten business days to submit an appeal to the provost, as outlined above.

IV. UNIVERSITY-LEVEL PROMOTION REVIEW AND APPEALS

A. Provost’s Review:

The provost will conduct an independent review of the materials forwarded by the dean and any other related materials directly relevant to the NTT faculty member’s candidacy for promotion, also applying the guidelines, norms, and expectations for the university, college and department, and make his/her promotion recommendation. The provost will make a recommendation in each case, forward the recommendations to the president, and notify the appropriate deans. Within three business days after receiving notice of the provost’s recommendation, the dean shall notify the candidate of the provost’s recommendation.

Before forwarding a negative recommendation to the president, the provost will consult with the dean. In response to the query from the provost, the dean may gather additional information from the candidate, the department chair, the department or college committees, and other materials directly relevant to the NTT faculty member’s candidacy. The dean will notify the candidate and department chair of his/her reply to the provost.

B. President’s Review:

The president will conduct an independent review of the candidate’s dossier, and related materials and recommendations, and any other material directly relevant to the NTT faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms, and expectations for the University, college and department, and make his/her promotion decision. The decision will be communicated to the appropriate dean who shall notify the candidate within three business days after receiving notice of the president’s decision.
C. Appeals to the Provost

A candidate may appeal to the provost a negative recommendation by the dean. Upon receipt of the dean’s negative recommendation, the candidate shall have at least ten business days to appeal the negative recommendation to the provost. The grounds for appeal shall only be those that involve errors of due process. These would include procedural errors such as failure to receive notification at each stage of review. Errors of due process would also include substantive errors such as arbitrariness, capriciousness, and discrimination, as well as bias and other forms of nonprofessional judgment on the part of any person or group involved in the promotion review. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the dean, the department chair, the department committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or outside the University. By the date specified in the NTT promotional manual calendar, the provost shall provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected.

D. Appeals to the President

A candidate may appeal to the president a negative recommendation by the provost or a decision by the provost rejecting the candidate’s appeal to the provost. The appeal to the president shall conform to the principles and processes stated above for appeals to the provost. By the date specified in the promotion manual calendar, the president shall provide the provost, the appropriate dean and the candidate a written decision including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate’s appeal is supported or rejected.

V. LECTURER REVIEW

There are five types of structured reviews for lecturers:

- annual review leading to re-appointment,
- third-year review,
- fifth-year review with promotion to senior lecturer,
- subsequent review with promotion to principal senior lecturer, and
- post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).

In these reviews, the primary consideration is contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to contributions in the area of research (professional development).

A. Annual Review

An appointment to a lecturer position is for a one-year period. Lecturers are reviewed on an annual basis as described in the College of Arts and Sciences Annual Review of Regular Faculty policy.

B. Third-Year Review

The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of teaching and service contributions. Lecturers in their third year will provide all required materials to the chair.
The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is an elected committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include both tenured faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers. This committee will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in teaching and service to the department chair.

The chair will provide a written assessment of the lecturer's effectiveness in teaching and service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and provide to the lecturer its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between the chair, the associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further recommendations to the faculty member.

C. Lecturer Promotion Reviews

1. Criteria for Promotion:

   a. Terms of Evaluation: Candidates will be evaluated as having met or not met the standards for promotion in the categories of teaching and service using the evaluative terms outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The exact terms that represent the standard in teaching and service for promotion are specified under items b and c below. The evaluations will take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and resources of the department. Guidelines for the application of the terms outstanding, excellent, very good, etc. as they apply within the candidate’s field are specified in each department’s NTT faculty review guidelines.

   b. Promotion to Senior Lecturer: Lecturers in their fifth year of service must be considered for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer (to begin in the seventh year of service). Lecturers that do not meet the standards for promotion after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

      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. 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 the rank of senior lecturer.

   c. Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer: Senior lecturers in their fifth year in rank or higher may be considered for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer (to take effect at the beginning of the subsequent fall semester).

      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 with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. 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 the rank of principal senior lecturer.

2. Promotion Review Process: The Dean’s Office will notify all candidates of their
eligibility for promotion (with a copy to the chair). Those seeking promotion to senior
lecturer or principal senior lecturer will provide all required materials to the chair.
The chair will provide a departmental committee with this material. See section III.B
above for a description of the composition of the departmental NTT promotion review
committee.

The departmental committee will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines
to provide a written report, which includes an assessment of the lecturer’s
effectiveness in teaching and service and a recommendation for or against promotion,
to the department chair, along with any minority reports.
The chair will provide a written report, which includes an assessment of the lecturer’s
effectiveness in teaching and service, a recommendation for or against promotion, and
an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all
review materials (i.e., his or her report, the committee report, any minority reports,
and any responses from the candidate) to the Dean’s Office, which will forward these
materials to the college NTT promotion review committee.
The college NTT promotion review committee will review the material and make a
recommendation to the dean.
The dean and associate dean will review the material and submit the dean’s final
recommendation to the university provost.

See Section IV above for information on the evaluation and appeal processes of the
university provost and president.

D. Scope of Evaluations:
1. Evaluation of Teaching: Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the
college’s Policy on Assessment of Teaching for Full-time Faculty
(http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf). The specific nature of
each lecturer’s teaching activities may vary as a function of the mission of the
department. Thus, evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it
relates to their department’s mission. Among the factors that evaluators should
consider in their assessments are the following:
a. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through
review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials.
Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading
assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course materials
should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of
knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as
customized texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. In
departments that give standardized and/or departmental examinations, scores on
these examinations should be included for review. Credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students.

b. Development of new courses or teaching programs: Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member.

c. Teaching portfolios: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E below for guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy, teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable).

d. Student evaluations: The review will include student evaluation scores, in the context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary area. The information will also include other important variables, such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

e. Direction of students: The extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities, such as independent studies, practica, theses, performances, and recitals will be considered. The effectiveness of these efforts will be judged by such outcomes as student success in acceptance to graduate or professional schools, scores on national examinations, and special awards or achievements.

f. Additional methods: Departments may consider developing additional assessment criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.

2. Evaluation of Service: Contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the department, college, or university, professional service, and community and public service. Service for lecturers is dependent on the mission as defined by the department, but it is generally at the departmental, college, or university level.
3. **Additional Considerations:** Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review include the following:

   a. Research (professional development) contributions (if appropriate): Activities such as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the lecturer’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance, may be considered if specified in the departmental guidelines.

   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 effectively fulfill changing needs of the department.

**E. Evaluation Materials**

For the third-year review and lecturer promotion reviews, candidates prepare a professional dossier containing the information on teaching and service indicated below for the review period appropriate to the specific review.

**Definition of Review Periods:**

- For third-year review, the dossier covers the period since the hire date.
- For the fifth-year review leading to promotion to senior lecturer, the dossier includes teaching portfolios from the last three full calendar years and student evaluation scores from the last three academic years\(^1\), while the rest of the dossier covers the period since the hire date.
- For the review leading to promotion to principal senior lecturer, the dossier includes teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years, while the rest of the dossier covers the last five academic years.
- For the five-year post-promotion structured review, the dossier includes annual reports and teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years, while the rest of the dossier covers the last five academic years. Further information on the materials to be submitted for five-year post-promotion structured reviews is detailed in section V.F below.

---

\(^1\) The fifth-year review dossier consists of three years of student evaluation data and teaching portfolios due to several factors. First, it is the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences that departmental and college reviewers do not consider a candidate’s student evaluations from their first academic year at Georgia State as part of the promotion review, so candidates are instructed to exclude this information from their dossier. Second, because fifth-year promotion reviews begin during the fall semester of each candidate’s fifth year, student evaluation and teaching portfolio data are not available from either semester of the candidate’s fifth year. Further, candidates only include the last three years of teaching portfolios, which are submitted by calendar year as part of the annual review process, because their teaching portfolios from their first two calendar years at Georgia State each include student evaluation data from a semester during their first academic year.
Specific Instructions for the Physical Format of the Dossier:

- All materials must be placed in three-ring, large capacity binders. Each section in each of the evaluative categories must be clearly separated by dividers.
- Staples or paper clips must not be used in the compilation of materials
- Binders should not be filled to capacity
- Do not insert materials in plastic sleeves/sheet protectors. Plastic sleeves can be used only if holes cannot be punched to place in three-ring binders.

Contents of the Dossier:

1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate’s name, department, and date of appointment at Georgia State University.
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department chair): Describe the candidate’s primary responsibilities under the general categories of Teaching and Service.
4. Information on Teaching
   a. Statement of Teaching Interests, Goals, and Qualifications (2-3 pages): Each lecturer should briefly describe an educational philosophy and a set of goals and objectives in teaching and service projects, and a list of courses and/or areas they believe they are qualified to teach.
   b. Courses Taught during the review period (include summers, if applicable):
      i. Using the format in Appendix A, the candidate must provide a list of courses taught during the review period (see section V.E above for guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review periods).
      ii. The candidate must also provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught during the time period. Only one syllabus for each different course is required.
      iii. The development of new courses or significant revisions to existing courses should be noted in this section.
      iv. The candidate should indicate if the course is part of a study abroad, international student exchange program, signature experience, or field experience.
   c. Perception of Students (include summers, if applicable): The candidate must include standardized summaries of student evaluation numerical scores from a Crystal Report (no comments) and student evaluations from GoSOLAR (with written comments) for the review period at Georgia State University. Department chairs will assist the candidates in obtaining these materials.
   d. Teaching Funding (if appropriate): Describe all intramural and extramural funding of teaching initiatives.
e. Honors or Special Recognition for Teaching: These should be listed in tabular form.

f. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, Non-thesis projects, Theses, and Dissertations: These items should be listed as follows with the student name, title, and date completed for each:
   i. Independent Studies
   ii. Practica
   iii. Honors Theses
   iv. Non-Thesis Projects
   v. Theses
   vi. Dissertations

g. Published Materials: Textbooks and published articles related to the candidate’s teaching. A copy of each must be provided.

h. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E above for guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy, teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable).

i. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness: The candidate may include other materials not specified above and not specifically required by the department as part of the teaching portfolio. Such evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, peer evaluations, students’ passing rates on licensure/certification examinations, use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, and student accomplishments.

5. Information on Service

   a. Assigned service roles: indicate administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments (e.g., undergraduate director, program coordinator).

   b. Teaching Service: a list of teaching service beyond the classroom. Examples of teaching service may include participating in developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, supervising and/or mentoring faculty.

   c. Assistance to Colleagues: guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and teaching issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, or
assistance with new teaching technology), providing advice about or reviews of
manuscripts or grant applications.

d. Contributions to the department, college, and university: student advisement
and mentoring, memberships on departmental/college/university committees,
development of teaching and service programs.
e. Professional service (if appropriate): memberships on professional societies,
advisory boards, etc.
f. Community and public service (if appropriate): lectures, speeches,
presentations, performances, short courses, assistance to governmental
agencies.

6. Information on research (professional development) activities (if appropriate):
Departmental guidelines may specify that a faculty member can provide information
on research (professional development) activities, such as publications of their
research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference
presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on
the lecturer’s knowledge of the field or teaching performance.

F. Five-year Structured Review

As stated in the university manual, structured reviews are intended to provide a longer-
term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. Faculty members who have
been promoted to the senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer ranks will go through a
structured cumulative review in the fifth year following promotion and in each fifth year
following the previous cumulative review (NTT Post-Promotion Review). Senior Lecturers
are exempted from this requirement in the year(s) that they are considered for promotion
to the principal senior lecturer rank.

Senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers will provide all required materials to the
chair. The review materials consist of the items enumerated below. Departments may
require additional materials.

1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate’s name, department, and date of appointment at
Georgia State University.

2. Updated curriculum vitae.

3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department
chair): Describe the candidate’s primary responsibilities under the general
categories of Teaching and Service.

4. Annual reports for each of the years under review.

5. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she has
compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E above for guidelines
on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review
periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy, teaching
portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all
independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition,
faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written
student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty
course and one a more general course. In consultation with the department chair,
faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad
representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable).

6. Perception of Students (include summers, if applicable): The candidate must include
standardized summaries of student evaluation numerical scores from a Crystal
Report (no comments) and student evaluations from GoSOLAR (with written
comments) for the review period at Georgia State University. Department chairs will
assist the candidates in obtaining these materials.

The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is an elected
committee composed of at least three tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers (with
representation from each rank required). This committee will provide a written
assessment of effectiveness in teaching and service to the departmental chair.

The chair will provide a written assessment of the faculty member's effectiveness in
teaching and service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position.
The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., his or her recommendation and the
committee report) to the Dean's Office.

The assessment statements of the departmental committee and department chair will
address whether the faculty member is performing at the level necessary for
reappointment, whether the faculty member is progressing toward promotion, and they
will identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential in
terms of contribution to the university. The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and
provide any necessary response by the date designated by the Board of Regents for
contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between
the chair and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further
recommendations to the faculty member.

G. Lecturers Hired at the Senior Level

All lecturers whose initial appointment at GSU is at the senior level or above (see Appendix
B) shall have a third year review and subsequent reviews every five years.
VI. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

According to Board of Regents requirements, the academic professional title “may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual 803.10). Therefore, the primary consideration in the third- and fifth-year reviews of academic professionals is service contributions. Contributions in teaching will be considered as part of the review if a candidate’s workload includes teaching. Other activities, such as publications of research, creative activities, and scholarship, are not required; however, departments have the option of considering such activities in the reviews, particularly as they bear on service or teaching performance.

There are four types of structured reviews of academic professionals in use in the College of Arts and Sciences:

- annual review leading to re-appointment,
- third-year review,
- fifth-year review with promotion to senior academic professional and re-appointment,
- post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).

In each academic professional review, the primary consideration is contributions in service and teaching, with consideration given to contributions in the area of research (professional development).

A. Annual Review

An appointment to an academic professional position is for a one-year period. Academic professionals are reviewed on an annual basis as described in the College of Arts and Sciences Annual Review of Regular Faculty policy.

B. Third-Year Review

The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of service and teaching contributions. Academic professionals in their third year will provide all required materials to the chair.

The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is an elected committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include tenured faculty and NTT faculty at senior rank or above (see Appendix B). This committee will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in service and teaching to the departmental chair.

The chair will provide a written assessment of the academic professional’s effectiveness in service and teaching, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., his or her recommendation and the departmental committee report) to the Dean’s Office.

The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide to the academic professional its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between
the chair, the area associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further recommendations to the faculty member.

C. Promotion Review

1. Criteria for Promotion:

   a. Terms of Evaluation: Candidates will be evaluated as having met or not met the standards for promotion in the categories of service and teaching (if the candidate’s workload includes teaching) using the evaluative terms outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The exact terms that represent the standard in service and teaching (if applicable) for promotion are specified under item b below. The evaluations will take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate’s discipline, and the mission and resources of the department. Guidelines for the application of the terms outstanding, excellent, very good, etc. as they apply within the candidate’s field are specified in each department’s NTT faculty review guidelines.

   b. Promotion to Senior Academic Professional: Academic professionals in their fifth-year of service may be considered for promotion to the rank of senior academic professional (to begin in the sixth year of service). Academic professionals not reappointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

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

2. Promotion Review Process: The Dean’s Office will notify all candidates of their eligibility for promotion (with a copy to the chair). Those seeking promotion to senior academic professional will provide all required materials to the chair.

       The chair will provide a departmental committee with this material. See section III.B above for a description of the committee’s composition. The departmental committee will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written report, which includes an assessment of academic professional’s effectiveness in service and teaching (if applicable) and a recommendation for or against promotion, to the department chair, along with any minority reports.

       The chair will provide a written report, which includes an assessment of the academic professional’s effectiveness in in service and teaching (if applicable), a recommendation for or against promotion, and an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., his or her report, the committee report, any minority reports, and any responses from the candidate) to the Dean’s Office, which will forward the materials to the college NTT promotion review committee.

       The college NTT promotion review committee will review the material and make a recommendation to the dean.
The dean and associate dean will review the material and submit the college's final recommendation to the university provost. See Section IV above for information on the evaluation and appeal processes of the university provost and president.

D. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Service: Given the variation in service roles assigned to academic professionals across the college, evaluators will assess the service performance of academic professionals primarily as it relates to the department's mission and the specific service responsibilities of the candidate. Reviewers should evaluate the candidate using the following criteria and any provided in departmental guidelines.

a. Job Knowledge: Knowledge, skills and abilities as they relate to performing job requirements.

b. Productivity: The amount of work successfully produced while maintaining standards and meeting deadlines.

c. Accuracy and Quality: The extent to which he/she performs major job duties or responsibilities correctly and completely; professionalism and thoroughness of work produced.

d. Adaptability: Ability to master new techniques or duties and understand explanations as required for the position. Demonstrates flexibility in meeting the changing demands of the work environment.

e. Organizational Skills: Ability to effectively and efficiently plan, arrange, and complete work priorities; makes efficient use of available resources to optimize productivity.

f. Communication Skills: Ability to express ideas effectively through verbal and written communication. Ability to communicate in a clear concise manner. Ability to listen and ask appropriate questions.

g. Teamwork: Develops and maintains effective relationships with co-workers, supervisor, faculty, staff, students and others in the handling of job duties.

h. Supervisory Ability: Ability to effectively delegate and monitor work and follow up with others; effectively coach, communicate with, reward and discipline. Demonstrates understanding and uses appropriate financial and budget controls. Adheres to safety requirements and practices, and communicates hazards to other employees in the workplace.

i. Additional Criteria: Departments may consider developing additional assessment criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.

2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable): Reviewers should evaluate the candidate's teaching contributions using the criteria listed below and those provided in departmental guidelines. The specific nature of the teaching duties assigned to academic professionals may vary across or within departments. Thus, evaluators should assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals primarily as it
relates to the department’s mission and the specific teaching responsibilities of the
candidate.

a. Quality of Course Content: The quality of a course will be evaluated through
review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials.
Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading
assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course
materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the
current state of knowledge in the field. Academic professionals may provide
additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other
relevant information. In departments that give standardized and/or
departmental examinations, scores on these examinations should be included for
review. Credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in
ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students.

b. New Courses/Teaching Programs Developed: Evaluation will include the effective
development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the
development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques
and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member.

c. Teaching Portfolios: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she
has compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section VI.E below for
guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different
review periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy,
teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of
all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In
addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi,
exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per
year - one a specialty course and one a more general course. In consultation with
the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so
that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught
(including summers, if applicable).

d. Student Evaluations: The review will include student evaluation scores, in the
context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses
(i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary
area. The information will also include other important variables, such as class
size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the
evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In general,
evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged
in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating
teaching effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

e. Additional Criteria: Departments may consider developing additional assessment
criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.
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 professionals 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 effectively fulfill changing needs of the department.

   b. **Research (Professional Development) Activities (if appropriate):** Activities such as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the academic professional's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance, may be considered if specified in the departmental guidelines.

---

**E. Evaluation Materials**

For the third-year review and academic professional promotion review, candidates prepare a professional dossier containing the information on teaching and service indicated below for the review period appropriate to the specific review.

**Definition of Review Periods:**

- For third-year review, the dossier covers the period since the hire date.

- For the fifth-year review leading to promotion to senior academic professional, the dossier includes teaching portfolios from the last three full calendar years and perceptions of students from the last three academic years (if the candidate’s workload includes teaching), while the rest of the dossier covers the period since the hire date.

- For the five-year post-promotion structured review, the dossier includes annual reports and teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years (if the candidate’s workload includes teaching), while the rest of the dossier covers the last five academic years. Further information on the materials to be submitted for five-year post-promotion reviews is detailed in section VI.F below.

---

2 The fifth-year review dossier consists of three years of student evaluation data and teaching portfolios due to several factors. First, it is the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences that departmental and college reviewers do not consider a candidate’s student evaluations from their first academic year at Georgia State as part of the promotion review, so candidates are instructed to exclude this information from their dossier. Second, because fifth-year promotion reviews begin during the fall semester of each candidate’s fifth year, student evaluation and teaching portfolio data are not available from either semester of the candidate’s fifth year. Further, candidates only include the last three years of teaching portfolios, which are submitted by calendar year as part of the annual review process, because their teaching portfolios from their first two calendar years at Georgia State each include student evaluation data from a semester during their first academic year.
Specific Instructions for the Physical Format of the Dossier:

- All materials must be placed in three-ring, large capacity binders. Each section in each of the evaluative categories must be clearly separated by dividers.
- Staples or paper clips must not be used in the compilation of materials
- Binders should not be filled to capacity
- Do not insert materials in plastic sleeves/sheet protectors. Plastic sleeves can be used only if holes cannot be punched to place in three-ring binders.

Contents of the Dossier:

1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department, and date of appointment at Georgia State University.
2. Curriculum Vitae.
3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department chair): Describe the candidate's primary responsibilities under the general categories of Service and Teaching.
4. Information on Service: Describe objectives and contributions in the following service areas. Candidates are expected to address only those areas that apply.
   a. Facility / Services Management: Describe activities such as managing instructional laboratories or instructional technology support programs.
   b. Supervisory/Mentoring Activities: Describe activities such as supervision of graduate laboratory or teaching assistants, student assistants, staff, or part-time instructors.
   c. Teaching Service (if applicable): Describe activities such as coordination of clinical practica or field experiences, leading and/or supporting teaching training programs, or providing support for the development of new courses and programs.
   d. Academic Advisement and Curriculum: Describe activities such as providing academic advisement or managing advisement/recruitment programs, maintaining curriculum, course scheduling, or contributing to program evaluation and certification processes.
   e. Contributions to the Department, College, or University: List memberships on departmental/college/university committees; participation in university-sanctioned outreach or service activities beyond the scope of regular job duties.
   f. Professional Service: List memberships in professional societies, advisory boards, etc.
   g. Community and Public Service: List non-university lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, assistance to governmental agencies.
   h. Published Materials: Include copies of articles, training manuals, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate's service
responsibilities.

i. Additional Service: List service contributions not related to the categories above. Examples may include reviewing manuscripts or grant applications, contributions in support of research programs, or sponsored funding gained relating to service responsibilities. Departments may specify additional requirements in the departmental guidelines.

5. Information on Teaching (if applicable):

a. Statement of Teaching Interests, Goals, and Qualifications: Describe educational philosophy within the context of assigned teaching duties. Candidates should indicate all courses he/she is qualified to teach as an instructor of record and generally describe other types of contributions made in the classroom.

b. Courses Taught During the Review Period (include summers, if applicable): Using the format in Appendix A, the candidate must provide a list of courses taught during the relevant review period and the role he/she played in the course (i.e., instructor of record, assisted instructor, laboratory instructor, assisted laboratory instructor, etc.). For each course where the candidate was the instructor of record, please provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for the course. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. Please indicate on the syllabus if it was solely the work of the candidate, developed collaboratively, or based largely on the work of another faculty member.

c. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section VI.E above for guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy, teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable).

d. Student Evaluations (include summers, if applicable): Summary of questions 1-17 on the student questionnaire must be provided for courses taught as the instructor of record during the review period. The candidate must provide standardized summaries of student evaluation numerical scores from a crystal report (no comments) and student evaluations from GoSOLAR (with written comments). Department chairs will assist the candidates in obtaining these materials.

e. New Courses/Teaching Programs Developed: List and generally describe role played in the development of the course.

f. Teaching Funding: Describe all intramural and extramural funding of teaching
initiatives.

841 g. Published Materials: Include copies of articles, textbooks, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate’s instruction.

843 h. Additional Teaching: Include other activities directly related to classroom teaching. Examples may include honors or special recognition for teaching. Departments may specify additional requirements in the departmental guidelines.

846 6. Research (Professional Development) Activities (if appropriate): Departments may specify that a faculty member can provide information on research activities, such as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the academic professional’s service and teaching responsibilities.

853 F. Five-year Structured Review

854 As described in the university manual, structured reviews are intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. Faculty members who have been promoted to the senior academic professional rank will go through a structured cumulative review in the fifth year following promotion and in each fifth year following the previous cumulative review (NTT Post-Promotion Review).

859 Senior academic professionals will provide all required materials to the chair. The review materials consist of the following:

861 1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate’s name, department, and date of appointment at Georgia State University.

863 2. Updated curriculum vitae.

864 3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department chair): Describe the candidate’s primary responsibilities under the general categories of Teaching and Service.

866 4. Annual reports for each of the years under review.

868 5. (If their workload includes teaching) Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section VI.E above for guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy, teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable).
6. (If their workload includes teaching) Perception of Students (include summers, if applicable): The candidate must include standardized summaries of student evaluation numerical scores from a Crystal Report (no comments) and student evaluations from GoSOLAR (with written comments) for the review period at Georgia State University. Department chairs will assist the candidates in obtaining these materials.

The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is a committee composed of at least three tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from each rank required). This committee will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in service and teaching to the departmental chair.

The chair will provide a written assessment of the faculty member’s effectiveness in service and teaching, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., his or her recommendation and the committee report) to the Dean's Office.

The assessment statements of the departmental committee and department chair will address whether the faculty member is performing at the level necessary for reappointment, whether the faculty member is progressing toward promotion, and they will identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential in terms of contribution to the university. The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and provide any necessary response by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between the chair and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further recommendations to the faculty member.

**G. Academic Professionals Hired at the Rank of Senior Academic Professional**

All academic professionals whose initial appointment at GSU is at the rank of senior academic professional shall have a third year review and subsequent reviews every five years.
VII. RESEARCH FACULTY REVIEW

The primary responsibility of Research Faculty is to conduct research. The purpose of Research Faculty appointments, based on available external funding, is to increase the research, scholarly, and creative efforts of the University. Research Faculty will work either in close collaboration with other faculty and/or will carry out independent research that builds upon an explicit area of focus for the University. Research Faculty salaries are primarily from research grants or other sources of external funds (non-general state funds). Research Faculty hold a terminal degree in their discipline, have demonstrated evidence of independent research careers (non-independent investigators should be appointed at the post-doctoral level), and concentrate primarily on research. Appointments of members of the Research Faculty are renewable on an annual basis upon satisfactory review and available external funding.

Further details regarding the research faculty position are in the GSU document entitled, “Policy on Research Assistant Professors, Research Associate Professors, and Research Professors,” available online at http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/r-ntt_gsu.pdf.

3 The college is temporarily housing the university policy on our file server.

The college is developing a full section for research faculty that includes process information, dossier instructions and general review criteria along the lines of sections V and VI.
APPENDIX A:

SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX TO 20XX

Please provide a list of courses taught and the role he/she played in the course (i.e., instructor of record, assisted instructor, laboratory instructor, or assisted laboratory instructor).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester / year</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall/02</td>
<td>Bio 1107</td>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Instructor of Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

NTT RANK EQUIVALENCY CHART FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPOSING PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior Rank:</th>
<th>Senior Rank:</th>
<th>Highest Rank:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lecturer Track:</strong></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Professional Track:</strong></td>
<td>Academic Professional Associate⁴</td>
<td>Academic Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Faculty Track:</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ The Academic Professional Associate rank is not used in the College of Arts and Sciences, currently.