

**Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second
Language**

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES**

Policy Title:	Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	03/27/2015
College Approval:	04/03/2015
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of Applied Linguistics and
3 English as a Second Language (ESL) are vital components of our faculty. The policies
4 and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks
5 are outlined in this document (department guidelines), the College of Arts and Sciences
6 Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia
7 State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual).
8 Whereas the university and college NTT manuals provide general statements of the
9 expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document
10 identifies the concrete forms these achievements should take. In particular, this
11 document articulates the Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL’s criteria for the
12 various rankings that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of teaching
13 and service. Candidates should consult the college and university manuals for matters
14 of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and time-in-rank policies that govern
15 eligibility for promotion consideration.

16 The Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in
17 the lecturer track in three different programs: ESL credit-bearing program, Intensive
18 English Program, and the undergraduate program in Applied Linguistics. The ranks
19 within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior):
20 Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer
21 track faculty are described in the college manual.

22

23 **II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR**
24 **LECTURER AND PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER**

25 **A. Process Overview**

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

- 28 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for
29 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the
30 department chair.
- 31 2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s materials to the departmental review
32 committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be
33 made by the committee as a whole).
- 34 3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation in printed and e-versions,
35 including any minority reports, to the department chair. The committee members will
36 sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages. The department chair will also provide a
37 copy of the departmental committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the

38 candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the
39 department chair within three business days.

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

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

49

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

51 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all
52 tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the department (Senior
53 Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the chair of the department and any
54 members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate's
55 promotion application at the college or university levels. Departments may operate
56 through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate's
57 credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole.
58 The committee of the whole must meet in person to discuss and vote on its final
59 recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be
60 signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the
61 recommendation. The signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be
62 removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's
63 report(s). Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on
64 the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the
65 department chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee
66 with NTT members from other departments when the home department does not have a
67 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at
68 least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

69 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

70 **A. General Considerations**

71 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual
72 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
73 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior

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

82

83 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

84 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

85 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
86 of the college's policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
87 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to the
88 mission/goals of their respective programs or department. However, if a lecturer has
89 primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then
90 assessment will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the department. This
91 includes lecturers who may have program service duties as their primary role in the
92 department (see Section B2, paragraph 2 of this document and Appendix of the Georgia
93 State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

94 For the evaluation of instructional accomplishment, candidates should provide evidence
95 of student accomplishments and achievement of learning; student perceptions of the
96 effectiveness of the instructor; how the instructor's pedagogy contributes to the
97 program's, the department's, the college's, and the university's curricular needs,
98 innovations, and improvements; and the quality of their teaching materials.

99 Candidates may also provide evidence of recognition of their pedagogy by
100 constituencies within the program, department, college, or university, or institutions
101 outside the university; the degree to which their pedagogy has been innovative; the
102 degree to which they have assessed their pedagogical innovations; the degree to which
103 they have demonstrated effort to improve the effectiveness of their pedagogy; and their
104 contributions to scholarship on pedagogy and/or curriculum.
105

106 As a general rule, evaluators will consider in their assessments of teaching
107 effectiveness the following criteria:

108 **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through
109 review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and
110 other elements integrated into the learning environment used by the candidate for
111 promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines.
112 Assessment materials should require students to engage material that is appropriate for

113 the course level and catalog description. Course materials should also be assessed for
114 their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers
115 may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and
116 other course elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student
117 engagement and success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are
118 structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their
119 students. Courses that connect students with other university programs and resources
120 and that take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will
121 also be viewed as evidence of successful teaching. The department also encourages
122 faculty to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify
123 students who are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to
124 improve their performance as the semester unfolds. The department recognizes that
125 teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or
126 exceeding promotion expectations, however, demonstrate a sustained interest in
127 encouraging student interest in the material and designing materials that foster the
128 mastery of significant skills and concepts.

129 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
130 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective
131 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development
132 of new programs or initiatives and the use of new teaching techniques and practices.
133 The design of courses with a travel component and/or the subsequent successful
134 recruitment of students to study abroad is another potential achievement. Initiatives in
135 the development of new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching
136 ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are ones that (1) affect significant
137 numbers of students, (2) sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in
138 significant achievements such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate
139 and/or graduate research, or for IEP/ESL, (3) new courses or resources that assist
140 students in obtaining admission to or being successful in degree programs.

141 **c. Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will include student
142 evaluation scores, which are insightful indicators of student perceptions of instruction.
143 Evaluation scores, which the department will not rely upon exclusively when
144 determining minimum qualifications for ratings, will be considered in the context of the
145 normal range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000,
146 2000, etc.) within the department. The review will also consider other important
147 variables such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response
148 rate on the evaluations, the number of students enrolled in the course, and the
149 language proficiency of the students. In addition to average scores, the department will
150 also be attentive to mean and median scores and to the impact of any outlying scores
151 on averages. Qualitative evidence offered by the students' written comments on the
152 student evaluation forms will receive serious attention from the department as a

153 meaningful supplement to the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light
154 of these contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn
155 consistently strong evaluations and high scores, as defined below.

156 **d. Direction of students:** The department will assess the extent and quality of faculty
157 efforts in the direction of student projects for respective programs and academic
158 activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses, student research
159 presented at GSURC, as well as individual student engagement in academic projects or
160 programs hosted by other institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include
161 time spent offering additional tutoring and mentoring of students at risk for
162 underperforming in the courses in which the faculty teaches and/or additional guidance
163 to students pursuing additional research projects or feedback on language/cultural
164 understanding as it impacts the students' other degree courses. Efforts also include
165 cooperating teacher duties related to working with Practicum students, classroom
166 assistants, and interns. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of recommendation
167 for students might also be viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of
168 teaching effectiveness.

169 **e. Development of new skills:** The department encourages faculty to continue to
170 develop skills to inform their teaching, for example, with new software, languages, new
171 approaches to teaching language, and technology or other pertinent areas that would
172 improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for
173 promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the classroom.
174 Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new certifications and competencies may
175 present such achievements to the department as evidence of their commitment to
176 staying abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The department recognizes that new
177 skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more interactive
178 classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing might
179 contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

180

181 **2. Evaluation of Service**

182 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality
183 instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university; professional
184 service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies depending on
185 the individual's core mission as defined by the department, but it is generally at the
186 department or college level. Contributions to service in the Department of Applied
187 Linguistics and ESL typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles,
188 such as administrative roles (e.g., directing a program such as IEP, ESL, departmental
189 undergraduate or graduate studies) or other service duties that are ongoing
190 assignments; instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula,
191 organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, supervising or mentoring

192 faculty, or administrative contributions to the IEP/ESL tutoring lab; assistance to
193 colleagues, such as guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and teaching issues,
194 and providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts, grant applications, university-
195 based conference proposals and/or scholarship essays; contributions to the
196 department, college, and university, such as student advisement and mentoring,
197 memberships on department/college/university committees, and development of
198 teaching and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as service to
199 professional organizations or advisory boards; community and public service (if
200 appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short
201 courses, and assistance to government agencies, as well as written contributions to
202 public service (editorials, white papers, magazine or newsletter articles, and any other
203 dissemination of academic research to the general populace) .

204 The department's review of candidates' records in service will consider the wide variety
205 of tasks that chairs might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should
206 document any arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to
207 take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. The degree to
208 which assigned service responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be
209 part of the consideration of their service record.

210

211 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

214 **Professional Development Contributions:** The Department shall consider
215 professional development activities (e.g., publications of their research and scholarship,
216 conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded) as they bear on the
217 lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production of peer-
218 reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the department
219 certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-reviewed
220 publications, the publication of textbooks, e-books, book chapters, publications or
221 appearances in popular media, participation in academic conferences, facilitation of
222 workshops, and/or the pursuit of grants (e.g., to fund research in the discipline, to fund
223 local/international teacher training initiatives) all enhance the candidates' case that they
224 are modeling the best practices of the profession to students. Such professional
225 development can also help the candidate's case for promotion if it can be shown to
226 augment the faculty member's expertise in subjects relevant to the classroom.

227 Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction
228 section of the dossier rather than under a Professional Development section.

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

234

235 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

249 **a. Teaching**

250 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
251 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's performance and supporting material demonstrate
252 evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, professional
253 intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department. Supporting
254 material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as
255 diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom,
256 successful mentoring of students, a classroom environment that consistently supports
257 learning, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of
258 student learning should consistently show that students meet course objectives.
259 Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and comments across
260 student course evaluations. Taking into account such factors as the topic and format of
261 the course and the language proficiency of the students, the candidate normally will
262 have a record of student evaluation scores that consistently fall in the mid-4 out of 5
263 range.

264 If appropriate to his or her workload, the candidate should demonstrate commitment to
265 mentoring through individual direction of students and/or contributions to student
266 development as language teachers. This involvement in individual student mentoring
267 may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study courses
268 and/or provision of guidance to students in professional development or course
269 selection; it may also include sharing professional knowledge with teachers in training.
270 Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate's assigned workload and described
271 in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence
272 of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship; examples of such
273 evidence include observation reports, student presentations or publications, applications
274 to graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation.

275

276 **b. Service**

277 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating
278 of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills his or her
279 assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the
280 requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as
281 opportunities to most effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results
282 for students in the program(s) in which s/he teaches. Service at this level might include
283 some experiences beyond the department (service on college or university committees).

284

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

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

298 **a. Teaching**

299 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
300 of *excellent*, the lecturer's performance and supporting materials illustrate a trajectory
301 as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy.

302 ***In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching for
303 promotion to senior lecturer, the successful candidate for promotion *to the rank of*
304 *principal senior lecturer* will have a record of student evaluations in the mid- to upper 4-
305 out-of-5 range and will have demonstrated extensive, successful mentorship of students
306 in the programs in which they teach and development of new courses or materials for
307 existing courses. There should be evidence that, over the length of his or her teaching
308 career, the candidate has grown pedagogically in ways that reflect changes in the
309 discipline and in the practice of teaching. This growth normally will include innovations
310 in teaching, the impacts of which should be assessed by the candidate (e.g., with
311 student learning outcomes as well as student evaluations, see above); innovations need
312 not always have been successful. In addition, the candidate's dossier normally will
313 demonstrate accomplishment in one or more of the following areas: teaching awards;
314 production of a refereed journal article or other publication of similar quality on
315 pedagogy; invitation to conduct a teacher training workshop at another institution or a
316 national/international conference; external funding for pedagogical initiatives; the
317 development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the
318 larger teaching community. A candidate whose record of achievement does not self-
319 evidently conform to this standard should document and explain how their record
320 corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

321

322 **b. Service**

323 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
324 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if he or she has been diligent and
325 effective in carrying out assigned responsibilities and has contributed consistently to the
326 mission of the department and the respective programs over a sustained period. The
327 *excellent* candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of consistently providing
328 assistance to graduate teaching assistants, interns, and student assistants as well as
329 staff and other tenure and non-tenure track faculty (e.g., through teaching consultation,
330 guest lecturing). It may include service-related innovations (e.g., supervising a special
331 program or other initiative), or significant service to the department as a program
332 director. The excellent candidate at this level contributes to the College, University,
333 professional community, and/or professional organization.

334

335 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

336 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
337 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
338 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may

339 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
340 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

341 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

342 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are
343 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by
344 the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report covering the prior
345 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation
346 with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the
347 lecturer track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the
348 Appendix.

349 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

350 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's
351 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental review
352 committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty
353 and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the
354 lecturer's record of teaching and service. The committee is elected by the departmental
355 NTT review committee of the whole. The department chair will provide an independent
356 assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further
357 evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point
358 scale of adjectives listed in the Appendix. However, the spirit of the third-year review is
359 different from that of the fifth-year promotion review; it is meant to review the lecturer's
360 achievements to date and provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should
361 be addressed before the fifth-year review.

362

363 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers**

364 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
365 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy
366 and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's
367 teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria
368 listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in
369 the college manual) for evaluation by a committee elected by tenured faculty and
370 senior/principal senior lecturers (departmental NTT review committee of the whole). The
371 elected committee will consist of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the
372 rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each when the department
373 has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). The department chair will
374 provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the
375 Dean's Office for response.

376 **APPENDIX: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to**
377 **be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative**
378 **Reviews**

379

380 **A. Teaching**

381 **Poor:** The lecturer displays an unacceptable record of classroom-based teaching based
382 on the markers of effectiveness describe in this document (Section III. B.1),
383 minimal/ineffective involvement or no involvement in mentoring students or in
384 programmatic curriculum or reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and
385 inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course
386 content to students.

387 **Fair:** The lecturer displays a minimally acceptable record of classroom-based teaching
388 based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III. B.1),
389 minimal involvement and effectiveness in departmental curricular or programmatic
390 reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and minimally adequate effort as an
391 instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

392 **Good:** The lecturer only minimally demonstrates competence in classroom-related
393 teaching and does not meet criteria for a rating of *very good*, based on the markers of
394 effectiveness described in this document (Section III. B.1).

395 **Very Good:** The lecturer is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes
396 evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of
397 students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the
398 department and respective program based on the markers of effectiveness described in
399 this document (Section III. B.1). Class assignments are creative and methodologically
400 varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the
401 lecturer is an effective teacher, her/his student evaluations show inconsistencies or
402 generally fall in the mid-4 range.

403 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):**

404 The lecturer's performance and supporting material demonstrate evidence of continued
405 commitment to innovative and effective instruction, professional intellectual growth, and
406 engagement with the work of the department, based on the markers of effectiveness
407 described in this document (Section III.B.1). Supporting material must exhibit
408 consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as diligent and thoughtful
409 preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of
410 students, a classroom environment that consistently supports learning, and, as a
411 foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of student learning
412 should consistently show that students meet course objectives. Successful teaching
413 may be assessed by the pattern of scores and comments across student course

414 evaluations. Taking into account such factors as the topic and format of the course and
415 the language proficiency of the students, the candidate normally will have a record of
416 student evaluation scores that consistently fall in the mid-4 out of 5 range.

417
418 If appropriate to his or her workload, the candidate should demonstrate commitment to
419 mentoring through individual direction of students and/or contributions to student
420 development as language teachers. This involvement in individual student mentoring
421 may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study courses
422 and/or provision of guidance to students in professional development or course
423 selection; it may also include sharing professional knowledge with teachers in training.
424 Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate's assigned workload and described
425 in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence
426 of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship; examples of such
427 evidence include observation reports, student presentations or publications, applications
428 to graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation.

429
430 **Excellent** (*Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer*): In addition to the stated
431 expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, the successful candidate for
432 promotion *to the rank of principal senior lecturer* will have a record of consistent student
433 evaluations in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher and will have demonstrated extensive,
434 successful mentorship of students in the programs in which they teach and development
435 of new courses or materials for existing courses. There should be evidence that, over
436 the length of his or her teaching career, the candidate has grown pedagogically in ways
437 that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This growth
438 normally will include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which should be assessed
439 by the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as student evaluations,
440 see above); innovations need not always have been successful. In addition, the
441 candidate's dossier normally will demonstrate accomplishment in one or more of the
442 following areas: teaching awards; production of a significant article or other publication
443 on pedagogy; invitation to conduct a teacher training workshop at another institution or
444 a national/international conference; external funding for pedagogical initiatives; the
445 development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the
446 larger teaching community.

447
448 **Outstanding** (*Promotion to Senior Lecturer*): The lecturer's impact on students is of the
449 highest level. On top of the expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching appropriate
450 to his or her rank, as described above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a mastery of
451 instruction in his or her area as evidenced by at least one of the following based on the
452 markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III, B. 1): successful

453 pursuit of external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions;
454 student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

455

456 **Outstanding** (*Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer*): In the context of review for
457 promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of *outstanding*
458 characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the department's pedagogical
459 mission and the cutting edge of pedagogy in the field with an established national or
460 international reputation. In addition to meeting criteria for *excellent* described above, he
461 or she will have a record demonstrating that his/her classes and instructional programs
462 manifest an innovative pedagogical proficiency that has a broad, positive impact on
463 other faculty and on the departmental curriculum at large. The lecturer rated as
464 *outstanding* at this level normally takes a leadership role in the department's or
465 respective program's instructional mission (e.g., learning outcome assessment,
466 retention/progression/graduation initiatives, and curriculum development).

467

468

469 **B. Service**

470 **Poor:** Lecturers judged to be *poor* in service show no evidence of service
471 accomplishments nor fulfill assigned service obligations and are not responsible citizens
472 of the department.

473 **Fair:** Lecturers judged to be *fair* in service show no evidence of service
474 accomplishments, do not effectively fulfill assigned service obligations, and are not
475 responsible citizens of the department.

476 **Good:** Lecturers judged to be *good* in service show evidence of few service
477 accomplishments, do not always effectively fulfill assigned service obligations, and are
478 not consistently responsible citizens of the department.

479 **Very Good:** The lecturer diligently and effectively fulfills his or her assigned roles; rather
480 than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement
481 sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as opportunities to most
482 effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results for students in the
483 program(s) in which they teach. Service at this level might include some experiences
484 beyond the department (service on college or university committees).

485 **Excellent:** The Lecturer will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been
486 diligent and effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed
487 consistently to the mission of the department and the respective programs over a
488 sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of
489 consistently providing administrative assistance to graduate assistants, interns, and
490 classroom assistants as well as staff and other tenure and non-tenure track faculty (e.g.,
491 through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). It may include service-related innovation

492 (e.g., supervising a special program) or significant service to the department as program
493 director. The excellent candidate at this level contributes to the College, University,
494 professional community, and/or professional organization.

495 ***Outstanding:*** The Lecturer will be judged *outstanding* in service if criteria for *excellent*
496 are met and s/he has a track record of sustained, significant service accomplishments
497 beyond the department and throughout the college and university; has been
498 substantially active and engaged in a professional organization (e.g., serving in an
499 elected leadership position); and/or has won a prestigious service award. He/she has
500 also taken considerable personal initiative to seek out best practices and new
501 opportunities for maximizing the success of the department in meeting its stated goals.
502 Faculty members judged to be *outstanding* in service will have been recognized by their
503 peers, students, or university administrators as having established a long track record of
504 success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways