

Department of Biology
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of Biology Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Departmental Approval:	04/13/2015
College Approval:	03/23/2015
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Biology Department of
3 Georgia State University filling critical instructional and service roles. The Department of
4 Biology has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion
5 of faculty in non-tenure track ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general
6 requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and
7 with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and Georgia State University
8 guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University Promotion
9 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual), and (2) the College of Arts and
10 Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual). In the event of
11 a conflict between the departmental and college/university documents, the
12 college/university documents take precedence.

13 The Department of Biology employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer
14 and academic professional tracks. The ranks of lecturer (listed from most junior to most
15 senior) are: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The academic
16 professional ranks employed are Academic Professional and Senior Academic Professional.

17 For Lecturer positions, the Department of Biology will nominate for promotion to
18 Senior Lecturer only those candidates who are evaluated as *excellent* in teaching. A service
19 evaluation of *very good* is also required for promotion. For promotion of a Senior Lecturer
20 to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, evaluations of *excellent* or better in both teaching
21 and service are required.

22 For Academic Professional positions, the Department of Biology will nominate for
23 promotion to Senior Academic Professional only those candidates who present evidence of
24 a sustained evaluation of *excellent* in service. For candidates whose workload includes
25 teaching, an evaluation of *excellent* in teaching that promotes the general goals and welfare
26 of the department and fits the needs of the department is also required for promotion.

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

29 **A. Process Overview**

30 The primary stages of the Biology Department's NTT faculty review process are
31 outlined below. These steps must be carried out following a time schedule provided by the
32 College of Arts and Sciences.

- 33 1. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Dean's office and will
34 subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
35 to the department chair according to the schedule provided by the college.
- 36 2. The department chair forwards the candidate's review materials to a subcommittee
37 of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the
38 review. The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.
- 39 3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation, including minority
40 report(s) (if any), to the department chair. The committee members will sign the
41 report(s) on a separate page/pages. The department chair will provide a copy of the
42 committee's report (including minority report(s)) to the candidate.
- 43 4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the
44 departmental committee review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean's Office.
45 The department chair provides a copy of the chair report to the candidate. The
46 candidate has the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair
47 reports, addressed to the Dean's Office, within three business days. The Dean's
48 Office will provide the department chair with a copy of any formal response the
49 candidate has to the department committee and chair's report.

50 At this point, the review process passes from the department to the college and
51 university. See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review process at
52 the college and university level.

53 **B. Departmental Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee**
54 **(Committee of the Whole)**

55 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed
56 of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above (Senior Lecturer,
57 Principle Senior Lecturer, and Senior Academic Professional) in the department, except the
58 chair and associate chair of the department and those members of the department serving
59 in a position that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or
60 university level. For each candidate, the department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member
61 subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of
62 the whole, to initially review each candidate. The department chair shall also appoint a
63 committee chair (selected from the subcommittee) for each candidate. All final
64 recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the
65 whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a majority recommendation. The vote will be in the
66 form of signatures on the final recommendation. The letter from the departmental
67 committee of the whole must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members
68 who agree with the recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this
69 recommendation must provide a separate letter or letters (minority report) indicating
70 their recommendation and supporting rationale. The signatures must appear on a separate
71 page(s) so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of
72 the committee's report(s).

73 NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the
74 final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the
75 department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be
76 authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean
77 may augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from
78 other departments if the Biology Department does not have a sufficient number of faculty

79 to constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a
80 tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at Senior level or above.

81 The committee of the whole shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to
82 the chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the
83 Department of Biology in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of the committee of
84 the whole shall be approved by majority vote.

85 Duties of the departmental committee of the whole include the following:

- 86 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
87 review procedures adopted by the Department of Biology.
- 88 2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate.
- 89 3. The written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of
90 the whole is delivered to the department chair.
- 91 4. Committee members who do not sign the written majority recommendation must
92 provide a signed separate letter or letters (minority report) indicating their
93 recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations. The signatures must
94 appear on a separate page(s) so that they can be removed when the candidate is
95 provided with his or her copy of the committee's report(s).
- 96 5. The written statement and all separate letters from the committee of the whole
97 must be sent to the chair of the department.

98

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

100

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

105 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

106

107 **A. General Considerations**

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

119 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

120 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

127 Instruction for science majors communicates the discipline of biology to students and
128 trains them to be skilled and responsible researchers, practitioners, teachers, or other
129 professionals.

130 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
131 but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Table A for details). The candidate
132 must include such evidence in the dossier.

- 133 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 134 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 135 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
136 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 137 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially
138 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 139 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
140 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
141 as defined in the college manual (section V.E).
- 142 6. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
143 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
144 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
145 meetings).
- 146 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
147 learned societies.
- 148 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
149 teaching activities.
- 150 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
151 participation in textbook development.
- 152 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

153 **2. Evaluation of Service**

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

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

- 160 (a) Ensuring the highest safety standards at all times.
- 161 (b) Maintaining and overseeing equipment. Where appropriate, it is expected
162 that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that departmental
163 equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and
164 repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use
165 of equipment.
- 166 (c) Participation on departmental committees. Effective participation on the
167 NTT Promotion Review Committee and other committee appointments,
168 including curriculum committee and grade appeal committees, is expected.
169 Other service avenues may include student advisement/mentoring,
170 assistance to colleagues, and role on college committees, etc.
- 171 (d) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.

172 The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality.
173 Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have
174 consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all
175 assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their
176 assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of *very good* in service.

177 Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
178 responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a

179 different service load than those assigned major departmental and/or college roles. Such
180 additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, direction of
181 student teams (e.g., Science Olympiads), etc.

182 Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and
183 timely manner to achieve the rating of *very good*.

184 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

185 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
186 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
187 relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. The single
188 measure for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and
189 service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in
190 both categories is included in the Appendix.

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

192 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
193 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and
194 service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
195 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated
196 as *excellent* in teaching. Table A of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to
197 obtain this. The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level
198 of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their
199 assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them,
200 who have performed all assigned tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.)
201 qualify for a rating of *very good* in service. Table B of the Appendix gives details for the
202 descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

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

204 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a
205 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued

206 growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide
207 a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college,
208 university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based
209 on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching
210 and service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair,* and
211 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must
212 be rated as *excellent* in instruction and *excellent* in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B
213 (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary to obtain this.

214 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

218 219 **1. Annual Review**

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

227 **2. Third-Year Review**

228 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
229 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period
230 and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. A departmental
231 review committee composed of at least three members, which will include tenured faculty
232 and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers, will evaluate the required materials and

233 provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service
234 to the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review
235 committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which along
236 with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in
237 the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and
238 service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*.
239 Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating. Split ratings such as "very
240 good/excellent" are to be avoided.

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

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

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

260 criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent
261 assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional
262 information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.

263 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

264 **A. General Considerations**

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

277 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

278 **1. Evaluation of Service**

279 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in
280 Section VI of the college manual, which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements.
281 Service roles are assigned by the department depending on departmental needs and
282 mission. Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties.

283 Service roles normally assigned by the department (individual assignments may include all
284 or some of these roles) include:

- 285 • Facility/Service Management
- 286 • Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- 287 • Instructional Service (laboratory coordination is one example)
- 288 • Academic Advisement and Curriculum
- 289 • Contributions to the Department, College or University
- 290 • Professional Service
- 291 • Community and Public Service
- 292 • Published Materials
- 293 • Additional Service

294

295 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality.

296 To receive an *excellent* rating all assigned tasks must be performed effectively and
297 diligently and in a thorough and timely manner. The candidate must also play a leadership
298 role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, cost effectiveness, and planning will also be factored
299 into the evaluation.

300 **2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)**

301 For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching, instructional
302 assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The
303 effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department's mission and the
304 specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary on certain
305 occasions to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly match their

306 skills/background. The candidate will be shown special consideration under these
307 conditions.

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

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

312 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
313 but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Appendix, Table A). The candidate
314 must provide such evidence in the dossier.

- 315 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 316 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 317 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
318 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 319 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially
320 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 321 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
322 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
323 as defined in the college manual (section VI.E).
- 324 6. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
325 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
326 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
327 meetings).
- 328 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
329 learned societies.
- 330 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
331 teaching activities.

332 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
333 participation in textbook development.

334 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
335

336 **C. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Academic Professional**

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

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

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

353 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

357 **1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals**

358 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional
359 track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the
360 materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report
361 information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate
362 materials. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department
363 chair will evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and teaching
364 (if applicable) using the criteria described in the Appendix.

365

366 **2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals**

367 As discussed in detail in Section VI.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
368 dossier containing information on service and teaching (if applicable) for the appropriate
369 review period and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. A
370 departmental review committee composed of at least three members, which will include
371 tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from each when
372 the department has one or more available senior academic professionals within its ranks)
373 will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written assessment with ranking
374 that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in service and teaching (if applicable) to
375 the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review
376 committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which along
377 with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in
378 the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and
379 service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*.
380 Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings such as "very
381 good/excellent" are to be avoided.

382 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion)
383 review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and

384 dialogue of the academic professional's accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to
385 that point. In addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address
386 possible deficiencies before the fifth-year review.

387 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals**

388 All Senior Academic Professionals must undergo a comprehensive review every five
389 years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the Post-
390 Promotion Review for Senior Academic Professionals is to assess the quality and
391 effectiveness of their long-term service and teaching (if applicable) and possibly identify
392 opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior
393 Academic Professional will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion
394 review and the materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section VI.F of the
395 college manual. This material is submitted by the Senior Academic Professional to the
396 department chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The review committee is
397 elected by the departmental NTT review committee of the whole and consists of at least
398 three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of Senior Academic Professional (with
399 representation from each when the department has an available Senior Academic
400 Professional within its ranks). This committee evaluates the Senior Academic Professional
401 in the categories of service and teaching (if applicable) using the criteria summarized in the
402 Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment and send on both
403 evaluations to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult Section VI.F of the
404 college manual.

APPENDIX

Table A. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f): (a) update/revise courses (b) student perceptions (c) direct independent study courses (d) publications in instructional journals (e) instructional creativity as evidenced by development of new courses and/or awards for instructional innovation (f) learning outcomes as evidenced by grade distribution and drop rates, (g) involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	3 items: (a), (b), and (f)
Good	Meets obligations	2 of 7 items, including (b)
Fair	Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness	1 of 7 items

Poor	Substandard, ineffective teacher	0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints
------	-------------------------------------	---

Table B. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Candidates

Service¹ Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Major effective leadership roles	Major effective role in department. Major effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization
Excellent	Effective departmental leadership role(s)	Effective role in department. Effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization will also be considered
Very Good	Helpful citizenship. Some leadership role	Effective role in the department; meets departmental obligations effectively and is helpful; provides departmental leadership.
Good	Acceptable citizenship	Meets minimum departmental obligations/requests
Fair	Needs improvement	Does not meet departmental obligations in a timely manner
Poor	Needs major improvement; negative leader	Hinders department operations

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