

Department of Chemistry
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of Chemistry Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Departmental Approval:	02/26/2015
College Approval:	01/26/2015
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

17 For Lecturer positions, the Department of Chemistry 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 to the
20 rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, evaluations of *excellent* or better in both teaching and service
21 are required.

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

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

30 **A. Process Overview**

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

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

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

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

56 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of all
57 tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank or above (senior lecturer, principle senior
58 lecturer, and senior academic professional) in the department, except the chair and associate
59 chair of the department and those members of the department serving in a position that will
60 review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university level. For each
61 candidate, the department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT
62 and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole, to initially review each
63 candidate. The department chair shall also appoint a committee chair (selected from the
64 subcommittee) for each candidate. All final recommendations must be made by the committee
65 of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a majority
66 recommendation. The vote will be in the form of signatures on the final recommendation. NTT
67 faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final
68 recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the department
69 chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be authorized to vote in
70 specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean may augment the
71 departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments if the
72 Chemistry department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of
73 at least three voting members, with at least one being a tenured TT and at least one being a senior
74 or principal senior NTT faculty member.

75 The committee of the whole shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to the
76 chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the department of
77 chemistry in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of the committee of the whole shall
78 be approved by majority vote.

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

- 80 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
81 review procedures adopted by the department of chemistry.
- 82 2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate.
- 83 3. The written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of the
84 whole is delivered to the department chair.
- 85 4. Committee members who do not sign the written majority recommendation must provide
86 signed separate letters (minority report) indicating their recommendations and the reasons
87 for these recommendations.
- 88 5. The written statement and all separate letters from the committee of the whole must be
89 sent to the chair of the department.

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

91
92 The rating system for all structured reviews of NTT faculty will be: *outstanding, excellent,*
93 *very good, good, fair, and poor.* Factors used in the evaluation for NTT faculty for teaching are
94 listed in Table A1 of the Appendix. The corresponding factors for service are listed in Table A2
95 of the Appendix.

96 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

97 **A. General Considerations**

99 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual review
100 leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior
101 lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior lecturer (the timing for which
102 is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured

103 review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in teaching and service,
104 with consideration given to contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the
105 candidate's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that
106 are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are
107 defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for
108 promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

109 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

110 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

111 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the
112 college's policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf). Evaluators will
113 assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging
114 undergraduate learning in courses ranging from introductory survey of chemistry to advanced
115 lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs, and Internship experience.

116 Instruction for science majors communicates the discipline of chemistry to students, develops
117 in them an excitement about the molecular structure of the world around them, and trains them to
118 be skilled, responsible members of a chemistry-related profession.

119 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but
120 goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must include in the dossier
121 evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as:

- 122 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 123 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 124 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials,
125 and/or effective instructional techniques.

- 126 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if
127 these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 128 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented
129 for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.
- 130 6. Results of all standardized exams given to all students (e.g., the ACS standardized
131 exams).
- 132 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
133 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations (oral
134 and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
- 135 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned
136 societies.
- 137 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
138 teaching activities.
- 139 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
140 participation in textbook development.
- 141 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

142 **2. Evaluation of Service**

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

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

- 148 (a) Safety is always of primary concern in a chemistry department. It is expected that
149 the candidate will maintain the highest safety standards at all times.
- 150 (b) Maintenance and oversight of equipment is of vital importance in a chemistry
151 department. Where appropriate, it is expected that the candidate will take a
152 vigorous role in making sure that Departmental equipment is in working order,

153 both by overseeing equipment purchase and repair, and by training students and
154 research associates carefully in the use of equipment.

155 (c) Participation on departmental committees is an important responsibility of all
156 faculty. Effective participation on the NTT Promotion Review Committee and
157 other committee appointments is expected.

158 (d) Faculty are expected to provide limited course oversight/coordination or fulfill
159 other assigned duties.

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

165 Each Lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
166 responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term will have a different
167 service load than those assigned major departmental and/or College roles. Only service that
168 meets the Department's mission will be considered.

169 A. For Lecturers with Full Teaching Loads. Service assignments are limited to (a) safety
170 issues, (b) equipment oversight, (c) departmental committees, participation in department
171 activities, and (d) limited course oversight/coordination or limited assigned departmental tasks
172 (science fair judges, seminar related tasks, etc.).

173 B. For Lecturers with Major Assigned Obligations in Departmental and/or
174 College/University Committees/Tasks. Service assignments in addition to (a)-(d) above include
175 one or more of the following: (e) Undergraduate Director, (f) Area Committee (e.g., Freshman,
176 Organic, etc.), (g) Pre-Med Advisor (departmental), (h) College/University committee work
177 (Pre-Med. etc.), (i) course lab manual responsibilities, (j) course/area Web responsibilities, and
178 (k) Science Olympiads or other major assigned departmental tasks.

179 Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties with diligence and with quality (e.g.,
180 timely/thorough and effective performance of assigned tasks) to achieve the rating of *very good*.

181 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

189 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
190 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
191 relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. In order
192 to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* in
193 teaching. Table A1 of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. The
194 service of Lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers
195 who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have
196 consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned
197 tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) qualify for a rating of *very good* in
198 service. Table A2 of the Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the
199 service of NTT faculty.

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

201 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a
202 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued growth
203 in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high
204 standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college, university,
205 and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence

206 that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the
207 evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted
208 to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* in instruction
209 and *excellent* in service. Tables A1 (for teaching) and A2 (for service) of the Appendix outline
210 in detail what is necessary to obtain this.

211 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

215 **1. Annual Review**

216 Each faculty member, TT and NTT, undergoes an annual review. The annual report of the
217 previous year (except for faculty in their first year at GSU), plus an updated curriculum vita and
218 any other appropriate material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process. The Chair
219 of the Chemistry Department in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee shall
220 evaluate performance in instruction and service using the specific standards described in the
221 Appendix.

222 **2. Third-Year Review (Lecturer)**

223 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
224 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and
225 deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental
226 committee of the whole will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written
227 assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the departmental chair. As
228 discussed in Section IIB of this document, a subcommittee shall be formed for each candidate to
229 provide an initial draft evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but the committee of the whole
230 must meet, discuss, and vote on the final recommendation and ranking. The Chair will provide
231 an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be
232 forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will

233 evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent,*
234 *very good, good, fair, and poor.* Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating.
235 Split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as “very
236 good but approaching excellent” may be appropriate.

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

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

243 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every 5
244 years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion
245 Review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and effectiveness of
246 their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the
247 candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or Principal Senior Lecturer
248 (PSL) will be notified by the college in advance of the Post-Promotion Review and the required
249 materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This
250 material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the department chair according to a schedule provided by
251 the college in advance of the review. The departmental executive committee elects an evaluation
252 committee consisting of at least three faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least one NTT
253 faculty member of rank equal or higher to that of the SL/PSL). This committee evaluates the
254 SL/PSL in the categories of instruction and service using the criteria summarized in the
255 Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment, and both evaluations
256 will be sent to the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college
257 manual.

258 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

259 **A. General Considerations**

260 There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track: 1)
261 annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
262 promotion to senior academic professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year
263 structured review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in service and
264 teaching. Supplemental consideration will be given to contributions in the area of professional
265 development bearing on the candidate's knowledge and departmental responsibilities. This
266 document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in
267 the body of the document are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to
268 candidates being considered for promotion to senior academic professional.

269 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

270 **1. Evaluation of Service**

271 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in Section VI
272 of the college manual which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements. Service roles
273 are assigned by the department depending on departmental needs and mission. Service
274 effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties. Service roles normally
275 assigned by the department (individual assignments may include all or some of these roles)
276 include:

- 277 • Facility/Service Management
- 278 • Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- 279 • Instructional Service (laboratory coordination is one example)
- 280 • Academic Advisement and Curriculum

- 281 • Contributions to the Department, College or University
- 282 • Professional Service
- 283 • Community and Public Service
- 284 • Published Materials
- 285 • Additional Service

286 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To
287 receive an *excellent* rating all assigned tasks must be performed thoroughly and in a timely
288 manner. The candidate must also play a leadership role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, cost
289 effectiveness and planning will also be part of the evaluation.

290 **2. Evaluation of Teaching**

291 For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching, instructional
292 assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The
293 effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department's mission and the
294 specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary on certain occasions
295 to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly match their skills/background.
296 The candidate will be shown special consideration under these conditions.

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

299 assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates to their assigned role in
300 the department.

301 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but
302 goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must provide evidence of
303 teaching effectiveness, such as:

- 304 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 305 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 306 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials,
307 and/or effective instructional techniques.
- 308 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if
309 these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 310 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented
311 for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.
- 312 6. Results of all standardized exams given to all students (e.g., the ACS standardized
313 exams).
- 314 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
315 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations (oral
316 and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
- 317 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned
318 societies.
- 319 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
320 teaching activities.
- 321 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
322 participation in textbook development.
- 323 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

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

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

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

332 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
333 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in service and teaching (if
334 applicable) relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
335 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must
336 be rated as *excellent* in service. Table A2 of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to
337 obtain this. The candidate must also be rated as *excellent* in teaching and Table A1 of the
338 Appendix outlines what this entails.

339 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

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

344 An appointment to an academic professional position is for a one-year period. Each academic
345 professional undergoes an annual review. The annual report of the previous year (except for
346 faculty in their first year at GSU), plus an updated curriculum vita and any other appropriate
347 material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process. The Chair of the Chemistry
348 Department in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee shall evaluate
349 performance in instruction and service using the specific standards described in the Appendix.

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

351 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
352 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and
353 deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental
354 committee of the whole will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written
355 assessment with ranking that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in instruction and
356 service to the departmental chair. As discussed in Section IIB of this document, a subcommittee
357 of the committee of the whole shall be formed for each candidate to provide an initial draft
358 evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but the committee of the whole must meet, discuss,
359 modify, and vote on the final recommendation. The Chair will provide an independent
360 assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's
361 Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in
362 teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair,* and
363 *poor*. Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings such as
364 "very good/excellent" are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as "very good but approaching
365 excellent" may be appropriate.

366 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion) review, its
367 purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and dialogue of the
368 academic professional's accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In
369 addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address possible deficiencies
370 before the fifth-year review.

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

372 All Senior Academic Professionals must undergo a comprehensive review every 5 years after
373 their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion Review for
374 Senior Academic Professionals is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term
375 teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach
376 his/her full potential. The Senior Academic Professional will be notified by the college in

377 advance of the Post-Promotion Review and the required materials they are required to provide
378 are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the Academic
379 Professional to the department chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The
380 departmental executive committee elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three
381 faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least one NTT faculty member of rank equal or higher to
382 that of the Senior Academic Professional). This committee evaluates the Senior Academic
383 Professional in the categories of instruction and service using the criteria summarized in the
384 Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment and on both evaluations
385 to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college manual

APPENDIX

Table A1. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evidence Considered in Evaluation
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	<p>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f):</p> <p>(a) update/revise courses (b) appropriate student perceptions¹ and appropriate grades/drop rates² (c) direct independent study and/or Chem 4160 courses, (d) pub. in instructional jour. (e) instructional creativity, and/or develop new courses (f) appropriate learning outcomes, favorable test results relative to those of other faculty teaching the same or similar courses/ACS exam results^{2,3} (g) involvement/participation with educationally focused grants/proposals</p>
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	<p>Normally⁴ 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)</p>
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	<p>3 items: (a), (b), and (f)</p>
Good	Meets obligations	<p>2 of 7 items, including (b)</p>

Fair	Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness	1 of 7 items
Poor	Substandard, ineffective teacher	0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints

¹Compared to the departmental 4 year average for the area and course level.

²Department's normal statistics for each level of courses will be used as the standard. Student performance and honors are applicable.

³Results on ACS national exams meet Departmental goals and expectations (previous results used as criteria).

⁴For Academic Professionals assigned limited teaching responsibilities (< 25% of job functions), “appropriate student perceptions, and appropriate grades/drop rates” (item (b) in “Evidence Considered in Evaluation”) is replaced with “appropriate student perceptions and/or appropriate grades/drop rates”.

Table A2. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Candidates

Service¹ Rating	Definition	Evidence Considered in Evaluation
Outstanding	Major effective leadership roles	Major effective role in department. Major effective role in College or Senate or University, or in a professional organization
Excellent	Effective departmental leadership role(s)	Effective role in department. Effective role in college or senate or university, 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.