

**Department of Geosciences
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University**

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

Policy Title:	Department of Geosciences Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Departmental Approval:	October 06, 2016
College Approval:	October 10, 2016
Effective:	October 10, 2016

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2
3 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty members provide important components of the
4 Geosciences instructional program. These faculty members also make important service
5 contributions to the Department, College, University, and to their professional communities.
6 The Department of Geosciences currently employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the
7 lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track (listed from most junior to most senior)
8 are Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The review and promotion
9 processes also note the special contributions that the lecturer corps makes in instruction and
10 service to the Department, College, University, and to their professional communities. The
11 workloads of lecturer-track faculty may vary year-to-year. These workloads are determined
12 by the Chair for all Geosciences (GEOS) faculty members, consistent with relevant College and
13 University workload policies.
14

15 The Department has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review
16 and promotion of faculty in NTT ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general
17 requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with
18 the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and Georgia State University
19 guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University Promotion
20 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual), and (2) the College of Arts and
21 Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), along with these
22 departmental guidelines. In the event of a conflict between the departmental and
23 college/university documents, the college/university documents take precedence.
24

25 Promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and from Senior Lecturer to Principal
26 Senior Lecturer are not accompanied by the award of Tenure. However, these promotions
27 reflect the sense of the faculty that the candidate for promotion is a valuable asset to the
28 department. Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires that the individual's performance over
29 the five-year review period merits ratings of at least *excellent* in teaching and *very good* in
30 service, consistent with the assigned service role (see below). For promotion to Principal
31 Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and
32 effectiveness in teaching and continued growth in the time period since the last promotion,
33 and be ranked as *excellent* in teaching. The candidate must also be ranked as *excellent* in
34 service, reflecting leadership in appropriate service roles within and external to Georgia State
35 University.
36

37 This document describes the criteria to be used by the department in evaluation of a
38 Lecturer seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer and for a Senior Lecturer seeking promotion
39 to Principal Senior Lecturer. The departmental criteria follow the general framework
40 established in the college manual but are more detailed and specific to the needs and
41 expectations within the Department of Geosciences.
42

43 **II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER**
44 **AND PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER**

45 **A. Process Overview**

46 The primary stages of the Department's NTT faculty review process are outlined
47 below. These steps must be carried out following a time schedule provided by the
48 College of Arts and Sciences.
49

- 50 1. After consultation with the department chair, if the eligible candidate intends
51 to pursue the promotion track, then the following review process begins. As

52 described in the College Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty, the Dean's office
53 notifies the candidate about their eligibility for promotion and forwards a copy
54 to the department chair. The candidate will discuss his/her qualification with
55 the chair and then subsequently submit the required review materials outlined
56 in the college manual to the department chair according to the schedule
57 provided by the college.

- 58 2. The department chair forwards the candidate's review materials to a
59 subcommittee of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the
60 whole) to initiate the review. The final review must be made by the committee
61 of the whole.
- 62 3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation with signatures to the
63 department chair, including any minority report(s). Endorsements of the
64 specific committee members should not be revealed to the candidate.
65 Therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be
66 removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the
67 committee's report(s).
- 68 4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the
69 departmental committee review, including minority report(s), to the Dean's
70 Office, and provides copies of these documents to the candidate. The candidate
71 has the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair reports,
72 addressed to the Dean's Office, within three business days after receiving the
73 documents from the chair. The Dean's Office will then provide the department
74 chair with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the department
75 committee and chair's report.

76
77 At this point, the review process passes from the department to the college and then to
78 the university. See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review
79 process at the college and university level.

80
81 **B. Departmental NTT Promotion Review Committee (Committee of the Whole)**

82 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be
83 composed of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above
84 (Senior Lecturer, Principle Senior Lecturer, and Senior Academic Professional) in
85 the department, except the chair of the department and those members of the
86 department serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion
87 application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the department
88 chair will appoint a three- to five-member subcommittee, with at least one TT and
89 one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole. The department chair
90 shall also appoint a committee chair selected from the subcommittee. The
91 subcommittee has the responsibility to thoroughly analyze the candidate's dossier,
92 coordinate deliberation with the committee members, and provide initial
93 evaluation of the dossier. Final recommendation regarding promotion must be
94 made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must discuss the

95 candidate's eligibility for promotion, and arrive at a majority recommendation. All
96 actions of the committee of the whole must be approved by majority vote.

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

- 98 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the
- 99 promotion and review procedures adopted by the Department.
- 100 2. Approve, by majority vote, an overall recommendation for each candidate.
- 101 3. Deliver the written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the
- 102 committee of the whole to the departmental chair.
- 103 4. Submit signed minority reports (if any) of committee members who disagree
- 104 with the written majority recommendation to the departmental chair. This report
- 105 should include recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.
- 106

107 The vote for the recommendation will be in the form of signatures on the final
108 recommendation report. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the
109 candidate's current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the
110 committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the department chair and
111 dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be authorized to vote
112 in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean may augment
113 the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other
114 departments if the Department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to
115 constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a
116 tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at Senior level or above.

117
118 The committee of the whole must review all credentials and make a
119 recommendation to the chair of the department using the review and promotion
120 guidelines adopted by the Department in accord with the college and university
121 guidelines.

122 123 **C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service**

124 The rating system for all promotion and structured reviews of NTT faculty is as
125 follows: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. Factors used in
126 determining these ratings are listed in the Appendix A (teaching) and Appendix B
127 (service).

128 129 130 131 **III. ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING**

132 133 **A. Criteria**

134 The assessment of the candidate's teaching ranking will be based on performance and
135 evaluation of the following primary criteria: the quality of course content (Criterion 1);
136 development of courses/program (Criterion 2); learning outcomes of classroom instruction

137 (Criterion 3); and student evaluations of classroom instruction (Criterion 4). These criteria
138 are described below.

139
140 **Quality of Course Content (Criterion 1):** The quality of course content will be
141 evaluated through review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary
142 materials. Syllabi should be reviewed and revised as necessary for conformity with university
143 guidelines. Reading assignments should be appropriate to course level and catalog
144 description. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to
145 the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such
146 as customized texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. A teaching portfolio
147 should be provided as indicated in the College format instructions.

148
149 **Development of New Courses or Teaching Programs (Criterion 2):** Evaluation will
150 include the effective development and execution of new courses, creativity, and significant
151 leadership in the development of teaching new courses and/or programs.

152
153 **Learning Outcomes of Classroom Instruction (Criterion 3):** Student learning can
154 be documented in a number of ways. Examples include: results of exam questions
155 administered to multiple sections of the same course; copies of answers to final exam
156 questions; results of pre- and end of course exams; results of capstone projects or field
157 exercises; presentation of student course work to audiences beyond the classroom.
158 Candidates should describe briefly the method(s) for assessing the learning outcomes for
159 their courses. The candidate is encouraged to write a section in their dossier for how they
160 achieved the specific learning outcomes for each course.

161
162 **Student Evaluations of Classroom Instruction (Criterion 4):** The candidate will
163 include the student evaluation scores (written and numerical). These student comments and
164 scores will be evaluated in the context of the range of scores for specific courses and for
165 similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the
166 disciplinary area. The information will also include other important variables, such as class
167 size, whether the course is required or an elective, response rate on the evaluations, written
168 comments by students, and number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations
169 are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged in the context of other
170 information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

171
172 The faculty will consider additional contributions in teaching by the candidate when
173 Criteria 1-4 are clearly satisfied for promotion to the next rank. These supplemental
174 contributions are defined as five Criteria (5-9), and achievement in at least one of these is
175 expected for a rating of *excellent*. Criterion (5): direction and mentoring of student work such
176 as, for example, independent studies, theses, practica. Criterion (6): Contributing
177 significantly as a co-investigator, collaborator, or lead investigator on instruction-oriented
178 projects that extend beyond the scope of development of new courses or refinement for an
179 existing course. Criterion (7): Receipt of award(s) from the College, University, National, or
180 State professional groups reflecting on instructional contributions. Criterion (8): Publication
181 of peer-reviewed pedagogical, disciplinary materials, and peer review of manuscripts
182 submitted to professional journals. Criterion (9): Receipt of intramural or extramural funding
183 leading to new instructional methods or enhancements on current instruction.

184
185 **Direction and Mentoring of Students (Criterion 5):** The extent and quality of
186 faculty efforts in the direction of student projects, field training, and academic activities will
187 be considered where these activities by the candidate are seen as exceptional and effective.
188 Examples of such activities include: development and leading independent studies and
189 practica; the direction of Masters theses and non-thesis projects; or comparable activities.

190 The exceptional nature and the effectiveness of these efforts will be judged in terms of the
191 extent and quality of such advisement as evident by the practica, theses, or independent
192 studies produced and/or such outcomes as student success in acceptance to graduate or
193 professional schools, scores on national examinations, and special awards or achievements to
194 the student.

195
196 **Instructional Projects (Criterion 6):** These projects are endeavors to improve
197 instruction or address specific areas related to instruction of students in Geosciences and
198 related fields (e.g., science education) beyond new course development. Lecturers involved in
199 educationally focused grants/proposals serving as a named function (Collaborator, Co-
200 Investigator or Primary Investigator) have the opportunity to investigate the effectiveness of
201 current instructional techniques or develop new techniques or research-related materials for
202 instruction. Instructional or disciplinary projects for science majors communicating
203 geosciences-related disciplines to students and trains them to be skilled and responsible
204 researchers, practitioners, teachers, or other professionals. Examples of projects that can be
205 included in this criteria include but are not limited to: CETL, USG-wide/cross-departmental
206 (STE(A)M) projects, Georgia Geographic Alliance, participation on review panels of
207 instructional proposals submitted to national agencies.

208
209 **Receipt of Awards and Recognition (Criterion 7):** The receipt of awards from
210 College, University, University System of Georgia, national, state, and/or from professional
211 societies reflecting the quality, impact, and/or effectiveness of the instruction and mentoring
212 done by the candidate are considered high valued achievements. These awards reflect well on
213 the instructional efforts by the candidate.

214 **Publication and Review of Instructional and/or Disciplinary Materials (Criterion**
215 **8):** These comprise contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning in the
216 geosciences. The publication of papers on new instructional techniques, paradigms, and/or
217 related topics in professional journals conveys new knowledge on instruction in geosciences
218 and related disciplines. The direction of undergraduate and graduate theses/research
219 projects may lead to peer-reviewed published work (abstracts and papers). Reviews of
220 journal articles, proposals, textbooks likewise should be substantive, for prominent
221 publishing houses and national organizations, and represent significant intellectual
222 contributions.

223
224 **Receipt of Intramural and Extramural Funding for Instructional and/or**
225 **Disciplinary Projects (Criterion 9):** The receipt of funding for instructional-related projects
226 is valued and may have transformative effects for the candidate's instruction. All intramural
227 and extramural funding received by the candidate should be listed in this section.

228 229 **B. Scope**

230
231 The candidate will prepare a dossier containing the components named in the College
232 of Arts and Sciences' *Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty*. Evaluation of teaching
233 effectiveness will use the criteria of the college's Policy on Assessment of Teaching for Full-
234 time Faculty (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).

235
236 As part of the College's policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness, the candidate
237 should include the teaching portfolio that he/she has compiled at Georgia State for the review
238 period (see Section V.E below in the College policy for guidelines on the number of years of
239 review materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college's
240 teaching assessment policy, teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all
241 courses for which the candidate has had primary responsibility including courses outside

242 GEOS (e.g. Honors College, NSCI, ISCI, study abroad, and in other departments). The candidate
243 should also provide a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses directed
244 by the candidate. In addition, the candidate shall include in the portfolio more complete data
245 (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year -
246 if possible, one specialty course and one more general course. In consultation with the
247 department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will
248 contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if
249 applicable). These portfolios will be assessed for appropriateness and completeness of
250 course content and course development. The scope and level of the material for each course
251 will be assessed for appropriateness and consistency with departmental policy for those
252 courses.

253
254 The dossier will also be reviewed for demonstrated and/or anticipated effectiveness
255 for achieving the learning/performance outcomes established by the department for those
256 courses. Numerical scores on student evaluations will be judged based on the type and level
257 of the course, and should be within departmental norms for the same type and level of
258 course. In specific instances, a lecturer may be permitted (with Department and College
259 approval) to teach graduate course where a lecturer has current knowledge and appropriate
260 qualifications

261 C. Ratings

262 **Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

263
264 A rating of at least *excellent* in teaching is required to be recommended for promotion
265 to the rank of Senior Lecturer. A candidate for promotion to this rank whose dossier shows
266 that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in all Criteria 1-4, plus
267 achieved effectiveness in one of the supplemental Criteria (5-9), will receive a rating of
268 *excellent* in teaching. A rating of *outstanding* is given where the candidate has achieved
269 effectiveness in Criteria 1-4 plus achieved effectiveness in two or more criteria (5-9). A
270 candidate whose dossier shows that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved
271 effectiveness in four, three, two, one (or none) of the areas will receive a rating of *very good*,
272 *good*, *fair*, or *poor*, respectively, in teaching. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are
273 summarized in Appendix A.

274 **Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer**

275
276 A rating of at least *excellent* in teaching is required to be recommended for promotion
277 to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer. In addition, a candidate for promotion to this rank
278 must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching in the
279 Geosciences and related disciplines with continued growth in the time period since the last
280 promotion. To achieve a rating of *excellent* at this level, normally the dossier will show that
281 he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in all Primary Criteria 1-4,
282 at least one supplementary Criteria (5-9) as well as provided evidence of continued growth.
283 Because promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer is an exceptional achievement, it is expected
284 that significant and new contributions since promotion to Senior Lecturer are demonstrated.
285 Examples of continued growth include: teaching new courses or significant revision of
286 existing courses, substantial direction of student work, improved student outcomes and
287 learning. A rating of *outstanding* is given where the candidate has put forth the effort and
288 achieved effectiveness in Criteria 1-4, plus two or more supplemental criteria (6-9). A
289 candidate whose dossier shows that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved
290 effectiveness in four, three, two, one (none) of the areas will receive a rating of *very good*,
291 *good*, *fair*, or *poor*, respectively, in teaching. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are
292 summarized in Appendix A.

293
294

295 **IV. ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE**

296

297

A. Forms of Service

298

299 Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Senior Lecturers are crucial to
300 the success of Geosciences. The service of lecturers is evaluated with respect to the quantity
301 of service, and quality of service. The quality of service reflects the degree of diligence, and
302 level of effectiveness in the performance of the service. Examples of important service roles
303 for a Lecturer at the Department level would be (and not limited to): active participation by
304 the candidate in the facilitation of introductory and upper division/graduate course
305 laboratories; assistance to colleagues in areas that contribute to the mission and reputation
306 of the department; effective participation in the department's committee system, particularly
307 in areas that directly support instruction; and performance of other service activities deemed
308 appropriate by the department (e.g. grade appeals, web sites, awards night, undergraduate
309 committee, graduate committee). In the Department of Geosciences, there is a large logistical
310 burden regarding infrastructural upkeep and maintenance of equipment and facilities in
311 geoscience (rock preparation, introductory, specialized discipline) labs, and vehicles for field
312 activities. A Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer whose instruction
313 depends on these facilities would be expected to demonstrate active participation leading to
314 the smooth running of these laboratory and field facilities.

314

315 The quantity of service expected of Lecturers may vary, and will be consistent with the
316 instructional load and years of service at rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal
317 Senior Lecturer. Moreover, given that the quantity may change from year to year, the Chair
318 will be available to provide guidance to each Lecturer to help them understand their service
319 assignments. After having established first a very good record of service at the department
320 level (see below), the candidate may undertake service at College and University levels
321 (Panther Preview, Freshmen Learning Communities, and College Committees, Senate
322 membership) with consultation with the Chair.

323

324

B. Scope

325 Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
326 responsibilities and external service commitments. Lecturers who are assigned a full
327 teaching load each term may have a different departmental service load than those lecturers'
328 assigned major departmental and/or college roles. Such additional assigned roles may
329 include service as Undergraduate Director, and course lab manual responsibilities of courses
330 with high enrollments. As noted previously, the service of lecturers is evaluated with respect
331 to quantity and level of quality. Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Senior Lecturers who
332 have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended
333 committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and
334 in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and
335 effectively qualify for a rating of *very good* in service.

336

337 Effective service outside the department and outside the university will also be
338 considered for promotion of a Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and a promotion of a Senior
339 Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer. Examples of this type of activity would be participation
340 in activities such as Saturday Schools (e.g. Professional Geology Exam Preparation courses),
341 Science Olympiad, and talks to middle-school and high-school groups; leadership roles in the
342 professional community (e.g. Georgia Geographic Alliance, SEDAAG, GSA), service activities in
343 support of local and national professional societies (AAG, GSA). Depending on the quantity,
344 effectiveness and role of service outside Geosciences, the candidate may be rated as *excellent*
345 or *outstanding*. Exceptional Departmental service may lead to a rating of *excellent* without
346 service at the College or University level under unusual circumstances where the candidate
347 has made very strong contributions. Departmental service considered not executed

348 thoughtfully, diligently, or effectively will receive a rating below *very good* (*good, fair or*
349 *poor*).

350
351 **C. Ratings**

352
353 **Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

354 Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer must be rated as *very good* in service to
355 be recommended for promotion. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are summarized
356 in Appendix B.

357
358 **Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer**

359 Candidates for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer must be rated as *excellent* in
360 service to be recommended for promotion. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are
361 summarized in Appendix B.

362
363
364 **V. OTHER REVIEWS OF LECTURER-TRACK FACULTY**

365
366 All GEOS faculty members undergo annual and cumulative reviews as per College and
367 University manuals. The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion
368 reviews are all distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time
369 periods and possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

370
371
372 **A. Annual Review**

373 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty
374 are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by
375 the faculty member, including updated CV, annual report information covering the prior
376 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate material. In consultation with
377 the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the lecturer-track
378 faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

379
380
381 **B. Third-Year Review**

382 In keeping with the college manual, a Lecturer in the Department of Geosciences will
383 undergo a cumulative review in their third year to assess whether the individual is on track
384 for promotion to Senior Lecturer. This review will be conducted by a three-member
385 departmental subcommittee consisting of tenured faculty, Senior Lecturers, and Principal
386 Senior Lecturers, which is elected by the committee of the whole. If the Department does not
387 have a Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer, then the Department shall seek and
388 appoint a Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer from outside the Department to serve as one
389 member of the three member committee in consultation with Deans Office. In cases when
390 there are no other NTT faculty members of appropriate rank available, the committee will
391 consist entirely of tenured faculty in the department. The subcommittee will investigate and
392 evaluate the accomplishments and progress of the candidate in the areas of teaching and
393 service, measured against the standards for teaching and service necessary for promotion to
394 Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer. The subcommittee will identify areas in which
395 the candidate is strong and those in which the candidate is either weak or in need of
396 improvement. The results will be used to inform the Committee of the Whole and the
397 candidate as to the areas that must be improved before the candidate is considered for
398 promotion at the end of the fifth year. The findings will be communicated to all tenured
399 faculty, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Senior Lecturers in GEOS for any comment prior to
400 sending to the Chair. The Chair will write a separate assessment. The committee members'

401 identity shall remain confidential and communication with the candidate done through the
402 Chair.

403
404 **C. Post-Promotion Review (Senior Lecturer and Principal Senior Lecturer)**

405 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every
406 five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the post-
407 promotion review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and
408 effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that
409 will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer or Principal
410 Senior Lecturer (candidate) will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion
411 review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of
412 the college manual. This material is submitted by the candidate to the department chair
413 according to a schedule provided by the college in advance of the review. The departmental
414 committee of the whole elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty
415 who are either tenured or at the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer (with representation from
416 each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). This
417 committee evaluates the candidate in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria
418 summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment,
419 and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult
420 Section V.F of the college manual.

Appendix A: 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>Criteria- 1-5 plus at least one or more from Criteria 6-9:</p> <p>Course content (Criterion 1). (Criterion 2) Update/revise courses, creativity. (Criterion 3) Learning outcomes. (Criterion 4) Appropriate student perceptions and appropriate grades/drop rates, favorable test results relative to those of other faculty teaching the same or similar courses. (Criterion 5) Mentoring, direct independent study courses. (Criterion 6) Involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals. (Criterion 7) Awards. (Criterion 8) Publications, as related to instruction. (Criterion 9) Receipt of funding.</p>
Excellent	Innovative, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	<p>Normally Criteria 1-4. Plus at least one or more from Criteria 5-9.</p>
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	<p>Three Criteria of 1-4 including Criterion 1 and Criterion 4.</p>
Good	Meets obligations	<p>Two Criteria of 1-4 including Criterion 4.</p>
Fair	Needs improvement	<p>Criterion 4.</p>
Poor	Needs significant improvement	<p>None of Criteria 1-4.</p>

Appendix B. **Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Faculty**

Service 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.