

Department of History
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of History Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	10/10/2014
College Approval:	10/29/2014
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

15 The Department of History employs NTT faculty in the lecturer track at the following
16 ranks (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal
17 Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the college
18 manual.

19 **II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER AND**
20 **PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER**

21 **A. Process Overview**

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

- 24 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for
25 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
26 to the department chair.
- 27 2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s materials to the departmental
28 review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation
29 must be made by the committee as a whole).
- 30 3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority
31 reports, to the department chair. The department chair will provide a copy of the
32 departmental committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate
33 with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the
34 department chair within three business days.
- 35 4. The department chair submits her/his independent recommendation and the
36 recommendation of the departmental committee, including any minority reports
37 and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The department chair
38 will provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that
39 the candidate has the option to respond to the Dean’s Office within three business

40 days. The Dean's Office will provide to the department chair a copy of any response
41 from the candidate to the department chair's report.

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

44

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

46 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all
47 tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above in the department, except
48 the chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position
49 that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels.
50 Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and
51 evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the
52 committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on
53 its final recommendation. Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank
54 may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In
55 consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment the departmental
56 promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the
57 home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a
58 committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured and one being
59 NTT faculty.

60 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

61 **A. General Considerations**

62 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual
63 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
64 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
65 lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
66 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
67 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
68 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's
69 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
70 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document
71 are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being
72 considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

73 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

74 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

77 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
78 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education
79 requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of
80 teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to
81 their assigned role in the department.

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

84 **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through
85 review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and
86 other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for
87 promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Exam
88 questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course
89 level and catalog description. Writing assignments should develop the students' ability
90 to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent historical arguments
91 that answer meaningful questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their
92 appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may
93 provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other
94 course elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement
95 and success. In particular, credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are
96 structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their
97 students, as evidenced by course designs that push students to perceive how historical
98 problems are relevant to their lives and how historical methods can assist them in
99 gaining a deeper perspective on these problems. Candidates who are evaluated as
100 above the bar in teaching (defined as *excellent* or above, according to the college
101 manual, and described in more detail in Section C of this document) might have
102 demonstrated the ability to foster student engagement with meaningful historical
103 questions through the analysis of primary sources. Courses that connect students with
104 other university programs and resources and that take advantage of opportunities
105 created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as evidence of successful
106 teaching. And the department also encourages faculty to design courses with sufficient
107 points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to
108 provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the
109 semester unfolds. The department recognizes that teachers might use a variety of
110 methods. Candidates evaluated as above the bar in teaching, however, share a
111 sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and designing
112 assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

113 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
114 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective
115 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development
116 of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if
117 these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with
118 a travel component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study
119 abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Initiatives in the development of

120 new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or
121 exceed promotion standards are ones that affect significant numbers of students or
122 sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant achievements such as
123 the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research.

124 **c. Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will include student
125 evaluation scores, which are useful indicators of student perceptions of instruction.
126 Evaluation scores, which the department will not rely upon exclusively when
127 determining minimum qualifications for ratings, will be considered in the context of the
128 normal range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000,
129 etc.) within the department. The review will also consider other important variables
130 such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on
131 the evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In addition to average
132 scores, the department will also be attentive to mean and median scores and to the
133 impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative evidence offered by the students'
134 written comments on the student evaluation forms will receive serious attention from
135 the department as a meaningful supplement to the quantitative data from the
136 evaluation instruments. In light of these contextual elements, successful candidates for
137 promotion normally earn consistently strong evaluations and high scores, as defined
138 below.

139 **d. Direction of students:** The department will assess the extent and quality of faculty
140 efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as
141 independent studies, honors theses, student research presented at GSURC, as well
142 individual student engagement in historical projects or programs hosted by other
143 institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering
144 additional tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for underperforming in
145 their history classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are
146 pursuing additional research projects connected to their history coursework. Faculty
147 members' willingness to write letters of recommendation for undergraduate and
148 graduate students might also be viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category
149 of teaching effectiveness.

150 **e. Development of new skills:** The department encourages faculty to continue to
151 develop skills and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to
152 improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as above the bar in teaching might exhibit an
153 ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo
154 formal training to gain new certifications and competencies may present such
155 achievements to the department as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of
156 best practices in historical pedagogy. The department recognizes that new skills need
157 not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more interactive classroom
158 exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing might contribute to a
159 faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

160 **2. Evaluation of Service**

161 Contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service, the
162 administration of department programs, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the
163 department, college, or university, professional service, and community and public
164 service. NTT faculty whose responsibilities focus on teaching undergraduate courses
165 normally will be assigned service that focuses on undergraduate student success. While
166 such assignments will be chosen by the chair, NTT faculty might be asked to mentor
167 graduate teaching assistants or visiting lecturers; or they might be asked to play a role in
168 advising undergraduate majors. They might be asked to take a leadership role in
169 directing the undergraduate honors curriculum or the departmental internship program,
170 or departmental efforts at job placement for history undergraduate and graduate
171 students. NTT faculty will frequently be assigned to the Freshman Studies Committee or
172 the Undergraduate Committee. For lecturers with primary responsibility for graduate
173 instruction, program direction, student advisement, the securing of external grants, and
174 departmental committee service will be judged with respect to degree of diligence and
175 level of effectiveness, evidence of which will be provided by colleagues in the
176 department and the department chair. Faculty efforts to recruit undergraduate majors
177 and applicants to departmental graduate programs will also be viewed as evidence of
178 successful service.

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

185

186 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

189 **1. Professional Development Contributions:** The Department shall consider
190 professional development activities (e.g. publications of their research and scholarship,
191 conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded) as they bear on the
192 lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production of
193 peer-reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the
194 department certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-
195 reviewed publications, publications or appearances in popular media, participation in
196 academic conferences, and/or the pursuit of grants to fund historical research all, by
197 definition, enhance the candidates' case that they are modeling the best practices of the
198 profession to students. Such professional development can also help the candidate's
199 case for promotion if it can be shown to augment the faculty member's expertise in
200 subjects relevant to the classroom.

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

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

208

209 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

223 **a. Teaching**

224 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
225 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's record shows consistently high levels of achievement
226 in multiple categories for assessing teaching detailed above. His or her course materials
227 illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his
228 or her pedagogy. Normally, he or she earns scores on the student evaluations that fall in
229 the mid- "4" range or higher. Additionally, he or she might have a track record of
230 developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring
231 undergraduate or graduate students.

232

233 **b. Service**

234 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
235 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate effectively fulfills his or her assigned roles;
236 rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement
237 sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as opportunities to most
238 effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results for undergraduate and
239 graduate students.

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

241 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate
242 a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as
243 *excellent*, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a
244 level of assigned service to the department, college, university, and/or to the
245 professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the
246 university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for
247 promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time
248 period since the last promotion. This growth might be in the area of teaching or service
249 or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher ranking in one of these areas, but this
250 need not necessarily be the case so long as the candidate has made improvements in
251 discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made new
252 contributions in teaching or service.

253 **a. Teaching**

254 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
255 of *excellent*, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement in multiple
256 categories for assessing teaching detailed above. His or her course materials illustrate a
257 long-term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his
258 or her pedagogy. His or her student evaluations are consistently strong, normally
259 earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper “4” range. He or she demonstrates a
260 sustained track record of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate
261 students, as well as developing new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition
262 to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate’s growth as
263 a teacher should also extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one’s
264 teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more
265 of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of
266 classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other publication on
267 pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical
268 initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of
269 mentored students. A candidates whose record of achievement does not self-evidently
270 conform to this standard should document and explain how their record corresponds to
271 a similar level of significance and achievement.

272
273 **b. Service**

274 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
275 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if he or she has highly effectively
276 carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the
277 department over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate exhibits a track record of
278 providing assistance to departmental advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants
279 and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition to continued growth in the areas
280 of service described above, the candidate’s growth in service should take one or more of
281 the following forms: highly effective service as a departmental program director or in a

282 role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant
283 service to the profession or community.

284

285 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

286 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
287 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
288 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
289 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
290 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

291

292 **1. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

293 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's
294 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental
295 subcommittee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured
296 faculty and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of
297 the lecturer's record. The department chair will provide an independent assessment
298 before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the
299 record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale used for
300 promotion reviews. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of
301 the fifth-year review; it is meant to review the lecturer's achievements to date and
302 provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the
303 fifth-year review.

304

305 **2. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers**

306 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
307 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy,
308 and accomplished in their service profiles. Faculty under review will present their
309 dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least
310 three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with
311 representation from each). The department chair will provide an independent
312 assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

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

315

316 **A. Teaching**

317

318 **Poor:** Candidates will be judged to be *poor* in teaching if one does not fulfill one's duties
319 as an instructor.

320

321 **Fair:** Candidates will be judged to be *fair* in teaching if one inconsistently or ineffectively
322 executes one's duties as an instructor. Course syllabi give evidence of incomplete
323 understanding of the field; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise
324 deficient. Student perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction.

325

326 **Good:** Candidates will be judged to be *good* in teaching if one does not always
327 effectively execute one's duties as an instructor. Course syllabi are incomplete or
328 unhelpful; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise deficient. Student
329 perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction. A ranking of *good* indicates
330 substandard classroom performance.

331

332 **Very Good:** Candidates will be judged to be *very good* in teaching if their overall
333 teaching record is highly competent; such teachers successfully execute their duties as
334 instructors but, in contrast to teachers that meet the bar, are not demonstrating a
335 willingness to grow further in their teaching practices by bringing a measure of creativity
336 to the classroom or by spending significant time beyond regular office hours to engage
337 students in the course materials or the benefits of the major. Conversely, an otherwise
338 strong teaching record may be evaluated as *very good* if student evaluations have a
339 declining trajectory or present overall concerns about student perceptions.

340

341 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The *excellent* teacher shows consistently high
342 levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. His or her course
343 materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to
344 improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, his or her student evaluations are consistently
345 high. Additionally, he or she might have a track record of developing new courses or
346 protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate
347 students.

348

349 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated expectations
350 for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the
351 rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of consistently high student
352 evaluations in the mid- to upper "4" range and will have demonstrated successful
353 mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students and development new courses
354 or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of
355 teaching described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend into

356 areas beyond those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For
357 example, candidates might engage in one or more of the following activities: production
358 of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches;
359 production of an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal
360 and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions;
361 student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.
362

363 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The candidate's impact on students is of
364 the highest level. On top of the expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching
365 appropriate to his or her rank, as described above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a
366 mastery of instruction in his or her area as evidenced by at least one of the following:
367 successful pursuit of external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching
368 awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

369 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated
370 expectations for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, the candidate for promotion
371 to the rank of principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as *outstanding* if he or she has
372 achieved more than one of the following: production of a publication suitable for use in
373 the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other
374 publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for
375 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other
376 accomplishments of mentored students. Candidates whose record of achievement does
377 not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and explain how their
378 record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

379

380 **B. Service**

381

382 **Poor:** Candidates judged to be *poor* in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations
383 and are not responsible citizens of the department.

384

385 **Fair:** Candidates judged to be *fair* in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service
386 obligations or are not responsible citizens of the department.

387

388 **Good:** Candidates judged to be *good* in service do not always effectively fulfill assigned
389 service obligations or are not consistently responsible citizens of the department.

390

391 **Very Good:** The candidate will be judged to be *very good* in service if they
392 enthusiastically and effectively fulfill their assigned roles; rather than merely attending
393 committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement sessions, such faculty actively
394 participate, using these meetings as opportunities to most effectively govern the
395 department and to achieve positive results for undergraduate and graduate students.

396 **Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been highly
397 effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the
398 mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate might
399 exhibit a track record of providing assistance to departmental advising efforts or to
400 graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition to
401 continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in
402 service should also take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as a
403 departmental program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility;
404 recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the profession or community.

405
406 **Outstanding:** On top of the stated expectations to achieve a rating of *excellent* in
407 service, the candidate will be judged to be *outstanding* in service if they have not only
408 fulfilled their assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to
409 seek out best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the success of the
410 department in meeting its stated goals. Faculty members judged to be outstanding in
411 service will have been recognized by their peers, students, or university administrators
412 as having established a long track record of success in improving campus life in
413 measurable or noticeable ways. Highly effective service as a departmental program
414 director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility, as well as extraordinary service
415 to the profession or community, are also indications of outstanding service.