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I. INTRODUCTION

The lecturers and academic professionals housed in the Department of Psychology are vital components of our faculty. The review and promotion process of these non-tenure track (NTT) faculty is intended to reflect and highlight their contributions to our department and their unique mission within the university, focused on their instruction within the Department of Psychology and their service within department, college, and/or university-based programs. While promotion to the level of senior lecturer, principal senior lecturer, or senior academic professional is not equivalent to tenure, such a promotion indicates the carefully adjudicated decision made by our department, the college, and the university that these faculty are extremely valuable and effective members of our department with whom we hope to have a long-term affiliation.

The policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks are outlined in this document (department guidelines), the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual). Whereas the university and college NTT manuals provide general statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document identifies the concrete forms these achievements should take. In particular, this document articulates the department’s criteria for the various rankings that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of teaching (if applicable for academic professionals) and service. Candidates should consult the college and university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and time-in-rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

The following two NTT faculty positions in use in the Department of Psychology are eligible for promotion. For each position, the ranks have been listed in parentheses starting with the lowest rank and ending with the highest possible rank. The general duties for each position are described in the college manual.

1. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
2. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)

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

A. Process Overview

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

1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the department chair.
2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s materials to the departmental review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).

3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the department chair. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s). The department chair will provide a copy of the departmental committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the department chair within three business days.

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

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

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

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above in the department, except the chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university levels. Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate’s credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its final recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s).

Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate’s current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the home department does not have a
sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with
at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

III. LECTURER REVIEWS

A. General Considerations

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

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Teaching

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
of the college’s policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education
requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of
teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to
their assigned role in the department.

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

Candidates may also provide evidence of recognition of their pedagogy by
constituencies within the department, college, or university, or institutions outside the
university; the degree to which their pedagogy has been innovative; the degree to which
they have assessed their pedagogical innovations; the degree to which they have
demonstrated effort to improve the effectiveness of their pedagogy; and their
contributions to scholarship on pedagogy and/or curriculum.
2. Evaluation of Service

As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university; professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies depending on the individual’s core mission as defined by the department, but it is generally at the department or college level. Contributions to service in the psychology department typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles, such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments; teaching service beyond the classroom (i.e., instructional service), such as developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, and supervising or mentoring faculty; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts or grant applications; contributions to the department, college, and university, such as student advisement and mentoring, memberships on department/college/university committees, and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards; community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

Candidates should document any arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. Examples of such duties include assistant director of lower-division studies, assistant to the graduate director, and directing exchange programs. The overall effectiveness of such service is evaluated based on the criteria of efficiency, dependability, and innovation.

3. Additional Considerations

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

a. Professional Development Contributions: It is expected that lecturers will manifest in their classes a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. One way (though not required for promotion) of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of scholarly or creative activities. Other ways include attending or participating in panels at professional conferences, and remaining current on readings in the field.

In considering a lecturer’s or senior lecturer’s performance in professional development, the department will not determine a specific level of accomplishment. Instead, the review committee will take careful account of the candidate’s professional development and use it to help determine the rating awarded in instruction and/or, when appropriate, the rating awarded in service. This reflects our belief that faculty members who are actively engaged in professional projects...
will be better teachers and members of the professional community. As a result, lecturers will be better able to convey to students -- as first-hand practitioners -- pedagogical insights about writing, research, theory, and other disciplinary matters. As teaching faculty of a research university, lecturers who have an active and successful record of professional development situate themselves as excellent colleagues of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. We recognize that lecturers, holding advanced degrees, have been trained for scholarly or creative activities, and should be fully encouraged to pursue these activities, which will enhance the overall accomplishments and reputation of the department.

Because a lecturer’s professional development is evaluated as a subordinate element of the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances his or her instructional effectiveness and/or service. One obvious way of doing this would be to show connections between the specific projects undertaken and the material taught in the classroom. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how a lecturer’s experience in the field of professional development relates to her or his performance in instruction or service.

The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are identical to those described in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (under ‘Criteria for Promotion and Tenure’): publications, editorial work, book reviews, hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences, awards and grants, and so forth.

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

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

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative terms outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be referenced in evaluations is included as an appendix to this document (see Appendix I).
1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

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

a. Teaching

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent*, the candidate’s performance and supporting material demonstrate evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, a classroom environment that consistently supports learning, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of student learning should consistently show that students meet course objectives. Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, taking into account such factors as the topic and format of course.

If appropriate to her or his workload, the candidate should demonstrate commitment to mentoring through individual direction of students. This involvement in individual student mentoring may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study courses and/or provision of guidance to students in professional development or course selection. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship; examples of such evidence include student presentations, applications to graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation. The candidate also should be involved with the department’s overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals, course revisions, or study abroad programs).

b. Service

The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to senior lecturer with a rating of *very good* if the candidate is an active colleague who serves when asked, takes initiative in developing helpful service contributions, and succeeds according to his or her own initiative. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the department (e.g., service to the Honors College, the Office of Student Life, or a university-recognized student group). A candidate evaluated as *very
good in service may also have some service outreach responsibilities outside of the
University.

2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer

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

a. Teaching

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
of excellent, in addition to meeting the requirements for excellence at the senior
lecturer level, the candidate’s teaching effectiveness is visible through direct measures
such as student learning outcomes and other departmental assessments. There should
be evidence that, over the length of her or his teaching career, the candidate has grown
pedagogically in ways that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of
teaching. This growth may also include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which
should be assessed by the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as
student evaluations, see above); innovations need not always have been successful. This
candidate should be able to document external recognition of teaching skill (e.g.,
teaching awards, production of a significant article or other publication on pedagogy,
external funding for pedagogical initiatives, or the development and diffusion of
pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the larger teaching community).
The candidate rated as excellent at this level normally will demonstrate extensive and
successful involvement in individual student mentoring as described above.

b. Service

The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
principal senior lecturer with a rating of excellent if the candidate continues to meet the
service requirements for promotion to senior lecturer and demonstrates growth in
service since the time of the last review. This growth must include service in a long-
term administrative role (e.g., practicum coordinator, Director of Undergraduate
Studies) or in in multiple short-term leadership roles (e.g., chair of multiple committees)
and performance of distinctive service in these roles, as well as service on a wider range
of committees. It may include service-related innovation (e.g., creating and supervising
a new program that supports the department’s instructional mission) and or significant service to graduate teaching assistants and faculty colleagues (e.g., through teaching consultation, mentorship, guest lecturing). It may also include significant service to the college, the university, a professional or practice community, and/or a professional organization.

D. Other Lecturer Reviews

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

1. Annual Review of Lecturers

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

2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental subcommittee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers will prepare an evaluation of the lecturer’s teaching and service. The department chair will provide an independent assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for further evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in Appendix I. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year promotion review; it is meant to review the lecturer’s achievements to date and provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

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

The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy, and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member’s teaching and service records over the past five years and will employ the criteria described in Appendix I. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). The
department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for response.

IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

A. General Considerations

There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior academic professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary consideration is service contributions, while teaching contributions will be considered if the candidate’s workload includes teaching. Supplemental consideration is given to contributions in the area of professional development as they bear on the candidate’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance (if applicable). This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to senior academic professional.

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Service

Service comprises at least 50% of the academic professional’s job functions. The quality of service of academic professionals is of paramount importance. Recognizing that each academic professional position is unique, the review committee will base its assessment of the candidate’s quality of service on the specific duties assigned to each academic professional. Candidates, with the approval of the chair and the Dean’s Office, should provide a summary of essential functions and responsibilities related to their program and position. Candidates will be evaluated in consideration with the areas below.

a. To demonstrate their service, candidates for promotion should

i. collect and provide written evidence of their diligence and effectiveness in performing the essential functions and responsibilities of their position.

ii. include in the dossier a list of programmatic duties approved by the chair and the Dean’s office, administrative roles, contributions to the development of their university and departmental initiatives, and committees served on, with brief descriptions of the work performed in each of these areas, such as reports or other documents prepared by the candidate.

b. Expectations regarding types of service activities will be detailed at the time of appointment in writing and may be modified at the annual evaluation. Service includes advising and serving the academic needs of students, and is typically
performed at the departmental and college levels, but may include university
service. Professional service, as well as public service involving professional
expertise, is also relevant.

2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
of the college’s policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates
to their assigned role in the department.

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

Additionally, when individual student instruction is included in the candidate’s
workload, the following information should be provided: supervision of directed
readings or independent study courses; direction of honors theses; membership on
student committees; advisement of students; and evidence of students’ successful
endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship (e.g., presentations and
publications).

3. Additional Considerations

Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the academic
professional review include the following:

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

b. Professional Development Contributions: It is expected that academic professionals
will manifest in their classes and in their programmatic work a rich intellectual
background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. One
way (though not required) of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of
scholarly or creative activities. Other ways include attending or participating in
panels at professional conferences, as well as remaining current on readings in the
field.

In considering an academic professional’s performance in professional development
during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the department will not determine a
specific level of accomplishment. Instead, the review committee will take careful
account of the candidate’s professional development and use it to help determine
the rating awarded in service and instruction. This reflects our belief that a faculty
member who is actively engaged in professional projects of some kind will be a
better teacher as a result, and will also serve better in the service role designated for
his or her particular appointment as academic professional: better able to convey to
students -- as a first-hand practitioner -- pedagogical insights about writing,
research, theory, and other disciplinary matters; and better able to perform
administrative duties because she or he has a significant professional standing.

Since an academic professional’s professional development is evaluated as a
subordinate element of the overall record in service and instruction, it is incumbent
on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the
dossier enhances her or his service and instructional effectiveness. One obvious way
of doing this would be to show connections between the specific projects
undertaken and the material taught in the classroom or service conducted on
campus. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how an
academic professional’s experience in the field of professional development relates
to his or her performance in instruction and service.

The specific forms of professional development that an academic professional may
produce are identical to those described at the beginning of this manual (under
‘Criteria for Promotion and Tenure’): publications, editorial work, book reviews,
hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences, awards and
grants, and so forth. All such work, whether produced during or before an academic
professional’s tenure at Georgia State University, may be included in the dossier.

Scholarship directly concerning pedagogy, curriculum, and so forth, should be
included in the ‘Instruction’ section of the dossier rather than a ‘Professional
Development’ section.

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
using the evaluative terms outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The
single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category is defined in
this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be referenced in
evaluations is included as an appendix to this document (see Appendix II).

1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional

For promotion to the rank of senior academic professional, the candidate must
demonstrate a level of assigned service to the department, college and/or university,
and/or the professional and practice community that is evaluated as excellent. If the
candidate’s workload includes teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as
demonstrating a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is also
evaluated as excellent, which meets the university standard for promotion to the rank of senior academic professional.

a. Service

The service of Academic Professionals is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. Specifically, candidates will be judged excellent if they have (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been highly effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) effectively assumed substantial service roles that serve the mission of the university, within the scope of their appointment. In addition, candidates may have made significant contributions to professional associations or to other organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that benefit from the candidate’s expertise.

b. Teaching

As stated in the college manual, promotion to senior academic professional is available only to those who are judged to be excellent in teaching. A candidate will be judged excellent in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at teaching, which is typically demonstrated in classroom-related instruction and mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective candidates will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course.

Depending on workload assignment, the candidate may be expected to demonstrate a commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom. Involvement in mentoring may include, for example, involvement on thesis committee(s), supervision of directed readings, research or independent study courses, direction of honors theses, and advisement of students with regard to professional development, or course selection. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship; examples of such evidence include presentations, applications to graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation.

D. Other Academic Professional Reviews

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

Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the academic professional track faculty member’s service and teaching (if her/his workload includes teaching) using the criteria described in Appendix II, depending on her/his current rank.

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

The third-year review for academic professionals is designed to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior academic professional. A departmental subcommittee composed of three faculty, which will include tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from each when the department has an available senior academic professional within its ranks), will prepare an evaluation of the academic professional’s service and teaching (if applicable). The department chair will provide an independent assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for further evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in Appendix II. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year promotion review: it is meant to encourage an assessment of, and dialogue about, an academic professional’s achievements to date, and to generate advice about possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

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

The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior academic professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if applicable). The review will cover the faculty member’s service and teaching (if applicable) records over the past five years and will employ the criteria described in Appendix II. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of senior academic professional (with representation from each when the department has an available senior academic professional within its ranks). The department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for response.
APPENDIX I. Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

A. Teaching

Poor: The lecturer displays an unacceptable record of classroom-based teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document, minimal/ineffective involvement or no involvement in mentoring students or in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

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

Good: The lecturer does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document.

Very Good: The lecturer is a highly competent candidate whose supporting material includes evidence not only of effective classroom teaching, but also of some mentoring of students and a commitment to the mission of the department. Markers of classroom teaching effectiveness are described in the body of this document.

Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer): The lecturer’s performance and supporting material demonstrate the dedicated work of a teacher and faculty member who displays evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department. Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of student learning consistently show that students meet course objectives. Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, taking into account such factors as the topic and format of course. The classroom environment consistently supports learning. If appropriate to the candidate’s workload, involvement in individual student mentoring may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study courses. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship. The
candidate also should be involved with the department’s overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals, course revisions, or study abroad programs).

**Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of excellent indicates that, in addition to meeting the requirements for excellence at the senior lecturer level, the candidate’s teaching effectiveness is visible through direct measures such as student learning outcomes and other departmental assessments. There should be evidence that, over the length of her or his teaching career, the candidate has grown pedagogically in ways that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This growth may also include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which should be assessed by the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as student evaluations, see above); innovations need not always have been successful. This candidate should be able to document external recognition of teaching skill (e.g., teaching awards, production of a significant article or other publication on pedagogy, external funding for pedagogical initiatives, or the development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the larger teaching community). The candidate rated as excellent at this level normally will demonstrate extensive, successful involvement in individual student mentoring as described above.

**Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The record of highly effective instruction exceeds the criteria for excellent described above. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional preparation; the faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, as indicated, for example, by training grants or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may have published a textbook or curriculum or peer reviewed articles on the scholarship of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.

**Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of outstanding characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the department’s pedagogical mission and the cutting edge of pedagogy in the field. In addition to meeting criteria for excellent described above, he or she will have a record demonstrating that his/her classes and instructional programs manifest an innovative pedagogical proficiency that has a broad, positive impact on other faculty and on the departmental curriculum at large. This candidate will take a leadership role in the department’s instructional mission (e.g., learning outcome assessment, retention/progression/graduation initiatives, and curriculum development). There should be external validation, as well, of this candidate’s prowess: teaching awards and prestigious pedagogical publications (which could be print or online resources) that have a demonstrated national impact are examples of this.
B. Service

Poor: The lecturer manifests no significant service accomplishments. The lecturer may serve on departmental committees, but without a documentable impact.

Fair: The lecturer manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The lecturer has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks that were assigned.

Very Good: The lecturer is an active colleague who serves when asked, often suggests his or her own helpful service projects and roles, and succeeds according to her or his own initiative. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the department (e.g., service to the Honors College, the Office of Student Life, or a university-recognized student group). A candidate evaluated as very good in service may also have some service outreach responsibilities outside of the University.

Excellent: The lecturer continues to meet the service requirements for a rating of very good and demonstrates growth in service since the time of the last review. This growth must include service in a long-term administrative role (e.g., practicum coordinator, Director of Undergraduate Studies) or in in multiple short-term leadership roles (e.g., chair of multiple committees) and performance of distinctive service in these roles, as well as service on a wider range of committees. It may include service-related innovation (e.g., creating and supervising a new program that supports the department’s instructional mission), as well as significant service to graduate teaching assistants and faculty colleagues (e.g., through teaching consultation, mentorship, guest lecturing). It may also include significant service to the college, the university, a professional or practice community, and/or a professional organization.

Outstanding: A lecturer will be judged outstanding in service if criteria for excellent are met and s/he has a track record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university; has been substantially active and engaged in a professional organization; and/or has won a prestigious service award.
APPENDIX II. Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Academic Professional-Track Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

A. Service

Poor: The academic professional manifests no significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but without a documentable impact.

Fair: The academic professional manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The academic professional has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks assigned to them, within the scope of their appointment.

Very Good: The academic professional has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) assumed service roles that serve the mission of the department or university, within the scope of their appointment.

Excellent: The academic professional has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been highly effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) effectively assumed substantial service roles that serve the mission of the university, within the scope of their appointment. In addition, candidates may have made significant contributions to professional associations or to other organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that benefit from his or her expertise.

Outstanding: Academic professionals will be judged outstanding if the criteria for excellent are met and s/he has a track record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university; has been substantially engaged in professional organizations; and/or has won a prestigious service award.
B. Teaching (if applicable)

**Poor:** The academic professional displays an unacceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal and ineffective or no involvement in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Fair:** The academic professional displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document, minimal involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Good:** An academic professional will be judged good in teaching if the academic professional does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document.

**Very Good:** The academic professional will be judged very good in teaching if the evidence indicates that the academic professional is effective in teaching, typically demonstrated by effective classroom instruction – based on the markers of effectiveness described above – and moderate involvement in mentoring students, if mentoring is expected in a candidate’s assigned workload.

**Excellent:** The academic professional will be judged excellent in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at teaching, which is typically demonstrated by effectiveness in classroom-related instruction and is engaged in effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective academic professionals will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Depending on workload assignment, the academic professional may be expected to demonstrate a commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom. Involvement in mentoring may include, for example, involvement on thesis committee(s), supervision of directed readings, research or independent study courses, direction of honors theses, and advisement of students. Other mentoring activities relevant to the academic professional’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the academic professional’s mentorship.
Outstanding: An academic professional will be judged outstanding in teaching if the record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational performance in the classroom, the course materials presented show exceptional preparation, and the candidate demonstrates a high level of effective mentoring of students. The academic professional may have also published a textbook or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.