

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

Policy Title:	Department of World Languages and Cultures Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	03/27/2015
College Approval:	05/18/2015
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of World Languages and
3 Cultures are vital components of our faculty. The policies and procedures related to the
4 review and 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’s criteria for the various rankings that candidates for promotion might
12 receive in the areas of teaching and service. Candidates should consult the college and
13 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 World Languages and Cultures employs regular, full-time NTT faculty
16 in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed
17 from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior
18 Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer- track faculty are described in the college
19 manual.

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

22 **A. Process Overview**

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

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

40 and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The department chair
41 will provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that
42 the candidate has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business
43 days. The Dean's Office will provide to the department chair a copy of any response
44 from the candidate to the department chair's report.

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

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

48 The Departmental Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all
49 tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the department (Senior
50 Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the chair of the department and any
51 members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate's
52 promotion application at the college or university levels. Departments may operate
53 through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate's
54 credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole
55 membership. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its
56 final recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must
57 be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the
58 recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must
59 provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and
60 supporting rationale. The signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be
61 removed when the candidate is provided with her or his copy of the committee's
62 report(s).

63
64 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final
65 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department
66 chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT
67 members from other departments when the home department does not have a
68 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with
69 at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

70 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

71 **A. General Considerations**

72 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual
73 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
74 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
75 lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
76 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
77 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
78 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's

79 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
80 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document
81 are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being
82 considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

83 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

84 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

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

94 **a. Quality of course content:** Lecturers in the Department of World Languages and
95 Cultures often teach courses with common syllabi and exams created by a coordinator
96 or by a committee. The quality of course content will be evaluated in courses for which
97 the candidate for promotion is solely or partially responsible for content creation. The
98 evaluation will include a review of such components as syllabi, exam questions, essay
99 assignments, in-class exercises, readings, as well as other appropriate elements. Syllabi
100 should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Exam questions should
101 require students to engage with material that is appropriate for the course level and
102 catalog description. Writing assignments involving research should develop the
103 students' ability to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent
104 arguments that answer meaningful questions. Course materials should be appropriate
105 and relevant to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide
106 additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other course
107 elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement and
108 success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that
109 cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. The department
110 recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods to meet these goals. In sum,
111 candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations demonstrate a
112 sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and in designing
113 assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

114 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
115 **improve existing courses:** Lecturers in World Languages and Cultures are sometimes
116 involved in curriculum design. When this is the case, evaluations will consider the
117 effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the
118 development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and

119 practices. The design of courses with a travel component and the subsequent successful
120 recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential achievement.
121 Additional contributions in the area of curriculum design that may occasionally be the
122 purview of Lecturers include upper-division courses involving student research and
123 involvement in the Atlanta community, such as the development or supervision of
124 internships or of courses involving contact with governmental, business or cultural
125 agencies.

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

139 **d. Direction of students:** While remaining constantly aware of the fact that the
140 Lecturer's teaching load usually consists mainly of lower-level language courses, the
141 department will give credit for extraordinary teaching-related efforts such as
142 independent studies, honors theses, and student research or creative work and
143 additional tutoring and mentoring of students. Documentation of letters of
144 recommendation written for undergraduate and graduate students might also be
145 viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

146 **e. Development of new skills:** The department encourages faculty to continue to
147 develop skills that may improve teaching, such as learning to master new software and
148 technology or to create interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical
149 conversation and writing.

150

151 **2. Evaluation of Service**

152 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality
153 instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university;
154 professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies
155 depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the department, but it is
156 generally at the department or college level. Contributions to service in the Department
157 of World Languages and Cultures typically fall into the following categories: assigned
158 service roles, such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing
159 assignments; instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula,

160 organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, or supervising or
161 mentoring faculty; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing and lending
162 expertise; contributions to the department, college, and university, such as student
163 advisement and mentoring, membership on department/college/university committees
164 (although membership on the Senate is not encouraged), and development of teaching
165 and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as active memberships
166 in professional societies and on advisory boards. The Lecturer will also be given credit
167 for any community or public service related to his or her teaching responsibilities.

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

174

175 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

178 **a. Professional Development Contributions:**

179 It is expected that lecturers will manifest in their classes a rich intellectual background
180 and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. Though not required
181 for promotion, one way of achieving such proficiency is through a program of scholarly
182 or creative activities. Other ways include attending or participating in panels at
183 professional conferences, and remaining current on scholarship in the field.

184 Since a lecturer's professional development is evaluated as a subordinate element of
185 the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate how
186 the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances his or her instructional
187 effectiveness and/or service. The specific forms of professional development that a
188 lecturer may produce are identical to those described in the departmental promotion
189 and tenure guidelines for tenure-track faculty: publications, editorial work, book
190 reviews, hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences, awards
191 and grants, and so forth. Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be
192 included in the Instruction section of the dossier rather than under a Professional
193 Development section.

194 **b. Role within the department:**

195 Since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers, like that of
196 tenure-track colleagues, may also change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the
197 college or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The
198 review will include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the
199 department and the ability of the lecturer to respond effectively to the changing needs

200 of the department.

201 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

215 **a. Teaching**

216 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
217 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's teaching record shows consistently high levels of
218 achievement as detailed above. The candidate's course materials, in the courses which
219 she or he designs in whole or in part, illustrate a long-term trajectory of an
220 accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Student
221 impressions, as reported in the student evaluations, are consistently strong. The
222 candidate demonstrates a sustained track record of successfully mentoring
223 undergraduate and/or graduate students (in the cases where the Lecturer has graduate
224 responsibilities), as well as of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses
225 in the cases where the lecturer's teaching responsibilities include upper-division
226 courses.

227 **b. Service**

228 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
229 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills her or his
230 assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the
231 requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as
232 opportunities to most effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results
233 for students.

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

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

247 **a. Teaching**

248 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
249 of *excellent*, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement as detailed
250 above. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the
251 candidate's growth should also extend into areas beyond those normally associated
252 with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in
253 one or more of the following activities: significant curricular innovation; instruction in
254 more than one language; production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of
255 classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other publication
256 related to the Lecturer's course assignments; successful pursuit of internal and/or
257 external funding for pedagogical initiatives; earning teaching awards/recognitions;
258 mentoring students who win awards or are recognized in other ways for their
259 accomplishments. A candidate whose record of achievement does not conform in an
260 obvious way to this standard should document and explain how her or his record
261 corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

262

263 **b. Service**

264 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
265 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if he or she has diligently and highly
266 effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the
267 mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level
268 normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to departmental advising efforts
269 or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition
270 to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in
271 service should take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as a
272 departmental program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility;
273 recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the profession or community.

274 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

275 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
276 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
277 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
278 diverge.

279

280 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

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

288 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

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

301

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

303 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
304 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy
305 and continue to provide very high-quality service. The review will cover the faculty
306 member's teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the
307 criteria listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as
308 described in the college manual) for evaluation by an elected committee of at least
309 three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with
310 representation from each when the department has an available principal senior
311 lecturer within its ranks). The departmental committee is elected by the departmental
312 NTT review committee from its whole membership. The department chair will provide
313 an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office
314 for response.

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

317

318 **A. Teaching**

319

320 **Poor:** The candidate displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
321 student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and little to no student mentoring.

322

323 **Fair:** The candidate displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
324 through student evaluations, course materials of inconsistent effectiveness, and
325 occasional student mentoring.

326

327 **Good:** The candidate's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate, as
328 evidenced through student evaluations, minimally effective course materials, and
329 generally satisfactory but limited effort as a mentor of students.

330

331 **Very Good:** The candidate is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes
332 evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of
333 students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the
334 department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and
335 pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the candidate
336 is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of
337 involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a
338 rating of *excellent*, as described below, and/or the candidate's student evaluations show
339 inconsistencies or regularly fall short of departmental expectations.

340

341 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):**

342 The candidate's teaching record shows consistently high levels of achievement. The
343 candidate's course materials, in the courses which she or he designs in whole or in part,
344 illustrate a long-term trajectory of an accomplished teacher who continually strives to
345 improve his or her pedagogy. Student impressions, as reported in the student
346 evaluations, are consistently strong. The candidate demonstrates a sustained track
347 record of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students (in the cases
348 where the Lecturer has graduate responsibilities), as well as of developing new courses
349 or protocols for existing courses in the cases where the lecturer's teaching
350 responsibilities include upper-division courses.

351 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):**

352 In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above,
353 successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer normally will
354 demonstrate growth as a teacher that extends into areas beyond those typically
355 associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might
356 engage in one or more of the following activities: substantive curricular innovation;

357 instruction in more than one language; production of a publication suitable for use in
358 the kinds of classes that the faculty member teachers; production of an article or other
359 publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for
360 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other
361 accomplishments of mentored students.

362

363 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The candidate's impact on students is of
364 the highest level. In excess of the expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching
365 appropriate to her or his rank, as described above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a
366 mastery of instruction in her or his area as evidenced by *at least one* of the following:
367 substantive curricular innovation; instruction in more than one language; production of
368 a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teachers;
369 production of an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal
370 and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions;
371 student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

372 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):**

373 In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, the
374 candidate for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as
375 *outstanding* if he or she has achieved *more than one* of the following: significant
376 curricular innovation; instruction in more than one language; production of a
377 publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches;
378 production of an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal
379 and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions;
380 student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

381 **B. Service**

382

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

385

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

388

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

391

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

396 department and to achieve positive results for undergraduate and graduate students.

397

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

408

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