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I. INTRODUCTION
Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of World Languages and Cultures are vital components of our faculty. 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 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 Department of World Languages and Cultures employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer-track faculty are described in the college manual.

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

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. 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 (Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), 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 membership. 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. The signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with her or his 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). Evaluator will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in introductory language and survey classes fulfilling general education requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then his or her assessment will reflect criteria suitable to the assigned role in the department.

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

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

b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that improve existing courses: Lecturers in World Languages and Cultures are sometimes involved in curriculum design. When this is the case, evaluations will consider the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and
practices. The design of courses with a travel component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Additional contributions in the area of curriculum design that may occasionally be the purview of Lecturers include upper-division courses involving student research and involvement in the Atlanta community, such as the development or supervision of internships or of courses involving contact with governmental, business or cultural agencies.

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

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

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

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 Department of World Languages and Cultures typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles, such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments; instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula,
organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, or supervising or mentoring faculty; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing and lending expertise; contributions to the department, college, and university, such as student advisement and mentoring, membership on department/college/university committees (although membership on the Senate is not encouraged), and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as active memberships in professional societies and on advisory boards. The Lecturer will also be given credit for any community or public service related to his or her teaching responsibilities.

The department’s review of candidates’ records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks that chairs might assign to particular faculty members. 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. The degree to which assigned service responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be part of the consideration of their service record.

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. Though not required for promotion, one way of achieving such 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 scholarship in the field.

Since 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. The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are identical to those described in the departmental promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure-track faculty: 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:

Since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers, like that of tenure-track colleagues, may also 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 respond effectively to the changing needs
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.

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

b. Service

To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of very good, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills her or his assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as opportunities to most effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results for students.
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, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement as detailed above. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate’s growth should also extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one’s teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more of the following activities: significant curricular innovation; instruction in more than one language; production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other publication related to the Lecturer’s course assignments; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; earning teaching awards/recognitions; mentoring students who win awards or are recognized in other ways for their accomplishments. A candidate whose record of achievement does not conform in an obvious way to this standard should document and explain how her or his record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

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 he or she has diligently and highly effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to departmental advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate’s growth in service should take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as a departmental program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the profession or community.
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.

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 service and teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

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 review committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the lecturer’s record. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee from its whole membership. 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 used for promotion reviews. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year 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 continue to provide very high-quality service. The review will cover the faculty member’s teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by an elected 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 departmental committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee from its whole membership. The department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for response.
APPENDIX: 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 candidate displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and little to no student mentoring.

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

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

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

Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):

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

Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):

In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching above, successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer normally will demonstrate growth as a teacher that extends into areas beyond those typically associated with one’s teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more of the following activities: substantive curricular innovation;
instruction in more than one language; production of a publication suitable for use in
the kinds of classes that the faculty member teachers; production of an article or other
publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for
pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other
accomplishments of mentored students.

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

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

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

**B. Service**

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

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

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

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

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

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