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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of Communication 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 statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document articulates the Department of Communication’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 Communication 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 committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages. 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
available 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. The department 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. 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 (or in accordance with the college
manual when necessary).

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 of Arts and Sciences Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-time Faculty. Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in 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.

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

a. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Exam questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. Writing assignments should develop the students’ ability to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation 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. Courses that connect students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as further evidence of successful teaching. The department also encourages faculty to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the semester unfolds. The department recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, encourage student interest in the material and designing assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that meaningfully improve existing courses: 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, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of successful
study abroad and other community-based courses is another laudable potential
achievement. New courses and the development of resources that affect significant
numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in
significant achievements such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate
and/or graduate research are highly valued.

c. Student evaluations: The review of a candidate’s materials will include overall
student evaluation scores, which are 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 number of students enrolled in the course. In addition to average
scores, the department will also be attentive to mean and median scores 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. In light of these contextual elements, successful candidates for
promotion normally earn consistently strong evaluations and high scores, as defined
below.

d. Direction of students: The department will assess the extent and quality of faculty
efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as
independent studies, honors theses, student research or creative work presented at
GSURC, as well individual student engagement in academic projects or programs hosted
by other institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent
offering additional tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for
underperforming in their Communication classes and time spent offering additional
guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their
Communication coursework. Time spent coaching, mentoring, and/or directing students
in creative, scholarly, and competitive extracurricular activities and performance also
may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, and should be documented
for assessment by the committee. Faculty members’ willingness to write letters of
recommendation 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 and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to
improve teaching as appropriate. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding
expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt innovative
practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new
certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the department as
evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The
department recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the
incorporation of more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical
conversation and writing might contribute to a faculty member’s assessment as excellent in teaching.

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. Because of the widely varying service roles assigned to lecturers in the Department of Communication, a candidate will be judged for diligence and effectiveness based on the context of each role’s specific requirements and expectations. Individual candidates will receive notice from the Chair of the Department of Communication to define the scope of their service responsibilities beyond their work with colleagues and advisement. Service assignments may include (but are not limited to) overseeing departmental programs and/or facilities; mentoring new hires, junior faculty, adjunct faculty, part-time instructors, graduate assistants, and staff; spearheading outreach efforts to on- and off-campus groups and organizations; establishing and maintaining study abroad programs; and other duties as assigned. Activities associated with these responsibilities will vary, and will need to be documented and described by the individual candidate.

In addition, lecturers may document service to departmental, college and university committees and student organizations, assistance to colleagues within the university in the form of guest lecturing, consulting, etc.; service to academic organizations and community groups and lending expertise with professional organizations, particularly those within the lecturer’s specific discipline; memberships on department/college/university committees; 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.

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. For example, since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers also may change. The review therefore might include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively the 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.

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 at least 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 at least 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 record shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher. Normally, he or she earns scores on student evaluations that fall in the mid-4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. Additionally, he or she demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

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 his or her assigned roles. The candidate has consistently attended committee meetings required of them, performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and has completed assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

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 in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course materials illustrate a long-term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. His or her student evaluations are consistently strong, normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range. He or she demonstrates a sustained track record of directing students, as well as developing new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate’s growth as a teacher should also extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one’s teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, successful candidates will engage in significantly notable ways in one or more of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; publication of pedagogical scholarship; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

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, graduate teaching assistants, other non-tenure track instructors, or additional individual people or aspects of the department appropriate to that particular candidate’s service role. 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 the 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 any one of these
reviews should not be assumed to transfer to 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 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.

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 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 committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee of the whole. 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 excellent teacher shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, he or she earns scores on student evaluations that fall in the mid-4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. Additionally, he or she demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer): In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of consistently strong student evaluations, normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range, and will have demonstrated successful direction of students and development new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate’s growth as a teacher should also extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one’s teaching responsibilities at GSU. For
example, successful candidates will engage in significantly notable ways in one or more
of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of
classes that the faculty member teaches; publication of pedagogical scholarship;
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 his or her rank, as described above, the **outstanding** teacher commands a
mastery of instruction in his or her area as evidenced by at least one of the following:
successful pursuit of extensive 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: production of publications suitable for use in
the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of pedagogical
scholarship; successful pursuit of extensive external funding for pedagogical initiatives;
notable teaching awards/recognitions; notable 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:** Candidates judged to be **very good** in service diligently and effectively fulfill
their assigned roles. These candidates consistently attended committee meetings
required of them, perform all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and
complete assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

**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, graduate teaching assistants, other non-tenure track instructors, or additional individual people or aspects of the department appropriate to that particular candidate’s service role. 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.