

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

Policy Title:	Department of Communication Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	4/17/2015
College Approval:	09/17/2015
Effective:	09/17/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

14 The Department of Communication employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer
15 track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior
16 to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general
17 duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the college manual.

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

20 **A. Process Overview**

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

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

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

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

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

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

60
61 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final
62 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department
63 chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT
64 members from other departments when the home department does not have a
65 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with
66 at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty (or in accordance with the college
67 manual when necessary).

68 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

69 **A. General Considerations**

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

79 are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being
80 considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

81 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

82 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

83 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
84 of the [College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for](#)
85 [Full-time Faculty](#). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it
86 relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in classes fulfilling
87 general education requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an
88 alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect
89 criteria suitable to their assigned role in the department.

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

92 **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through
93 review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and
94 other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for
95 promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Exam
96 questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course
97 level and catalog description. Writing assignments should develop the students' ability
98 to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer
99 meaningful questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their
100 appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may
101 provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other
102 course elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement
103 and success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways
104 that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that
105 connect students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage
106 of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as further
107 evidence of successful teaching. The department also encourages faculty to design
108 courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who
109 are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their
110 performance as the semester unfolds. The department recognizes that teachers might
111 use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion
112 expectations, however, encourage student interest in the material and 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 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective
116 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development
117 of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if
118 these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of successful

119 study abroad and other community-based courses is another laudable potential
120 achievement. New courses and the development of resources that affect significant
121 numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in
122 significant achievements such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate
123 and/or graduate research are highly valued.

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

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

153 **e. Development of new skills:** The department encourages faculty to continue to
154 develop skills and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to
155 improve teaching as appropriate. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding
156 expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt innovative
157 practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new
158 certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the department as
159 evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The
160 department recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the
161 incorporation of more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical

162 conversation and writing might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as
163 *excellent* in teaching.

164 **2. Evaluation of Service**

165 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality
166 instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university;
167 professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies
168 depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the department, but it is
169 generally at the department or college level. Because of the widely varying service roles
170 assigned to lecturers in the Department of Communication, a candidate will be judged
171 for diligence and effectiveness based on the context of each role's specific requirements
172 and expectations. Individual candidates will receive notice from the Chair of the
173 Department of Communication to define the scope of their service responsibilities
174 beyond their work with colleagues and advisement. Service assignments may include
175 (but are not limited to) overseeing departmental programs and/or facilities; mentoring
176 new hires, junior faculty, adjunct faculty, part-time instructors, graduate assistants, and
177 staff; spearheading outreach efforts to on- and off-campus groups and organizations;
178 establishing and maintaining study abroad programs; and other duties as assigned.
179 Activities associated with these responsibilities will vary, and will need to be
180 documented and described by the individual candidate.

181 In addition, lecturers may document service to departmental, college and university
182 committees and student organizations, assistance to colleagues within the university in
183 the form of guest lecturing, consulting, etc.; service to academic organizations and
184 community groups and lending expertise with professional organizations, particularly
185 those within the lecturer's specific discipline; memberships on
186 department/college/university committees; professional service (if appropriate), such as
187 memberships on professional societies and advisory boards; community and public
188 service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances,
189 short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

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

196 **3. Additional Considerations**

197 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review.
198 For example, since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers also
199 may change. The review therefore might include the role of the lecturer within the
200 context of the mission of the department and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill
201 effectively the changing needs of the department.

202 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

216 **a. Teaching**

217 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
218 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's record shows consistently high levels of achievement
219 in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her
220 course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher. Normally, he or she
221 earns scores on student evaluations that fall in the mid-4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-
222 of-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. Additionally, he or she
223 demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses
224 and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

225 **b. Service**

226 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
227 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills his or her
228 assigned roles. The candidate has consistently attended committee meetings required
229 of them, performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and has
230 completed assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

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

232 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate
233 a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as
234 *excellent*, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a
235 level of assigned service to the department, college, university, and/or to the
236 professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the
237 university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for

238 promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time
239 period since the last promotion. This growth might be in the area of teaching or service
240 or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher ranking in one of these areas, but this
241 need not necessarily be the case so long as the candidate has made improvements in
242 discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made new
243 contributions in teaching or service.

244 **a. Teaching**

245 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
246 of *excellent*, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five
247 categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course
248 materials illustrate a long-term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually
249 strives to improve his or her pedagogy. His or her student evaluations are consistently
250 strong, normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range. He or she
251 demonstrates a sustained track record of directing students, as well as developing new
252 courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of
253 teaching described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend into
254 areas beyond those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For
255 example, successful candidates will engage in significantly notable ways in one or more
256 of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of
257 classes that the faculty member teaches; publication of pedagogical scholarship;
258 successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives;
259 teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored
260 students.

261

262 **b. Service**

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

275 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

279 reviews should not be assumed to transfer to the others.

280

281 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

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

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

290 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's
291 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental review
292 committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty
293 and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the
294 lecturer's record. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee
295 from its whole membership. The department chair will provide an independent
296 assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further
297 evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point
298 scale used for promotion reviews.

299

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

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

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

314 **A. Teaching**

315

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

318

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

322

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

326

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

336

337 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The *excellent* teacher shows consistently high
338 levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section
339 III.B.1. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who
340 continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, he or she earns scores on
341 student evaluations that fall in the mid-4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as
342 appropriate to the course size and level. Additionally, he or she demonstrates a track
343 record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully
344 mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

345

346 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated expectations
347 for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the
348 rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of consistently strong student
349 evaluations, normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range, and
350 will have demonstrated successful direction of students and development new courses
351 or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of
352 teaching described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend into
353 areas beyond those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For

354 example, successful candidates will engage in significantly notable ways in one or more
355 of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of
356 classes that the faculty member teaches; publication of pedagogical scholarship;
357 successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives;
358 teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored
359 students.

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

366 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated
367 expectations for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, the candidate for promotion
368 to the rank of principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as *outstanding* if he or she has
369 achieved *more than one* of the following: production of publications suitable for use in
370 the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of pedagogical
371 scholarship; successful pursuit of extensive external funding for pedagogical initiatives;
372 notable teaching awards/recognitions; notable student awards or other
373 accomplishments of mentored students.

374 **B. Service**

375

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

378

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

381

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

384

385 **Very Good:** Candidates judged to be *very good* in service diligently and effectively fulfill
386 their assigned roles. These candidates consistently attended committee meetings
387 required of them, perform all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and
388 complete assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

389

390 **Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been
391 diligent and highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed
392 significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent*
393 candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to

394 departmental advising efforts, graduate teaching assistants, other non-tenure track
395 instructors, or additional individual people or aspects of the department appropriate to
396 that particular candidate's service role. In addition to continued growth in the areas of
397 service described above, the candidate's growth in service should also take one or more
398 of the following forms: highly effective service as a departmental program director or in
399 a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant
400 service to the profession or community.

401

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