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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of History 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 of History’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 History employs NTT faculty in the lecturer track at the following ranks (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 department chair will provide a copy of the departmental committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the department chair within three business days.

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

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

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

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above in the department, except the chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university levels. Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate’s credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its final recommendation. Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate’s current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

III. LECTURER REVIEWS

A. General Considerations

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

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Teaching

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

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 historical 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 should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students, as evidenced by course designs that push students to perceive how historical problems are relevant to their lives and how historical methods can assist them in gaining a deeper perspective on these problems. Candidates who are evaluated as above the bar in teaching (defined as *excellent* or above, according to the college manual, and described in more detail in Section C of this document) might have demonstrated the ability to foster student engagement with meaningful historical questions through the analysis of primary sources. 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 evidence of successful teaching. And 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 above the bar in teaching, however, share a sustained interest in encouraging 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 courses with a travel component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Initiatives in the development of
new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are ones 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.

c. **Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate’s materials will include 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 presented at GSURC, as well individual student engagement in historical 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 history classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their history coursework. 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. Candidates evaluated as above the bar in teaching might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt new 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 historical 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

Contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service, the administration of department programs, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the department, college, or university, professional service, and community and public service. NTT faculty whose responsibilities focus on teaching undergraduate courses normally will be assigned service that focuses on undergraduate student success. While such assignments will be chosen by the chair, NTT faculty might be asked to mentor graduate teaching assistants or visiting lecturers; or they might be asked to play a role in advising undergraduate majors. They might be asked to take a leadership role in directing the undergraduate honors curriculum or the departmental internship program, or departmental efforts at job placement for history undergraduate and graduate students. NTT faculty will frequently be assigned to the Freshman Studies Committee or the Undergraduate Committee. For lecturers with primary responsibility for graduate instruction, program direction, student advisement, the securing of external grants, and departmental committee service will be judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness, evidence of which will be provided by colleagues in the department and the department chair. Faculty efforts to recruit undergraduate majors and applicants to departmental graduate programs will also be viewed as evidence of successful service.

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:

1. Professional Development Contributions: The Department shall consider professional development activities (e.g. publications of their research and scholarship, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded) as they bear on the lecturer’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production of peer-reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the department certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-reviewed publications, publications or appearances in popular media, participation in academic conferences, and/or the pursuit of grants to fund historical research all, by definition, enhance the candidates’ case that they are modeling the best practices of the profession to students. Such professional development can also help the candidate’s case for promotion if it can be shown to augment the faculty member’s expertise in subjects relevant to the classroom.
Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction section of the dossier rather than under a Professional Development section.

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

C. Criteria for Promotion

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

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 multiple categories for assessing teaching detailed above. 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 the student evaluations that fall in the mid-“4” range or higher. Additionally, he or she might have 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 effectively fulfills his or her 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 undergraduate and graduate 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 in multiple categories for assessing teaching detailed 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” range. He or she demonstrates a sustained track record of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate 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, candidates might engage 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; production of an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognition; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students. A candidate whose record of achievement does not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and explain how their 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 highly effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. The excellent candidate 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. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

1. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental subcommittee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the lecturer’s record. 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.

2. 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. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each). 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:** Candidates will be judged to be *poor* in teaching if one does not fulfill one’s duties as an instructor.

**Fair:** Candidates will be judged to be *fair* in teaching if one inconsistently or ineffectively executes one’s duties as an instructor. Course syllabi give evidence of incomplete understanding of the field; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise deficient. Student perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction.

**Good:** Candidates will be judged to be *good* in teaching if one does not always effectively execute one’s duties as an instructor. Course syllabi are incomplete or unhelpful; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise deficient. Student perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction. A ranking of *good* indicates substandard classroom performance.

**Very Good:** Candidates will be judged to be *very good* in teaching if their overall teaching record is highly competent; such teachers successfully execute their duties as instructors but, in contrast to teachers that meet the bar, are not demonstrating a willingness to grow further in their teaching practices by bringing a measure of creativity to the classroom or by spending significant time beyond regular office hours to engage students in the course materials or the benefits of the major. Conversely, an otherwise strong teaching record may be evaluated as *very good* if student evaluations have a declining trajectory or present overall concerns about student perceptions.

**Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The *excellent* teacher shows consistently high levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, his or her student evaluations are consistently high. Additionally, he or she might have 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 high student evaluations in the mid- to upper “4” range and will have demonstrated successful mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate 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, candidates might engage 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; 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. On top 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 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 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. Candidates whose record of achievement does not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and explain how their record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

**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 highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. The excellent candidate might exhibit 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: On top 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.