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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the School of Film, Media, & Theatre 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 (school guidelines), the College of the Arts 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 School of Film, Media, & Theatre’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 School of Film, Media, & Theatre 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 School’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 director.

2. The director forwards the candidate’s materials to the school NTT promotion committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).

3. The school committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the director. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate, therefore, the committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s). The director will provide a copy of the school committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the director within three business days.

4. The director submits her/his independent recommendation and the recommendation of the school committee, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The director 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 director a copy of any response from the candidate to the director’s report.
See the college manual for information on the evaluation processes at the college and university levels.

**B. Composition of School Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee**

The School Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above in the school (Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the director and any members of the school serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university levels. The school 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 school 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 signed 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 director, the dean will augment the school promotion committee with NTT members from other departments when the school 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 consideration is contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to contributions in the area of research and creative activity 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 school 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 on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-time Faculty. Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to the school’s mission. Among the factors that evaluators should consider in their assessment are the following:

a. **Quality of course content**: The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading assignments appropriate to course level, and catalog description. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that particularly cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. The school recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, demonstrate 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 curricula**: 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.

**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 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 school and within the subject area. The review will also consider other important variables such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and the number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

c. **Direction of students**: The school 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 Film, Media, & Theatre classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their Film, Media, & Theatre 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.

d. **Development of new skills**: The school 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 school as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The school 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

Service for lecturers varies depending on the individual’s core mission as defined by the school, but it is generally at the school or college level. Because of the widely varying service roles assigned to lecturers in the School of Film, Media, & Theatre, a candidate will be judged for diligence and effectiveness based on the context of each role’s specific requirements and expectations. Individual candidates will work with the director of the School of Film, Media, & Theatre to define the scope of any specific service responsibilities beyond their standard work with colleagues and advisement. Examples of how a candidate might demonstrate high quality service include but are not limited to:

- designing and carrying out unique service responsibilities for specific functions or programs within the school at the request of the director. Activities associated with these responsibilities will vary, and will need to be documented and described by the individual candidate.

- acquiring letters of support for one’s artistic productions from professionals or scholars in the field not working within the school.

- documenting supervision/mentoring of junior faculty, new hires, adjunct faculty, staff, part-time instructors, or graduate laboratory or teaching assistants. Candidates should describe objectives and contributions, outlining activities and processes. Activities may include but are not limited to teaching support (for example with materials and/or classroom management), service guidance (such as helping identify avenues and areas for mentee to participate and be potentially productive), help with annual review and three-year review preparation, direction for potential professional development opportunities, and general assistance with developing plan for growth within the school in areas of teaching, service, and/or research as applicable to the mentee’s position.

- overseeing school facilities. Facilities could include oversight of the school’s audio/video equipment inventory with success demonstrated by student and instructor reviews of the quality of the service in checking-in/out equipment, maintaining the equipment in an operable manner and overseeing graduate student assistants assigned to the inventory room.

- establishing and maintaining outreach to on- and off-campus groups such as the GSU Players. Success can be demonstrated by active involvement, such as being a faculty advisor to student chapters and/or participating in professional organizations.
• establishing and maintaining study abroad programs. Success can be demonstrated by the evaluations from the participants in those programs, review of the syllabi and other course materials composed for the programs and the development of new programs.

In addition, lecturers may document service to school, 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 school/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 school’s review of candidates’ records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks that the director might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should document any arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. The degree to which assigned service responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be part of the consideration of their service record.

3. Additional Considerations

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

a. Research and creative activity (if appropriate): Activities such as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities (including directing, writing, performing, and exhibiting), conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the Lecturer’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance, may be considered.

b. Role within the school: Since needs of the school often change, the role of the lecturers may also change. The review therefore might include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the school and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively the changing needs of the school.

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 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. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the school, 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 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 range between 4 and 5, depending on the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this document. Additionally, he or she may demonstrate 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 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 with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the school, 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 Principal Senior Lecturer.

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 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 in the middle of the range between 4 and 5 or even higher, depending on the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this document. He or she may demonstrate 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 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 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 very good if he or she has diligently and highly effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the school over a sustained period. 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.

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

Lecturers are reviewed on an annual basis as described in the College of the Arts Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty policy.

2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of teaching and service contributions.

The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness and progress toward promotion to Senior Lecturer. A school review committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include both tenured faculty and Principal Senior Lecturers or Senior Lecturers, will prepare a written assessment of effectiveness in teaching and service to the director. The director will provide an independent assessment of the candidate’s effectiveness in teaching and service, as well as an assessment of the school’s need for this position, before forwarding the candidate’s materials and both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for further evaluation of the record. The committee is traditionally appointed by the director, but may be elected by the school NTT review committee of the whole at the director’s request. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale used for promotion reviews.

3. Five-Year Structured Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers

The five-year structured review is intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. 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 rank when the school has an available Principal
Senior Lecturer within its ranks). The committee is elected by the school NTT review committee
of the whole. The director 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 school. 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 school expectations.

Excellent: The excellent teacher shows consistently high levels of achievement in the 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 range between 4 and 5, depending on the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this document. 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.

* 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 in the range between 4 and 5 or even higher, depending on the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this document, 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 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 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: 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.

* 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 internal and/or 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 school.

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

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

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 school over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to school advising efforts, graduate teaching assistants, other non-tenure track instructors, or additional individual people or aspects of the school 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 school program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; 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 school 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 school 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.