

School of Film, Media, & Theatre

College of the Arts

Georgia State University

**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES**

Policy Title:	School of Film, Media, & Theatre Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
School Approval:	04/18/2017
College Approval:	10/06/2017
Effective:	10/06/2017

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

19 **A. Process Overview**

20 The primary stages of the School’s NTT faculty promotion review process are as follows:

- 21 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for  
22 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the  
23 director.
- 24 2. The director forwards the candidate’s materials to the school NTT promotion committee (or  
25 subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the  
26 committee as a whole).
- 27 3. The school committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the  
28 director. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate, therefore, the  
29 committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages so that they can be  
30 removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s).  
31 The director will provide a copy of the school committee’s report, including any minority  
32 reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond  
33 directly to the director within three business days.
- 34 4. The director submits her/his independent recommendation and the recommendation of the  
35 school committee, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate, to  
36 the Dean’s Office. The director will provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate  
37 with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond to the Dean’s Office within  
38 three business days. The Dean’s Office will provide to the director a copy of any response  
39 from the candidate to the director’s report.

40 See the college manual for information on the evaluation processes at the college and university  
41 levels.

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

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

56  
57 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final  
58 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the director, the dean will  
59 augment the school promotion committee with NTT members from other departments when  
60 the school does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least  
61 three members, with at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

## 62 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

### 63 **A. General Considerations**

64 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual review  
65 leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to Senior  
66 Lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer (the timing for which  
67 is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured  
68 review). In these reviews, the primary consideration is contributions in teaching and service, with  
69 consideration given to contributions in the area of research and creative activity bearing on the  
70 candidate's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that  
71 are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are  
72 defined in the context of school expectations specific to candidates being considered for  
73 promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer.

### 74 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

#### 75 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

76 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the

77 College's Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-time Faculty. Evaluators will  
78 assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to the school's mission. Among the  
79 factors that evaluators should consider in their assessment are the following:

80 **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of  
81 syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi should be reviewed  
82 for conformity with university guidelines, reading assignments appropriate to course level, and  
83 catalog description. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in  
84 relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Credit should also be given to faculty  
85 whose courses are structured in ways that particularly cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical  
86 acumen in their students. The school recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods.  
87 Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, demonstrate a  
88 sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and designing assessments  
89 that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

90 **b. Development of new courses or curricula:** Evaluations will consider the effective development  
91 and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new teaching  
92 programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the  
93 responsibilities of the faculty member.

94 **Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will include student evaluation scores,  
95 which are useful indicators of student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores will be  
96 considered in the context of the normal range of scores for specific courses and for similar level  
97 courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the school and within the subject area. The review will also  
98 consider other important variables such as class size, whether the course is required or an  
99 elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and the number of students enrolled in the  
100 course. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be  
101 judged in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating  
102 teaching effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

103 **c. Direction of students:** The school will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in the  
104 direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies,  
105 honors theses, student research or creative work presented at GSURC, as well individual student  
106 engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or communities. Such  
107 efforts might also include faculty time spent offering additional tutoring and mentoring of  
108 students who are at risk for underperforming in their Film, Media, & Theatre classes and time  
109 spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects  
110 connected to their Film, Media, & Theatre coursework. Time spent coaching, mentoring, and/or  
111 directing students in creative, scholarly, and competitive extracurricular activities and  
112 performance also may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, and should be  
113 documented for assessment by the committee. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of  
114 recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be viewed as evidence of  
115 significant effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

116 **d. Development of new skills:** The school encourages faculty to continue to develop skills and to  
117 master new software, languages, and technology in order to improve teaching as appropriate.  
118 Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an

119 ongoing willingness to adopt innovative practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal  
120 training to gain new certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the  
121 school as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The  
122 school recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of  
123 more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing  
124 might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

## 125 2. Evaluation of Service

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

- 134 • designing and carrying out unique service responsibilities for specific functions or  
135 programs within the school at the request of the director. Activities associated with  
136 these responsibilities will vary, and will need to be documented and described by the  
137 individual candidate.
- 138 • acquiring letters of support for one's artistic productions from professionals or scholars  
139 in the field not working within the school.
- 140 • documenting supervision/mentoring of junior faculty, new hires, adjunct faculty, staff,  
141 part-time instructors, or graduate laboratory or teaching assistants. Candidates should  
142 describe objectives and contributions, outlining activities and processes. Activities may  
143 include but are not limited to teaching support (for example with materials and/or  
144 classroom management), service guidance (such as helping identify avenues and areas  
145 for mentee to participate and be potentially productive), help with annual review and  
146 three-year review preparation, direction for potential professional development  
147 opportunities, and general assistance with developing plan for growth within the school  
148 in areas of teaching, service, and/or research as applicable to the mentee's position.
- 149 • overseeing school facilities. Facilities could include oversight of the school's audio/video  
150 equipment inventory with success demonstrated by student and instructor reviews of  
151 the quality of the service in checking-in/out equipment, maintaining the equipment in  
152 an operable manner and overseeing graduate student assistants assigned to the  
153 inventory room.
- 154 • establishing and maintaining outreach to on- and off-campus groups such as the GSU  
155 Players. Success can be demonstrated by active involvement, such as being a faculty  
156 advisor to student chapters and/or participating in professional organizations.

- 157 • establishing and maintaining study abroad programs. Success can be demonstrated by  
158 the evaluations from the participants in those programs, review of the syllabi and other  
159 course materials composed for the programs and the development of new programs.

160 In addition, lecturers may document service to school, college and university committees and  
161 student organizations; assistance to colleagues within the university in the form of guest  
162 lecturing, consulting, etc.; service to academic organizations and community groups and  
163 lending expertise with professional organizations, particularly those within the lecturer's  
164 specific discipline; memberships on school/college/university committees; professional service  
165 (if appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards;  
166 community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations,  
167 performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

168 The school's review of candidates' records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks that  
169 the director might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should document any  
170 arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to take on special  
171 administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. **The degree to which assigned service**  
172 **responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be part of the consideration of**  
173 **their service record.**

### 174 3. Additional Considerations

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

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

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

### 185 C. Criteria for Promotion

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

#### 192 1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

193 For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of

194 competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least *excellent*. Additionally, the  
195 candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the school, college, university, and/or to  
196 the professional and practice community that is evaluated as at least *very good*, which meets the  
197 university standard for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

198 **a. Teaching**

199 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with a rating of  
200 *excellent*, the candidate's record shows consistently high levels of achievement in the categories  
201 for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course materials illustrate a  
202 trajectory as an accomplished teacher. Normally, he or she earns scores on student evaluations  
203 that range between 4 and 5, depending on the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this  
204 document. Additionally, he or she may demonstrate a track record of developing new courses or  
205 protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate  
206 students.

207 **b. Service**

208 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with a rating of  
209 *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills his or her assigned roles.  
210 The candidate has performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner and has  
211 completed assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

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

213 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a  
214 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as *excellent* with  
215 continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, the candidate must  
216 provide a level of assigned service to the school, college, university, and/or to the professional  
217 and practice community that is evaluated as at least *very good*, which meets the university  
218 standard for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer.

219 **a. Teaching**

220 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer with a rating of  
221 *excellent*, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement in the categories for  
222 assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course materials illustrate a long-  
223 term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her  
224 pedagogy. His or her student evaluations are consistently strong, normally in the middle of the  
225 range between 4 and 5 or even higher, depending on the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of  
226 this document. He or she may demonstrate a sustained track record of directing students, as  
227 well as developing new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth  
228 in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend  
229 into areas beyond those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For  
230 example, successful candidates will engage in one or more of the following activities: production  
231 of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches;

232 production of pedagogical scholarship; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for  
233 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments  
234 of mentored students.

235

#### 236 **b. Service**

237 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to Principal  
238 Senior Lecturer with a rating of *very good* if he or she has diligently and highly effectively  
239 carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the school  
240 over a sustained period. These candidates consistently attended committee meetings required  
241 of them, perform all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and complete  
242 assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

### 243 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

244 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all distinct from  
245 one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time periods and may involve  
246 different evaluating bodies, the results of any one of these reviews should not be assumed to  
247 transfer to the others.

248

#### 249 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

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

#### 252 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

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

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

265

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

267

268 The five-year structured review is intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually  
269 provided by an annual review. The review will cover the faculty member's teaching and service  
270 records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria listed in the Appendix. Faculty  
271 under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by an

272 elected committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of Principal  
273 Senior Lecturer (with representation from each rank when the school has an available Principal  
274 Senior Lecturer within its ranks). The committee is elected by the school NTT review committee  
275 of the whole. The director will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both  
276 evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

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

279 A. Teaching

280

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

283

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

287

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

291

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

300

301 *Excellent:* The *excellent* teacher shows consistently high levels of achievement in the categories  
302 for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory  
303 as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, he  
304 or she earns scores on student evaluations that range between 4 and 5, depending on the  
305 factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this document. Additionally, he or she demonstrates a  
306 track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully  
307 mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

308

309 \* In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, the successful  
310 candidate for promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer will have a record of consistently  
311 strong student evaluations, normally in the range between 4 and 5 or even higher, depending on  
312 the factors described in section III.B.1(c) of this document, and will have demonstrated  
313 successful direction of students and development new courses or protocols for existing courses.  
314 In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate's  
315 growth as a teacher should also extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one's  
316 teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, successful candidates will engage in one or more  
317 of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that  
318 the faculty member teaches; production of pedagogical scholarship; successful pursuit of

319 internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions;  
320 student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

321 **Outstanding:** The candidate's impact on students is of the highest level. In excess of the  
322 expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching appropriate to his or her rank, as described  
323 above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a mastery of instruction in his or her area as  
324 evidenced by at least one of the following: successful pursuit of extensive external funding for  
325 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments  
326 of mentored students.

327 \* In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, the  
328 candidate for promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer will be evaluated as *outstanding*  
329 if he or she has achieved more than one of the following: production of publications suitable for  
330 use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of pedagogical  
331 scholarship; successful pursuit of extensive internal and/or external funding for pedagogical  
332 initiatives; notable teaching awards/recognitions; notable student awards or other  
333 accomplishments of mentored students.

## 334 B. Service

335

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

338

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

341

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

344

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

349

350 **Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been diligent and  
351 highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the  
352 mission of the school over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level normally  
353 exhibits a track record of providing assistance to school advising efforts, graduate teaching  
354 assistants, other non-tenure track instructors, or additional individual people or aspects of the  
355 school appropriate to that particular candidate's service role. In addition to continued growth  
356 in the areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in service should also take one  
357 or more of the following forms: highly effective service as a school program director or in a role  
358 with a similar level of responsibility; significant service to the profession or community.

359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368

*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.