

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURER PROMOTION GUIDELINES

I. Introduction

The School of Public Administration (SPA) Instructor and Lecturer Promotion Committee reviews instructors/lecturer credentials for promotion submits its recommendation as one level of the university review process. This document is to provide recommendations and guidelines to the committee for awarding promotion and the instructor/lecturer seeking promotion. The guidelines reflect the broad disciplinary and academic interests of the School and various subfields. The granting of promotion represents the recognition of substantial academic and professional achievements in academic discipline congruent with the rank being sought by the applicant. This document should be read in conjunction with *the School Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures*, and *the University Instructor and Lecturer Promotion Guidelines*. (See Attached)

II. Performance Categories for Promotion

The mission of the School is “to provide the highest quality graduate and undergraduate education for current and prospective public service officials in public and nonprofit organizations.” The School recognizes three basic categories of activities as essential to the promotion process. They are teaching, research, and service. Below, the typical activities for each area are listed (Note: See *the School Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures* for additional information).

A. Teaching Activities

1. Classroom instruction.
2. Online instruction.
3. Direction of independent studies, student research projects, internships, theses, and dissertations.
4. Academic advising.
5. Involvement and participation in workshops, seminars, and other forums which have as their principal themes or foci curricular interests, teaching, or the learning process.
6. Program and course development.

B. Service Activities

1. Service to the University, College, and/or School.
 - a. Activity devoted to the administration of the University, College, and/or School.
 - b. Activity that furthers the objectives of the University, College, and/or School.
 - c. Seeking and developing new ways to improve performance and make contributions to the University, College, and/or School.
 - d. Participation in conferences, courses, workshops, seminars, and acquisition of academic degrees designed to enhance competence and understanding of academic or scholarly material.
2. Service to the scholarly discipline.
 - a. Participation in professional organizations related to faculty members’ disciplines or general faculty roles.
 - b. Holding office in scholarly organizations.
 - c. Serving on or chairing committees in scholarly organizations.
 - d. Reviews or other critical assessments of scholarly work, including reviews of journal articles, books, and/or grant applications.

SPA Promotion Guidelines Approved by Faculty Members March 12, 2014

Section III. Guidelines for Promotion Approved by Faculty Members March 2, 2016

Approved by Faculty Excellence April 2016

Available for first use 2017-18

3. Activity that utilizes professional background and expertise in the community outside of the University.
 - a. Preparation or acquisition of non-research grants and contracts.
 - b. Presentations to community groups.
 - c. Participation on boards or working groups that seek to improve or develop public administration, nonprofit management, public planning, and/or policy.
 - d. Service in or holding office in civic organizations.

Other activities may be included by negotiation or special circumstance recognized by the School Director or the School Promotion Committee.

III. Guidelines for Promotion

The broad range of legitimate activities possible for faculty to participate in and the multi-disciplinary character of the School precludes extensive specification of criteria for promotion. Beyond the general criteria provided here, faculty excellence must be considered on a case-by-case basis and candidates are required to consult with the School Chair and SPA Instructor and Lecturer Promotion Committee for advice and approval (in writing) if they feel that criteria should be considered that are outside of what is outlined here.

Assessment for promotion will be based on the candidate's annual assignments. The following criteria assume a standard instructional-teaching role. Exceptions require an explanation and should be noted in the dossier.

A. Associate Instructor/Lecturer

1. The expectations for promotion to the rank of associate instructor/lecturer shall include the demonstration of a consistent record of excellence in the quality of assigned duties and the potential for continued excellence. This is demonstrated by an overall rating of "above average" in two of the last three years and no lower than "satisfactory" in any of the last three years for all assigned duties for the three years leading up to application for promotion.
2. In teaching, in the last three years leading up to the application for promotion, the faculty must provide evidence of sustained quality that is satisfactory or higher. This is demonstrated by a rating of "above average" in one of the last three years and no lower than "satisfactory" in any of the last three years leading up to application for promotion.
3. Evaluation in the area of research will only occur if the faculty member has had an assignment that was consistent and substantive enough to require evaluation as part of the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) process. The evaluation of a faculty member's research should be benchmarked against other faculty within the same/similar discipline/agenda.
4. In service, faculty must provide evidence of sustained quality. This may take the form of service to the discipline through its professional organizations, School, College, University, and/or community.

SPA Promotion Guidelines Approved by Faculty Members March 12, 2014

Section III. Guidelines for Promotion Approved by Faculty Members March 2, 2016

Approved by Faculty Excellence April 2016

Available for first use 2017-18

5. Evaluation in the area of “other university duties” will only occur if a faculty member has had an assignment, such as an administrative or clinical assignment, that was consistent and substantive enough to require evaluation as part of the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) process. The evaluation of “other duties as assigned” should take into account the size and nature of the assignment.

B. Senior Instructor/Lecturer

1. The expectations for promotion to the rank of senior instructor/lecturer shall include the demonstration of a consistent level of excellence in the quality of assigned duties and the potential for continued excellence. Additionally, faculty must demonstrated evidence of leadership in the university and/or profession. This is demonstrated by a rating of “above average” in two of the last three years and no lower than “satisfactory” in any of the last three years in all assigned duties for the three years leading up to application for promotion.
2. In teaching, in the last three years leading up to the application for promotion, the faculty must provide evidence of sustained quality. This is demonstrated by a rating of “above average” in one of the last three years and no lower than “satisfactory” in any of the last three years leading up to application for promotion.
3. Evaluation in the area of research will only occur if the faculty member has had an assignment that was consistent and substantive enough to require evaluation as part of the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) process. The evaluation of a faculty member’s research should be benchmarked against other faculty within the same/similar discipline/agenda.
4. In service, faculty must provide evidence of sustained quality that includes leadership to the university and/or profession. This may take the form of exemplary service to the discipline through its professional organizations, School, College, University, and/or community.
5. Evaluation in the area of “other university duties” will only occur if the faculty member has had an assignment, such as an administrative or clinical assignment, that was consistent and substantive enough to require evaluation as part of the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) process. The evaluation of “other duties as assigned” should take into account the size and nature of the assignment.