A. Overview

This document describes the processes for the third- and fifth-year reviews of academic professionals, the latter of which includes the possibility of promotion to the rank of senior academic professional. Academic professionals approved for promotion following the fifth-year review will become senior academic professionals at the beginning of the seventh year of service. Academic professionals not approved for promotion following the fifth-year review will be terminated at the end of the sixth year of service.

According to Board of Regents requirements, the academic professional title “may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual 803.10). Therefore, the primary consideration in the third- and fifth-year reviews of academic professionals is service contributions. Contributions in instruction will also be considered as part of the reviews. Other activities, such as publications of research, creative activities, and scholarship, are not required; however, departments have the option of considering such activities in the reviews, particularly as they bear on service or instructional performance. Reappointment of academic professionals and promotion of academic professionals to senior academic professional are dependent not only on performance in service and instruction but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of the college and its units.

Academic professional positions are not tenure track and are not intended to become so. As with all non-tenure track positions, academic professionals are reviewed annually for contract renewal. The annual review and annual contract renewal review processes follow established college and departmental policies as specified in other documents and are not covered here. Since annual reviews and annual contract renewal reviews are distinct from the third- and fifth-year reviews in that they involve different evaluating bodies, different materials, and different time spans, one may not be able to make a reliable inference from the annual reviews to the results of the fifth-year review.

B. Components of the Third and Fifth-Year Academic Professional Reviews:

All materials must be placed in a three-ring binder(s).

B.1. Dossier. The dossier will contain the following sections, as appropriate:

a. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department, and date of appointment at Georgia State University.

b. Curriculum Vitae
c. **Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department chair)**: Describe the candidate’s primary responsibilities under the general categories of Service and Instruction.

d. **Information on Service**: Describe objectives and contributions in the following service areas. Candidates are expected to address only those areas that apply.

- **Facility / Services Management**: Describe activities such as managing instructional laboratories or instructional technology support programs.
- **Supervisory/Mentoring Activities**: Describe activities such as supervision of graduate laboratory or teaching assistants, student assistants, staff, or part-time instructors.
- **Instructional Service**: Describe activities such as coordination of clinical practica or field experiences, leading and/or supporting instructional training programs, or providing support for the development of new courses and programs.
- **Academic Advisement and Curriculum**: Describe activities such as providing academic advisement or managing advisement/recruitment programs, maintaining curriculum, course scheduling, or contributing to program evaluation and certification processes.
- **Contributions to the Department, College, or University**: List memberships on departmental/college/university committees; participation in university-sanctioned outreach or service activities beyond the scope of regular job duties.
- **Professional Service**: List memberships in professional societies, advisory boards, etc.
- **Community and Public Service**: List non-university lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, assistance to governmental agencies.
- **Published Materials**: Include copies of articles, training manuals, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate's service responsibilities.
- **Additional Service**: List service contributions not related to the categories above. Examples may include reviewing manuscripts or grant applications, contributions in support of research programs, or sponsored funding gained relating to service responsibilities. Departments may specify additional requirements in the departmental guidelines.

e. **Information on Instruction**:

- **Statement of Instructional Interests, Goals, and Qualifications**: Describe educational philosophy within the context of assigned instructional duties. Candidates should indicate all courses he/she is qualified to teach as an instructor of record and generally describe other types of contributions made in the classroom.
Courses Taught During the Last Four Academic Years (include summers, if applicable): Using the format in Appendix A, the candidate must provide a list of courses taught during the last four academic years and the role he/she played in the course (i.e., instructor of record, assisted instructor, laboratory instructor, assisted laboratory instructor, etc.) for the fifth-year review (list all since hire date for third-year review). For each course where the candidate was the instructor of record, please provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for the course. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. Please indicate on the syllabus if it was solely the work of the candidate, developed collaboratively, or based largely on the work of another faculty member.

Teaching Portfolio: (Department Option) Department may choose to require candidates to submit a teaching portfolio, as described in the College's Teaching Assessment Policy and as further specified by the relevant departmental policy. Teaching portfolios will include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year. In consultation with the Chair, faculty members will vary the courses in the portfolio so that over a three-year period it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught.

The chair should include a rationale for requiring or not requiring the teaching portfolio in his/her written assessment of the candidate.

Student Evaluations (include summers, if applicable): Summary of questions 1-17 on the student questionnaire must be provided for courses taught as the instructor of record during the last four academic years (or all since hire date for third-year review). The candidate must provide standardized summaries of student evaluation numerical scores from a crystal report (no comments) and student evaluations from GoSOLAR (with written comments). Department chairs will assist the candidates in obtaining these materials.

New Courses/Instructional Programs Developed: List and generally describe role played in the development of the course.

Instructional Funding: Describe all intramural and extramural funding of instructional initiatives.

Published Materials: Include copies of articles, textbooks, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate's instruction.

Additional Instruction: Include other activities directly related to classroom instruction. Examples may include honors or special recognition for instruction. Departments may specify additional requirements in the departmental guidelines.

f. Professional Development Activities (if appropriate): Departments may specify that a faculty member can provide information on professional development activities, such as
publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the academic professional’s service and instructional responsibilities.

**B.2. Review Criteria:**

a. **Service:** Given the variation in service roles assigned to academic professionals across the college, evaluators will assess the service performance of academic professionals primarily as it relates to the department’s mission and the specific service responsibilities of the candidate. Reviewers should evaluate the candidate using the following criteria and any provided in departmental guidelines.

- **Job Knowledge:** Knowledge, skills and abilities as they relate to performing job requirements.
- **Productivity:** The amount of work successfully produced while maintaining standards and meeting deadlines.
- **Accuracy and Quality:** The extent to which he/she performs major job duties or responsibilities correctly and completely; professionalism and thoroughness of work produced.
- **Adaptability:** Ability to master new techniques or duties and understand explanations as required for the position. Demonstrates flexibility in meeting the changing demands of the work environment.
- **Organizational Skills:** Ability to effectively and efficiently plan, arrange, and complete work priorities; makes efficient use of available resources to optimize productivity.
- **Communication Skills:** Ability to express ideas effectively through verbal and written communication. Ability to communicate in a clear concise manner. Ability to listen and ask appropriate questions.
- **Teamwork:** Develops and maintains effective relationships with co-workers, supervisor, faculty, staff, students and others in the handling of job duties.
- **Supervisory Ability:** Ability to effectively delegate and monitor work and follow up with others; effectively coach, communicate with, reward and discipline. Demonstrates understanding and uses appropriate financial and budget controls. Adheres to safety requirements and practices, and communicates hazards to other employees in the workplace.
- **Additional Criteria:** Departments may consider developing additional assessment criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.

b. **Instruction:** Reviewers should evaluate the candidate’s instructional contributions using the criteria listed below and those provided in departmental guidelines. The specific
nature of the instructional duties assigned to academic professionals may vary across or within departments. Thus, evaluators should assess the instructional effectiveness of academic professionals primarily as it relates to the department’s mission and the specific instruction responsibilities of the candidate.

- **Course Quality:** The quality of a course 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. Academic professionals may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. In departments that give standardized and/or departmental examinations, scores on these examinations should be included for review.

- **New Courses/Instructional Programs Developed:** Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new instructional programs, and the use of new instructional techniques and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member.

- **Teaching Portfolios:** (Department Option) See above for description.

- **Student Evaluations:** The review will include student evaluation scores, in the context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary area. The information will also include 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 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 instructional effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

- **Additional Criteria:** Departments may consider developing additional assessment criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.

c. **Role within the Department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role of the academic professionals 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 academic professional within the context of the mission of the department and the ability of the academic professional to effectively fulfill changing needs of the department.

d. **Professional Development Activities (if appropriate):** Professional development activities (e.g. publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, collaborations) as they bear on the academic professional’s knowledge as it relates to instructional performance, may be considered if specified in the departmental guidelines.
**B.3. Ratings.** The third-year and fifth-year reviews will employ the following categories for the overall evaluation of service: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor. Directions for the application of these evaluations as they apply within the faculty member’s field are specified in each departmental guidelines and may vary depending on departmental context. The College considers an evaluation of *at least excellent* in service to be necessary for reappointment following the fifth-year review and promotion to senior academic professional. In addition, the faculty with instructional responsibilities must receive a college evaluation of *at least excellent* in instruction to be considered for reappointment following the fifth-year review and for promotion to senior academic professional. The parameters for the instructional evaluation are specified in the departmental guidelines and may vary depending on departmental context.

**C. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals.**

The third-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of service and instructional contributions. Academic professionals in their third year will provide all required materials to the chair by January 5.

The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee by January 7. This is an elected committee composed of at least 3 tenured faculty and senior academic professionals, with at least 1 being a tenured faculty member. This committee will use appropriate guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in service and instruction to the departmental chair by January 28. A candidate’s materials should remain as submitted at all levels of review. Anyone reviewing the materials must not underline, highlight, add margin notes, etc.

The chair will provide a written assessment of the academic professional’s effectiveness in service and instruction, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office by February 11.

The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide to the academic professional its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between the chair, the associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further recommendations to the faculty member.

**D. Fifth-Year Review of Academic Professionals with Promotion to Senior Academic Professional.**

The fifth-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis towards identifying academic professionals who have a sustained record of excellence in service and instruction. Academic professionals in their fifth year will provide all required materials to the chair by January 5.

The chair will provide the departmental fifth-year academic professional review committee with this material by January 7. This committee will consist of all senior academic professionals, all senior lecturers, and all tenured faculty in the department. Large departments may have this committee operate through subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate's credentials. The final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole. This committee will use appropriate guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in
service and instruction to the department chair by January 20. A candidate’s materials should remain as submitted at all levels of review. Anyone reviewing the materials must not underline, highlight, add margin notes, etc.

The chair will provide a written assessment of the academic professional’s effectiveness in service and instruction, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office by January 30.

A College Academic Professional Review Committee will then review these materials and make a recommendation to the dean. This committee will be composed of at least five tenured faculty and senior academic professionals. These must include one from each of the departments with an academic professional under review in the current year, and at least one from each of the four areas of the college (Natural and Computational Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts). Committee members will be elected by college faculty. This committee will write a letter of assessment to be submitted to the Dean’s Office by February 20.

The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide to the academic professional its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal.

*refers to department/school/institute

**refers to chair/director

Approved by College Promotion and Tenure Review Board on December 7, 2009.

Revised and Approved: November 22, 2010
APPENDIX A:
SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX TO 20XX

Please provide a list of courses taught and the role he/she played in the course (i.e., instructor of record, assisted instructor, laboratory instructor, or assisted laboratory instructor).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester / year</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall/02</td>
<td>Bio 1107</td>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Instructor of Record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>