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Academic Professionals must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Review of Academic Professionals and Promotion of Academic Professionals to Senior Academic Professionals. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the College Manual takes precedence.
INTRODUCTION

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has formulated these review and promotion guidelines in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the College of Arts and Sciences Manual on Review of Academic Professionals and Promotion of Academic Professionals to Senior Academic Professionals (http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/acadpro/acadpro_as.pdf), hereafter referred to as the College Manual. Any Academic Professional to be considered for review and/or promotion should carefully study the criteria, requirements and procedures outlined in the College Manual.

The two primary areas to be considered for each Academic Professional’s review and/or promotion are instruction and service. Other activities that enhance the responsibilities of the Academic Professional position will be also considered. Candidates should build their dossier in conformity with the general requirements, format, and organization set forth by the College Manual. It is the candidate’s responsibility to build her/his case for promotion and to be aware that the departmental Academic Professional Review Committee will perform a critical and thorough evaluation of their dossier.

INSTRUCTION

An Academic Professional must have provided excellent classroom teaching and student mentoring. The assessment of the candidate’s instructional ranking will be based on performance in the following four basic areas:

1. Quality of course content,
2. Student evaluations and student perceptions,
3. Teaching and learning outcomes and grade distributions, and
4. Development, enhancement, enrichment, coordination, or innovation of courses or curriculum.

The candidate’s dossier must contain the instruments identified in the College Manual. These include, but are not limited to, teaching portfolios, web pages, and numerical and written student evaluations of instruction. These materials will be used to evaluate the candidate in the four areas stated above.

Contents of the teaching portfolios will be assessed for the following: (1) appropriateness and completeness with respect to course content and course development, (2) appropriateness and consistency with departmental goals for those courses, and (3) effectiveness of achieving the teaching and learning outcomes established by the department for those courses. Numerical scores on student evaluations will be judged based on the type and level of the course, and should be appropriate for the departmental goals of the course. Moreover, attention to scores in individual categories, as well as written comments by the students, would be expected.
to indicate any particular strengths or weaknesses of the candidate, at least from the viewpoint of the students.

A candidate whose dossier shows that she/he is highly effective in all four instructional areas will receive a rating of Excellent in instruction. A candidate whose dossier shows that she/he has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in three, two, one, or none of the areas will receive a rating of Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor, respectively, in instruction. To be rated as Outstanding, additional contributions in instruction over and above excellent classroom teaching and student mentoring will be considered. Such additional activities include instruction grants, pedagogical publications, and conference presentations.

A candidate recommended for promotion to Senior Academic Professional must be judged by the departmental Academic Professional Review Committee to be Excellent or Outstanding in Instruction.

**ELABORATION OF CRITERIA**

Evaluation of instructional effectiveness will use the criteria of the College Manual (http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf). Among the factors that evaluators shall consider in their assessments are the following:

- **Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, assignments, peer review (if available) based on classroom visits, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi will be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Course materials will 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, lecture notes, handouts, software, and other relevant information that enhance, enrich, or otherwise add to the overall value of the course. Credit will also be given to those whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students.

- **Student evaluations and student perceptions:** 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.) within the department. The information will also include other important variables, such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, response rate on the evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. The ‘type’ of course will also be considered, such as whether the course required MILE hours, or was strictly online. Students’ written comments will also be considered. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged in the context of other information and will not be the sole basis for evaluating instructional effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.
Teaching and learning outcomes and grade distributions: An assessment of highly effective instruction includes a demonstration that students have mastered most of the teaching and learning outcomes of the particular course. Beyond the evidence provided for the areas of quality of course content and student evaluations and perceptions, the candidate is expected to supply additional information, such as performance on common exams in multi-section courses, to show that students have achieved the learning outcomes. The grade distributions should be consistent with the students’ mastery of the teaching and learning outcomes. A WDF rate much higher than those in other sections of a coordinated course may be a sign of ineffective instruction, while an excessively high AB rate in a lower level course may suggest grade inflation.

Development, enhancement, enrichment, coordination, or innovation of courses or curriculum: Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new or different course materials, significant involvement in the enrichment of the course through the use of different instructional programs, and the use of new instructional techniques and practices that may add to the overall value of the course.

Teaching portfolios: To facilitate the evaluation process, each faculty member shall compile a teaching portfolio that contains the materials required for the various assessments. Portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses and a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, the candidate shall include in the portfolios complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations, and other materials). The candidate shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that over a three-year period it will contain a broad representation of the courses she/he has taught.

SERVICE

In the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, an Academic Professional’s main service responsibilities fall into two categories: facilities management/technical assistance, and laboratory staff supervision.

Facilities Management/Technical Assistance – This duty includes significant advisory roles in development of a teaching lab, management of such a teaching unit, and supervision of the facility. By working with other supporting units, an Academic Professional must ensure that all components of the facility are working properly while the classes are in session.

Laboratory Staff Supervision – This includes supervision of GLAs/GTAs, student assistants, and work-study students staffed in the lab and coordination with instructors teaching the courses served by the lab.
All candidates are reviewed in terms of their performance in the two categories above and other services described in the College Manual, such as Instructional Service, Academic Advisement and Curriculum, and membership on departmental, college, or university committees, Professional Service, Community and Public Service, and Published Materials. There are six ratings: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent, and Outstanding.

Poor/Fair (an unacceptable/minimally acceptable record of service): The marginal effectiveness in the area of service should be clearly evident in all documents that illustrate practical needs and accomplishments.

Good (a performance that is adequate): The supporting material provides evidence of conscientious preparation but fails to demonstrate strong organizational skill and decisive commitment to the broad responsibilities of her/his job.

Very Good (a performance that exceeds adequate): The supporting material provides evidence of conscientious preparation and demonstrates either strong organizational skill or decisive commitment to the broad responsibilities of her/his job.

Excellent (a performance that is highly competent): The supporting material includes evidence that is not only of conscientious preparation, but also demonstrates strong organizational skill and decisive commitment to the broad responsibilities of her/his job.

Outstanding (a performance that significantly exceeds the level of excellence): The supporting material provides evidence that is significantly more substantial than that at the level of excellent service.

A candidate recommended for promotion to Senior Academic Professional must be judged by the departmental Academic Professional Review Committee to be Excellent or Outstanding in Service.

Additional Considerations

1. Academic Professionals are encouraged to submit evidence of all professional activity, for example, publications, grant proposals, and presentations, especially as they apply to their performance as Academic Professional.

2. Election to offices, committee activities, and important service to professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer reviewing as related to research and other creative activities, may also indicate the scholarly efforts of the Academic Professional. Note: many activities related to professional associations should be listed under service if scholarship is not involved.