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

All academic professionals are reviewed annually for contract renewal. In addition, academic professionals are reviewed comprehensively in their third and fifth years. Academic professionals reappointed after five years of consecutive service will be promoted to senior academic professionals, to begin in their seventh year of service. As per the College Manual, academic professionals not reappointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

This document details the department-specific guidelines and criteria for the third-year and fifth-year reviews of academic professionals in the Department of Physics and Astronomy as a supplement to the College of Arts and Sciences Manual for 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), which outlines the review processes and dossier requirements. In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in the areas of instruction and service. Instruction includes teaching students both inside and outside of the classroom environment. Service includes a wide variety of tasks, and is normally at the departmental and college levels, but may include university service. Professional service as well as public service involving professional expertise is also relevant.

Reappointment of academic professionals and promotion of academic professionals to senior academic professionals are dependent not only on their performance in instruction and service, but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of the College and its units. Any academic professional who might be considered for review and/or promotion should carefully study the criteria, requirements, and procedures that are outlined in the departmental guidelines and the College Manual.

DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA

The criteria set out below are intended to elaborate on those provided in the current College Manual, which states that the third-year and fifth-year reviews will employ the following categories for the evaluation of instruction: outstanding (6), excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), poor (1). Guidelines for the application of these evaluations as they apply within the faculty member’s field are specified in each departmental manual and may vary depending on departmental context. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, each candidate must be rated as at least excellent in service and excellent in instruction. The criteria for determining the ratings in these categories are given below.

INSTRUCTION

For academic professionals, instructional assignments can vary from term to term depending on departmental needs. The effectiveness of instruction will be evaluated as it relates to the department’s mission and the specific instructional responsibilities of the
candidate. For senior academic professional candidates, instruction will be rated to determine if the standard of excellence is achieved. With this in mind, the assessment of the candidate’s instructional ranking will be based on performance in the following three basic areas:

(1) Quality of course content, including enhancement of instructional materials,
(2) Student evaluations and perceptions, and
(3) Teaching and learning outcomes and grade distributions.

The candidate will prepare a dossier, containing the information identified in the College Manual. These include, but are not limited to, teaching portfolios that contain or reflect the following: syllabi, tests, assignments, handouts, web pages, example lectures (e.g., PowerPoint slides), and numerical and written student evaluations of instruction.

Contents of the portfolios will be assessed for appropriateness and completeness of course content and course development. The scope and level of the material for each course will be assessed for appropriateness and consistency with departmental policy for those courses. The material in the dossier will also be reviewed for effectiveness in 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 for the course. Moreover, attention to scores in individual categories, as well as written comments by the students, are expected to inform the faculty of any particular strengths or weaknesses of the candidate, at least from the viewpoint of the students.

**A candidate whose dossier shows that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in all three instructional areas will receive a rating of excellent in instruction.**

The faculty will consider additional contributions in instruction by the candidate that are beyond excellent classroom teaching. These may include publication or presentation of pedagogical or disciplinary materials; success in obtaining instructional grants; placement and success of graduates; good performance of students who move on to sequential classes; direction of undergraduate student research projects; significant role in recognition received by students (e.g., honors or awards); participation in departmental graduate programs including research; or development or innovation of instructional materials or curricula. Such additional activities would normally be considered to enrich the students’ learning experience, thereby adding a valuable dimension to courses beyond standard classroom instruction. **Substantial and effective activities such as these, when added to an excellent rating in classroom instruction, may earn the candidate a rating of outstanding in instruction.**

**Elaboration of Instruction Criteria**

Among the factors that evaluators shall consider in their assessments are the following:

(1) Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through
review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, assignments, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi will be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines and standard curricula in the department, when available. Course materials will also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, lecture notes, handouts, software, and other relevant information.

(2) Student evaluations and perceptions: The review will include student evaluation scores, in the context of the range of scores of tenure-track and tenured faculty as well as senior lecturers and senior academic professionals for specific courses and for similar level courses within the department. Students’ written comments will also be considered. Negative comments will be weighed against instructor’s use of good teaching practices. Student evaluations will be judged in the context of other information and will not be the sole basis for evaluating instructional effectiveness.

(3) Teaching and learning outcomes: Effective teaching is achieved when the students demonstrate that they have mastered most of the learning outcomes of the particular course. Beyond the evidence provided for the areas of quality of course content and student evaluations and perceptions, additional information, such as performance on common exams and observations of classroom performance by peers, may be considered by the evaluators. 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. Grade distributions should be consistent with typical distributions for similar courses in the department.

SERVICE

Service comprises at least 50% of the Academic Professional’s job functions. Service roles are assigned by the department and depend on departmental needs and mission. Service effectiveness will be judged as outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor with respect to the assigned service duties. Service roles are normally assigned by the department (individual assignments may consist of all or some of these roles) include the following (please see College document for detailed descriptions):

(1) Facility/service management, including management of laboratory equipment
(2) Supervisory/mentoring activities, including supervision of laboratory sections and teaching assistants
(3) Development of new laboratory exercises/equipment
(4) Writing/publishing/maintaining laboratory manuals
(5) Acquisition or development of equipment/facilities for instructional use
(6) Assessment of learning outcomes in programs or courses
(7) Academic advisement and curriculum development
(8) Community, public, or other beneficial service
The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To receive a rating of excellent or above, all assigned tasks must be performed thoroughly and in a timely manner.

Additional Considerations

Academic professionals may include evidence of professional activity, such as publications, grant proposals, and presentations, especially as they apply to their performances as academic professionals. 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. Substantial and effective activities such as these, when added to an excellent rating may help to earn the candidate a rating of outstanding in instruction or service, as appropriate.