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

This document describes the process for the review of lecturers and for the promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer. All lecturers are reviewed annually for contract renewal, as these positions are not tenure track and are not intended to become so. Lecturers who are reappointed after five years of consecutive service will be promoted to senior lecturer, to begin in their seventh year of service. Lecturers not reappointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

There are two types of reviews specific for lecturers; these are the third-year review and fifth-year review of lecturers, with promotion to senior lecturer. In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in the areas of instruction and service. Instruction includes teaching students, both inside and outside the classroom environment. Service includes advising and serving the academic needs of students. Service 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. Other activities, such as publications of their research and scholarship, are not required; however, the department has the option of considering such activities in the reviews, particularly as they bear on instructional performance.

Reappointment of lecturers and promotion of lecturers to senior lecturers 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.

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has formulated the review and promotion guidelines in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Manual for Review of Lecturers and Promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers of the College of Arts and Sciences (http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/lec/lec_as.pdf), hereafter referred to as the College Manual.

Any lecturer who might be considered for review and/or promotion should study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures that are outlined in the departmental guidelines and the College Manual.

DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA

The two primary areas to be considered for each lecturer’s review and/or promotion are instruction and service. Specific items to be considered are listed in the College Manual, and are summarized below. Lecturers should consult the College Manual concerning the format and organization of the materials to be submitted to the Department and College Lecturer Review Committees. Lecturers should be aware that the departmental Lecturer Review Committee will perform a critical and thorough evaluation of their dossier. In all cases, lecturers must satisfy the minimum requirements set forth by Georgia State University and the College of Arts and Sciences. Each case for promotion will be considered on its own merits based on the materials submitted by the lecturer. It is the lecturer's responsibility to build his or her case for promotion.
The criteria set out below are intended to elaborate those provided in the current College Manual that states

“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. The College considers an evaluation of at least excellent in instruction to be necessary for reappointment following the fifth-year review and for promotion to senior lecturer. In addition, the faculty member must perform high-quality service within his/her specified workload in order to be considered for reappointment following the fifth-year review and for promotion to senior lecturer.”

The definitions of the various ratings and the typical evidence associated with a rating are described below.

INSTRUCTION

The candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer must be judged by the department faculty to have a record of performance in instruction that is excellent or outstanding.

To be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer, a Lecturer must have provided excellent classroom teaching and student mentoring. With this in mind, the assessment of the candidate’s instructional ranking will be based on performance in the following four basic areas:

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

The candidate will prepare a dossier, containing the instruments 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, 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 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 demonstrated and/or anticipated effectiveness for 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, would be 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 four instructional areas will receive a rating of **excellent** in instruction. A candidate whose dossier shows that he/she 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.

The faculty will consider additional contributions in instruction by the candidate which are over and above excellent classroom teaching and student mentoring. These may include publication 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; or other appropriate activities. 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 and student mentoring, may earn the candidate a rating of **outstanding** in instruction.

### SERVICE

The service record of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. The following activities will be considered: serving as a course coordinator, mentoring GTAs, advising undergraduate majors, advising student clubs, enriching math and science activities at GSU, and serving on departmental committees. The following activities will be a plus: memberships on College/University committees, memberships on committees of professional organizations, organization of symposia and conferences, and presentations for general or student audiences. Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner) and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively, qualify for a rating of high quality service.

### Elaboration of Criteria

Evaluation of instructional effectiveness will use the criteria of the College’s Manual.[1](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. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, lecture notes, handouts, software, and other relevant information. Credit will also be given to faculty 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,
the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course.
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-
gained distinctions.

- **Teaching and learning outcomes and grade distributions**: Effective teaching is achieved
  when the students demonstrate that they 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
  curricula**: Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new courses
  or new/different materials for existing courses, significant involvement in the development
  of new instructional programs, coordination of multi-section courses, and the use of new
  instructional techniques and practices.

- **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, faculty
  shall include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student
  evaluations, and other materials) from two courses per year -- one a specialty course and
  one a more general course. Faculty members shall 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.

**Additional Considerations**

1. Lecturers are encouraged to submit (include) evidence of all professional activity, for
   example, publications, grant proposals, and presentations, especially as they apply to their
   performances a Lecturer.

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 lecturer. Note: many
   activities related to professional associations should be listed under service if scholarship is
not involved.

DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS AND SCHEDULE OF IMPORTANT DATES

The Departmental process will follow the College of Arts and Sciences Manual. A lecturer seeking promotion and/or review must submit his/her credentials to the Departmental Lecturer Review Committee in the same format in which these credentials are to be submitted to the College.