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

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

This document details the department-specific criteria for the third-year and fifth-year reviews of lecturers in the Department of Physics and Astronomy as a supplement to the College of Arts and Sciences Manual on the Review of Lecturers and Promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers (http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/admin/facrev/lect/lect_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 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.

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 Physics and Astronomy has formulated the review and promotion guidelines in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the College Manual. Any lecturer 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 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 criteria for determining the ratings in these categories are given below.
INSTRUCTION

To be considered for promotion to senior lecturer, a lecturer must have provided excellent classroom teaching. 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

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 or lab 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 diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended required committee meetings and have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner) and who have also completed their assignments effectively qualify for a rating of high quality service.
Additional Considerations

Lecturers may include evidence of professional activity, such as publications, grant proposals, and presentations, especially as they apply to their performances as lecturers. 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.**