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.
A. Overview (from the College manual - 2004)

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 consideration is contributions in 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 research and scholarship will be considered particularly as they bear on instructional performance.

Reappointment of lecturers and promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer 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.

This document does not cover the annual review and annual contract renewal review that occur for all tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. The process for these annual evaluations, including the composition of the departmental contract renewal committee, will follow the established college and departmental policies, as specified in other documents. Since annual reviews and annual contract renewal reviews are distinct from the third-year 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-Year Review of Lecturers and Fifth-Year Review with Promotion to Senior Lecturer (from the College manual - 2004):

B.1. Dossier. The dossier will contain the following sections:
   a. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, Department of Sociology, and date of appointment at Georgia State University.
   b. Curriculum Vitae
   c. Information on Instruction
      • Statement of Instructional Interests, Goals, and Qualifications: Each lecturer should briefly describe an educational philosophy and a set of goals and objectives in instruction and service projects, and a list of courses and/or areas they believe they are qualified to teach.
      • Courses Taught During the Last Eight Semesters: The candidate must provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught during the time period. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. Using the following format, the candidate must provide a list of courses taught:

        SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX TO 20XX.
        Semester/year   Title and Course Number   Number of Students
Teaching Portfolio: Each lecturer will compile a teaching portfolio, as described in the College's Teaching Assessment Policy and as further specified by Sociology Department policy (see attached memo to Sociology Department Faculty, 1/9/03). 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.

- **Student Evaluations:** Summary of questions 1-17 on the student questionnaire must be provided for courses taught during the last 8 semesters. Written comments other than the ones required in the teaching portfolios should not be included.

- **Description of new courses and instructional programs developed** (if appropriate).

- **Instructional Funding** (if appropriate): Describe all intramural and extramural funding of instructional initiatives.

- **Published Materials** (if appropriate): Articles, textbooks, creative activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate's instruction.

- **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction** (if appropriate)

- **Independent Studies, Practica, Theses** (if appropriate)

d. **Information on Service**

- **Instructional Service:** a list of instructional service beyond the classroom. Examples of instructional service may include participating in developing instructional materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on instructional methodology, supervising and/or mentoring faculty.

- **Assistance to Colleagues:** guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and instructional issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, or assistance with new instructional technology), providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts or grant applications.

- **Contributions to the Department and College:** student advisement and mentoring, memberships on departmental/college committees, development of instructional and service programs.

- **Contributions to the University** (if appropriate)

- **Professional service** (if appropriate): memberships on professional societies, advisory boards, etc.

- **Community and public service** (if appropriate): lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, assistance to governmental agencies.

e. **Information on professional development activities** (if appropriate): Each lecturer may provide information on professional development activities, such as publications of their research and scholarship, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the lecturer’s knowledge of sociology or specialty area(s).
B.2. Review Criteria

a. Instruction: Evaluation of instructional effectiveness will use the criteria of the College’s Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty (http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf) and the standards described in the Department of Sociology’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Among the factors that evaluators should 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, 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. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. Credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students.

- **Development of new courses or instructional programs:** 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:** 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. 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.

- **Direction of undergraduate students:** The extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of undergraduate independent studies, practica, and honors theses will be considered.

Department of Sociology Evaluation of Instruction (adapted from Department of Sociology Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, pp.16-18).

The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of instruction in keeping with the College Manual’s evaluation categories (outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor) based on the evidence submitted. The committee will be mindful of the vagaries inherent in student evaluations; the student evaluation averages mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to reify the numbers.

The candidate will be judged to be outstanding in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is
impeccable. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest inspirational performance in the classroom (the overall average is in the high-4 range); the course material presented must show exceptional preparation; the candidate must demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students; and the candidate must have published a textbook or received one or more teaching awards.

The candidate will be judged to be **excellent** in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is superb. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is in the mid-4 range); the course material presented must show impressive preparation. The candidate may demonstrate effective mentoring of students and may have published a textbook or won one or more teaching awards.

The candidate will be judged to be **very good** in instruction if the general impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is highly competent. For instance, the applicant’s student evaluation scores must suggest very effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is in the low-4 range) and the course material presented must show diligent preparation.

The evaluation categories **good**, **fair**, and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for **very good** performance.

**b. Service:** In addition to being rated as excellent in instruction, a candidate must also be rated as having provided high quality service. The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. 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.

**c. 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) may be considered as they bear on the lecturer’s instructional performance.

**d. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role of the lecturers 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 lecturer within the context of the mission of the Sociology Department and the ability of the lecturer to effectively fulfill changing needs of the department.

**B.3. Ratings.** 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). The Department considers an evaluation of at least excellent in instruction to be necessary for reappointment following the third-year review and for promotion to senior lecturer at the fifth-year review. Further, the Department considers an evaluation of high quality in
service to be necessary to be considered for reappointment following the third-year review and for promotion to senior lecturer at the fifth-year review.


The third-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of instructional and service contributions. Lecturers in their third year will provide all required materials to the chair/director by the fourth week of the spring semester. The chair/director will provide this material to a departmental committee by the sixth week of the spring semester. This committee is composed of all tenured faculty in the department. This committee will use the appropriate manuals to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in instruction and service to the departmental chair by the tenth week of the spring semester. The chair/director will provide a written assessment of the lecturer’s effectiveness in instruction and service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair/director will forward all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office by the thirteenth week of the spring semester. The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide to the lecturer its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal.

D. Fifth-Year Review of Lecturers with Promotion to Senior Lecturer (from the College manual - 2004).

The fifth-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis towards identifying lecturers who have a sustained record of excellence in instruction and high-quality service. Lecturers in their fifth year will provide all required materials to the chair/director by the fourth week of the spring semester. The chair/director will provide the departmental fifth-year lecturer review committee with this material by the sixth week of the spring semester. This committee will consist of all tenured faculty in the department. 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 instruction and service to the department chair/director by the tenth week of the spring semester. The chair/director will provide a written assessment of the lecturer’s effectiveness in instruction and service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair/director will forward all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Dean's Office by the thirteenth week of the spring semester.

A College Lecturer Review Committee will then review these materials and make a recommendation to the Dean. This committee will be composed of at least 5 tenured faculty and senior lecturers. These must include one from each of the departments with a lecturer 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 June 15. The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide to the lecturer its decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract renewal.