

Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
School Approval:	09/09/2015
College Approval:	09/14/2015
Effective:	09/14/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design are
3 vital components of our faculty. The policies and procedures related to the review and
4 promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks are outlined in this document (School
5 guidelines), the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track
6 Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-
7 Tenure Track Faculty (university manual). Whereas the university and college NTT
8 manuals provide general statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT
9 faculty accomplishments, this document identifies the concrete forms these
10 achievements should take. In particular, this document articulates the School’s criteria
11 for the various rankings that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of
12 teaching and service. Candidates should consult the college and university manuals for
13 matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and time-in-rank policies that
14 govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

15 The Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the
16 lecturer and academic professional tracks. The ranks within the lecturer track include
17 the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and
18 Principal Senior Lecturer, while the ranks in use within the academic professional track
19 include Academic Professional and Senior Academic Professional. The general duties for
20 lecturer and academic professional track faculty are described in the college manual.

21

22 **II. SCHOOL OF ART & DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR**
23 **LECTURER, PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL**

24 **A. Process Overview**

25 The primary stages of the School-level NTT faculty promotion review process are as
26 follows:

- 27 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for
28 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
29 to the School Director.
- 30 2. The School Director forwards the candidate’s materials to the School review
31 committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must
32 be made by the committee as a whole).
- 33 3. The School committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports,
34 to the School Director. The committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate
35 page/pages. The School Director will provide a copy of the School committee’s
36 report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the
37 candidate has the option to respond directly to the School Director within three
38 business days.
- 39 4. The School Director submits her/his independent recommendation and the

40 recommendation of the School committee, including any minority reports and any
41 responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The School Director will provide
42 a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that the candidate
43 has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days. The
44 Dean's Office will provide to the School Director a copy of any response from the
45 candidate to the School Director's report.

46 See sections III and IV in the college manual for information on the evaluation processes
47 at the college and university levels.

48 **B. Composition of School of Art & Design Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review** 49 **Committee**

50 The School of Art & Design Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of
51 all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the School (Senior
52 Lecturer, Senior Academic Professional, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the Director of
53 the School and any members of the School serving in a position that will review the
54 candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels. According to the
55 college manual, units may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially
56 review and evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be
57 made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss
58 and vote on its final recommendation. Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's
59 current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole.
60 In consultation with the School Director, the dean will augment the School promotion
61 review committee with NTT members from other units when the School does not have a
62 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with
63 at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.
64

65 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

66 **A. General Considerations**

67 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty in the lecturer track: 1) annual
68 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
69 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
70 lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
71 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
72 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
73 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's
74 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
75 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document
76 are defined in the context of School expectations specific to candidates being
77 considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

78 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

79 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

80 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
81 of the college's policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
82 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
83 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education
84 requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of
85 teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to
86 their assigned role in the School of Art & Design.

87 As a general rule, evaluators will consider in their assessments of teaching effectiveness
88 the following criteria:

89 **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be
90 evaluated through review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-
91 class exercises, readings, and other elements integrated into the learning
92 environment created by the candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be
93 reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. In courses that involve
94 written exams, exam questions should require students to engage material
95 that is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. In courses
96 that involve writing assignments, assignments should develop the students'
97 ability to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent
98 arguments that answer meaningful questions. Course materials should also
99 be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of
100 knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as
101 customized texts, handouts, software, and other course elements that reflect
102 the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement and success. In
103 particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that
104 cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses
105 that connect students with other university programs and resources and that
106 take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta
107 will also be viewed as evidence of successful teaching. The School also
108 encourages faculty to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to
109 allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to provide those
110 students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the semester
111 unfolds. The School recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods.
112 Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations,
113 however, encourage student interest in the material and design assessments
114 that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

115 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching**
116 **resources that meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will
117 consider the effective development and execution of new courses, significant
118 involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of
119 new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the

120 responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with a travel
121 component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study
122 abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Initiatives in the
123 development of new courses and resources that potentially line up with
124 teaching ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are ones that
125 affect significant numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual
126 students so as to result in significant achievements such as the presentation
127 or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research as well as the
128 exhibition and/or performance of artistic works.

129 **c. Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will
130 include overall student evaluation scores, which are useful indicators of
131 student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the School will
132 not rely upon exclusively when determining minimum qualifications for
133 ratings, will be considered in the context of the normal range of scores for
134 specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the
135 School. The review will also consider other important variables such as
136 whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the
137 evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In addition to
138 average scores, the School will also be attentive to mean and median scores
139 and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative evidence
140 offered by the students' written comments on the student evaluation forms
141 will receive serious attention from the School as a meaningful supplement to
142 the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these
143 contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn
144 consistently strong evaluations and high scores.

145 **d. Direction of students:** The School will assess the extent and
146 quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects and academic
147 activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses, student
148 research or creative work presented at GSURC, as well individual student
149 engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or
150 communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering
151 additional tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for
152 underperforming and time spent offering additional guidance to students
153 who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their
154 coursework. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of
155 recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be
156 viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of teaching
157 effectiveness.

158 **e. Development of new skills:** The School encourages faculty to
159 continue to develop skills and to master new software, languages, and
160 technology in order to improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or
161 exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness
162 to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal

163 training to gain new certifications and competencies may present such
164 achievements to the School as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast
165 of best practices in pedagogy. The School recognizes that new skills need not
166 involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more interactive
167 classroom exercises geared toward fostering things such as critical
168 conversation, writing, and artistic responses might contribute to a faculty
169 member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

170

171 **2. Evaluation of Service**

172 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality
173 instructional service; contributions to the School, college, or university; professional
174 service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies depending on
175 the individual's core mission as defined by the School, but it is generally at the School or
176 college level. Contributions to service in the School of Art & Design typically fall into the
177 following categories: assigned service roles, such as administrative roles or other service
178 duties that are ongoing assignments; instructional service, such as developing teaching
179 materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, or
180 supervising or mentoring faculty; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing,
181 consulting about educational and teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews
182 of manuscripts or grant applications; contributions to the School, college, and university,
183 such as student advisement and mentoring, memberships on School/college/university
184 committees, and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if
185 appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards;
186 community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches,
187 presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

188 The review of candidates' records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks that
189 the School Director might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should
190 document any arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to
191 take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. The degree to
192 which assigned service responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be
193 part of the consideration of their service record.

194

195 **3. Additional Considerations**

196 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review
197 include the following:

198 **1. Professional Development Contributions:**

199 It is expected that lecturers will manifest in their classes a rich intellectual background
200 and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. Though not required
201 for promotion, one way of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of scholarly
202 or creative activities.

203 Since a lecturer's professional development is evaluated as a subordinate element of

204 the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate how
205 the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances his or her instructional
206 effectiveness. The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may
207 produce are identical to those described in the School promotion and tenure guidelines
208 for tenure track faculty, depending on the discipline: publications, invited exhibitions,
209 artistic performances, commissions, lectures, awards and grants, and so forth.
210 Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction
211 section of the dossier rather than under a Professional Development section.

212 **2. Role within the School of Art & Design:**

213 Since needs of the School of Art & Design often change, the role of the lecturers also
214 may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or School may need
215 to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the
216 lecturer within the context of the mission of the School and the ability of the lecturer to
217 fulfill effectively changing needs of the School.

218

219 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

220 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
221 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
222 relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*.
223 The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category for each
224 rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be
225 referenced in evaluations is included as an appendix to this document.

226 **1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

227 For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of
228 competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least *excellent*,
229 according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of
230 assigned service to the School, college, university, and/or to the professional and
231 practice community that is evaluated as at least *very good*, which meets the university
232 standard for promotion to senior lecturer.

233 **a. Teaching**

234 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
235 rating of *excellent*, the candidate demonstrates strong ability to communicate and work
236 effectively with students and provides them with current concepts and practices
237 consistent with the mastery of the field. The candidate consistently is engaged in efforts
238 to recruit students to his/her discipline. Student enrollment is consistent with workload
239 expectation. Select graduates are accepted to major graduate programs and/or have
240 professional careers as artists, scholars, curators or teachers. Students participate in
241 exhibition or scholarly activities regionally or statewide. Students work in a broad range
242 of styles with a high level of competence, or have a broad understanding of
243 methodologies and balance breadth of exposure with depth of understanding in a
244 specific area of interest. The candidate's reputation as a master teacher/workshop

245 leader is recognized on a national or regional level, as evidenced by invited workshops,
246 chaired conference sessions, publication in peer reviewed pedagogical journals, and
247 awards, for example.

248 **b. Service**

249 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
250 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills his or her
251 assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the
252 requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as
253 opportunities to most effectively govern the School and to achieve positive results for
254 undergraduate and graduate students.

255

256 **2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer**

257 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate
258 a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at
259 least *excellent*, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must
260 provide a level of assigned service to the School, college, university, and/or to the
261 professional and practice community that is evaluated as at least *excellent*, which meets
262 the university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates
263 for promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the
264 time period since the last promotion.

265 **a. Teaching**

266 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer with a
267 rating of *excellent*, the candidate must exceed the level of excellence established at the
268 time of his/her promotion to Senior Lecturer though he/she need not have risen to the
269 level required for a rating of *outstanding*. The faculty member is clearly a master
270 teacher who demonstrates an exceptional ability to communicate and work effectively
271 with students, providing them with current concepts and practices consistent with
272 mastery of the field. The candidate recruits high-quality students and maintains steady
273 enrollment in the studio or classroom. His or her students are accepted into quality
274 graduate programs and/or are sufficiently prepared for professional careers. Students
275 participate in exhibition or scholarly activities regionally or nationally. Students have
276 won awards or recognition in significant competitions or scholarly forums. Students
277 work in a broad range of styles with a high level of competence, or have a broad
278 understanding of methodologies and balance breadth of exposure with depth of
279 understanding in a specific area of interest. A faculty member seeking promotion to
280 Principal Senior Lecturer is evaluated as *excellent* if the committee determines that the
281 quality of his/her accomplishments meets the criteria of *outstanding* for promotion to
282 Senior Lecturer. The candidate's reputation as a master teacher/workshop leader is
283 recognized on a national or international level, as evidenced by invited workshops,
284 chaired conference sessions, publication in peer reviewed pedagogical journals, and
285 awards, for example. The candidate rated as *excellent* at this level normally will
286 demonstrate extensive, successful involvement in individual student mentoring.

287

b. Service

288 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
289 Principal Senior Lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if the faculty member has been
290 diligent and highly effective in carrying out assigned responsibilities, and contributed
291 significantly to the mission of the School over a sustained period. The faculty member
292 normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to School advising efforts or to
293 graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition to
294 continued growth in the areas of service described above, the faculty member's growth
295 in service should also take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as
296 an area coordinator or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a
297 campus leader; significant service to the profession or community.

298

299 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

300 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
301 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
302 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
303 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
304 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

305

306 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

307 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are
308 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by
309 the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report covering the prior
310 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation
311 with the School Executive Committee, the School Director will evaluate the lecturer
312 track faculty member's service and teaching and service using the criteria described in
313 the Appendix.

314 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

315 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's
316 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A School subcommittee
317 composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty and principal
318 senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the lecturer's record.
319 The School Director will provide an independent assessment before forwarding both
320 evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record. The third-year
321 review will employ the terms of the six-point scale used for promotion reviews.
322 However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year
323 review; it is meant to review the lecturer's achievements to date and provide mentoring
324 regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

325 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers**

326 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior

327 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy
328 and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member’s
329 teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria
330 listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in
331 the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are
332 either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each
333 when the School has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). The School
334 Director will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations
335 to the Dean’s Office for response.

336

337 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

338 **A. General Considerations**

339 There are four types of structured reviews for faculty in the academic professional track:
340 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review
341 with promotion to senior academic professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative
342 review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary consideration is
343 service contributions, while teaching contributions will be considered if the candidate’s
344 workload includes teaching. Supplemental consideration is given to contributions in the
345 area of professional development as they bear on the candidate’s knowledge as it
346 relates to the faculty member’s service, teaching (if applicable), and overall
347 performance. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed
348 above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of
349 School expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to senior
350 academic professional.

351

352 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

353 **1. Evaluation of Service**

354 According to Board of Regents requirements, the academic professional track faculty
355 “may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities
356 total 50% or more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual 803.10). The Welch
357 School of Art & Design understands instruction to include the teaching of credit courses
358 over the course of a semester, supervision of interns enrolled in internship courses, and
359 collateral instructional activities including, but not limited to, mentoring students in
360 activities related to professional practices involved in extended signature experiences.
361 As teaching and research must account for less than half of the Academic Professional’s
362 duties, reviews will focus primarily on service contributions as well as non-research
363 professional activities appropriate to each individual’s field(s) of expertise/competency.
364 Teaching will also be considered as part of the review, for academic professionals
365 engaged in duties that require teaching/training/instruction. Research activities, such as
366 publications of scholarship, creative activities, exhibitions, etc., are not required beyond
367 what constitutes “normal” and/or “best” practices for each area of expertise. The Welch

368 School of Art & Design reserves the right to consider any activities above and beyond
369 those required by professional standards and best practices, particularly as they bear on
370 the academic professional's overall performance.

371 Recognizing that each academic professional position is unique, the review committee
372 will base its assessment of the candidate's quality of service on the specific duties,
373 responsibilities and contributions of the academic professional. The basis for judgment
374 will be the professional standards and best practices of each area of
375 expertise/competency as well as the university-approved job description for each
376 position.

377 **a. Administrative Duties**

378 The Welch School of Art & Design recognizes that the administrative duties of our
379 academic professionals may take many forms depending on the necessities of each
380 position. With that stipulated, however, we expect that academic professionals in the
381 School will perform the following administrative duties:

- 382 1. serve on and contribute to departmental and university committees (both
383 standing and *ad hoc* as necessary)
- 384 2. participate in local, regional, and national organizations appropriate to her or his
385 field(s) of expertise/competency
- 386 3. manage assigned areas or functions, budgets, and equipment as required by the
387 needs of the position and in accordance with the University approved job
388 description
- 389 4. perform any and all service requirements associated with individual job
390 functions (see: IV.B.1.b. 1 – 18).

391 To demonstrate the quality of one's **administrative duties**, a candidate for promotion
392 should include a list of administrative roles such as committee service, participation in
393 professional organizations, and oversight roles associated with her or his position.
394 Reports or other documentation prepared by the candidate are acceptable
395 documentation.

396 **b. Job Functions**

397 The Welch School of Art & Design recognizes that the job functions of our academic
398 professionals take many forms. We wish to make clear that the projects and duties of
399 each academic professional may manifest themselves differently from year to year and
400 that quality is our highest priority. The list of duties below may relate to one major
401 project, which due to its complexity takes a greater length of time to bring to fruition, or
402 to several smaller projects, which may be developed over a shorter period of time. The
403 quality of the project(s) and the impact of each on students, faculty and the School as a
404 whole carry the greatest weight in our considerations.

405 To demonstrate the quality of one's **job functions**, a candidate for promotion should
406 include a list of programmatic duties and contributions to the overall development of

407 the School and University. Candidates should collect and provide evidence of one's
408 diligence and effectiveness in performing the essential functions and responsibilities of
409 her or his position. Supporting materials should include documentation of the
410 performance of the duties related to the particular post. The materials should
411 demonstrate a level of quality commensurate with professional standards and best
412 practices for the candidate's field(s) of expertise/competency. The materials should also
413 reflect conformity with the university-approved job description for the position under
414 review.

415 **Depending on the candidates' essential duties and job functions, she or he should**
416 **provide evidence of the following where appropriate:**

- 417 1. assistance to colleagues and graduate students, such as participation in teaching
418 seminars, work as a mentor, presentation of faculty and graduate student training
419 sessions, guest lecturing, and advising;
- 420 2. planning or participating in workshops connected to duties as academic professional;
- 421 3. service to the School, College, University or community related to her or his duties;
- 422 4. managing program development to foster intellectual development and excellence
423 within the School of Art & Design and across campus;
- 424 5. supervisory activities, including funding, training, and/or managing interns, work-
425 study students, graduate assistants, and other staff related to program;
- 426 6. budget management, including annual budget planning, monthly budget reports,
427 and/or distribution of resources to faculty, graduate students, and/or staff;
- 428
- 429 7. facilities management, including managing physical or digital spaces for the use of
430 faculty and students;
- 431 8. planning, implementing or participating in conferences and/or curriculum related
432 programming and events connected to duties as academic professional;
- 433 9. website development and development of online tools to improve program efficiency
434 and expand program outreach;
- 435 10. development of programmatic materials, including brochures, handbooks, handouts,
436 and other educational and promotional materials;
- 437 11. assessment to gauge the effectiveness of school, departmental, college, or university
438 programs;
- 439 12. serving on school, departmental, college, or university committees;
- 440 13. collaborating with other school, college, university and departmental entities to
441 foster intellectual development across campus;
- 442 14. establishing local, regional, and/or national recognition by presenting at conferences
443 or publishing about program initiatives as part of professional standards and/or best

- 444 practices for the academic professional's field(s) of expertise/competency;
445 15. maintenance of current and relevant knowledge in field of expertise related to the
446 Academic Professional's GSU program;
447 16. development and/or continuance of significant partnerships with regional, national
448 or international arts organizations with the aim of increasing the influence, recognition,
449 and /or effectiveness of the school, college and university;
450 17. additional substantive duties as outlined in the specific School Academic
451 Professional job description, performed at the request of the School of Art & Design's
452 Director, or in fulfillment of additional School requirements, as necessary;
453 18. development and outcomes of any new initiatives that support, promote and/or
454 improve program(s) within the School of Art & Design.

455

456 **2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)**

457 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
458 of the college's policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
459 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates
460 to their assigned role in the School.

461 Not every Academic Professional in the School of Art & Design will be tasked with
462 teaching or may not teach on a regular basis. It is not necessary for an Academic
463 Professional to teach to attain promotion. For those with a teaching component to their
464 duties, evaluators as a general rule will consider in their assessments of teaching
465 effectiveness the following criteria:

466 **a. Quality of course content:**

467 The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, exam
468 questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and other elements
469 integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for promotion.
470 Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. In courses that
471 involve written exams, exam questions should require students to engage material that
472 is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. In courses that involve
473 writing assignments, assignments should develop the students' ability to work with
474 primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful
475 questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation
476 to the current state of knowledge in the field. Academic professionals may provide
477 additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other course
478 elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement and
479 success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that
480 cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that connect
481 students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of
482 opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as evidence
483 of successful teaching. The School also encourages faculty to design courses with

484 sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling
485 and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the
486 semester unfolds. The School recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods.
487 Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however,
488 demonstrate a sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and
489 designing assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

490 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
491 **meaningfully improve existing courses:**

492 Evaluations will consider the effective development and execution of new courses,
493 significant involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of
494 new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the
495 faculty member. The design of courses with a travel component and the subsequent
496 successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential
497 achievement. Initiatives in the development of new courses and resources that
498 potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are
499 ones that affect significant numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual
500 students so as to result in significant achievements such as the presentation or
501 publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research.

502 **c. Student evaluations:**

503 The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student evaluation scores, if
504 s/he is teaching consistently as part of their assignment. The overall scores are useful
505 indicators of student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the School will
506 not rely upon exclusively when determining minimum qualifications for ratings, will be
507 considered in the context of the normal range of scores for specific courses and for
508 similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the School. The review will also
509 consider other important variables such as the frequency with which the academic
510 professional is teaching over the course of the year, class size, whether the course is
511 required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students
512 enrolled in the course. In addition to average scores, the School will also be attentive to
513 mean and median scores and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages.
514 Qualitative evidence offered by the students' written comments on the student
515 evaluation forms will receive serious attention from the School as a meaningful
516 supplement to the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these
517 contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn consistently
518 strong evaluations and high scores, as defined below.

519 **d. Direction of students:**

520 The School will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student
521 projects and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses,
522 student research or creative work presented at GSURC, as well individual student
523 engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or
524 communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering additional

525 tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for underperforming in their Art &
526 Design classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing
527 additional research projects connected to their Art & Design coursework. Faculty
528 members' willingness to write letters of recommendation for undergraduate and
529 graduate students might also be viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category
530 of teaching effectiveness.

531 **e. Development of new skills:**

532 The School encourages faculty to continue to develop skills and to master new software,
533 languages, and technology in order to improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as
534 meeting or exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness
535 to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain
536 new certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the School as
537 evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The School
538 recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation
539 of more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation
540 and writing might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

541 **3. Additional Considerations**

542 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the academic
543 professional review include the following:

544 **a. Role within the School:**

545 Since needs of the School of Art & Design often change, the role of the academic
546 professional also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or
547 School may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include
548 the role of the academic professional within the context of the mission of the School
549 and the ability of the academic professional to fulfill effectively changing needs of the
550 School.

551 **b. Professional Development Contributions:**

552 Reviewers may consider professional development as it bears on the Academic
553 Professional's Service (Administrative Duties/Job Functions), Teaching, and Overall
554 Performance.

555 It is expected that Academic Professionals will manifest a rich intellectual background
556 and a familiarity with current trends and methods in their field(s) of
557 expertise/competency in their programmatic work as well as in any classes taught. One
558 way (though not the only) of achieving such proficiency is through a program of
559 scholarly or creative activities. In considering an Academic Professional's performance in
560 professional development during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the School will not
561 determine a specific level of accomplishment (unlike service and instructional
562 proficiency, which are rated "outstanding and excellent," and so forth). Instead, the
563 review committee will take careful account of the candidate's professional development
564 and use it to help determine the rating awarded in service and instruction. This reflects

565 our belief that a faculty member who is actively engaged in professional projects of
566 some kind will fulfill the responsibilities of their position in service and instruction as a
567 result: they will be better able to convey to students -- as a first-hand practitioner --
568 pedagogical insights about writing, studio practice, research, theory, pedagogy,
569 professional practice related to the arts, and other disciplinary matters.

570 Since an Academic Professional's professional development is evaluated as a
571 subordinate element of the overall record in service and instruction, it is incumbent on
572 the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier
573 enhances her or his service and/or instructional effectiveness, such as by demonstrating
574 connections between the specific projects undertaken and the material taught in the
575 classroom or service conducted on campus.

576 The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are
577 identical to those described in the School promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure
578 track faculty, depending on the discipline: publications, invited exhibitions, artistic
579 performances, commissions, lectures, awards and grants, and so forth. Scholarship
580 focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction section of the
581 dossier rather than under Professional Development.

582

583 **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

584 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
585 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
586 using the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The
587 single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category is defined in
588 this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be referenced in
589 evaluations is included as an appendix to this document (see Appendix II).

590 **1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional**

591 For promotion to the rank of senior academic professional, the candidate must
592 demonstrate a level of assigned service to the School, college and/or university, and/or
593 the professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*. If the
594 candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as
595 demonstrating a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is also
596 evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the university standard for promotion to the rank of
597 senior academic professional.

598 **a. Service**

599 To meet the standard in service for promotion to senior academic professional with a
600 rating of *excellent*, the candidate performs high quality work in all of the administrative
601 duties noted in Section IV.B.1.a above, as well as high quality work in at least five of the
602 job functions listed in Section IV.B.1.b, as determined by the School Director and
603 according to the university approved job description for each position.

604 **b. Teaching**

605 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion the rank of senior academic
606 professional with a rating of *excellent*, the candidate is a highly competent teacher
607 whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and
608 enthusiastic instruction but also of conscientious mentoring of students, effective
609 pedagogy, and a strong commitment to the mission of the School. The candidate's
610 effectiveness as a teacher is clearly evident in all documents that rate performance,
611 including student evaluations and peer observations if available.

612 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

613 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
614 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
615 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
616 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
617 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

618 **1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals**

619 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional
620 track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the
621 materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report
622 covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate
623 materials. In consultation with the School Executive Committee, the School Director will
624 evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and teaching (if
625 her/his workload includes teaching) using the criteria described in Appendix II.

626 **2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals**

627 The third-year review for academic professionals is designed to assess the faculty
628 member's effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior academic
629 professional. A School subcommittee composed of three faculty, which will include
630 tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from each), will
631 prepare an evaluation of the academic professional's service and teaching (if
632 applicable). The School Director will provide an independent assessment before
633 forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record.
634 The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in
635 Appendix II. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the
636 fifth-year promotion review: it is meant to encourage an assessment of, and dialogue
637 about, an academic professional's achievements to date, and to generate advice about
638 possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

639 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Academic Professionals**

640 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
641 academic professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if
642 applicable). The review will cover the faculty member's service and teaching (if
643 applicable) records over the past five years and will employ the criteria described in

644 Appendix II. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college
645 manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured
646 or at the rank of senior academic professional (with representation from each when the
647 School has an available senior academic professional within its ranks). The School
648 Director will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations
649 to the Dean's Office for response.

650 **APPENDIX I: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be**
651 **used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews**

652

653 **A. Teaching**

654

655 **Poor:** The faculty member demonstrates little evidence of mastery of teaching
656 techniques and content. Students show little or no progress.

657

658 **Fair:** The faculty member demonstrates minimum competence as an artist or scholar
659 and as a recruiter of students. There is little evidence that students have progressed in
660 their growth as artists or scholars.

661

662 **Good:** The faculty member demonstrates acceptable competence as an artist or scholar
663 and recruits an adequate number of students to the discipline. The candidate's
664 reputation as a teacher/workshop leader is recognized on the local and state level.

665

666 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates an above-average ability to provide
667 students with current concepts and practices consistent with mastery in the field.
668 Quality students are attracted and retained to the discipline, and are consistently
669 strong. The candidate's reputation as a teacher/workshop leader is recognized on a
670 regional level.

671

672 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The faculty member demonstrates a strong
673 ability to communicate and work effectively with students and provides them with
674 current concepts and practices consistent with mastery of the field. The candidate
675 consistently is engaged in efforts to recruit students to his/her discipline. Student
676 enrollment is consistent with workload expectation. Select graduates are accepted to
677 major graduate programs and/or have professional careers as artists, scholars, curators
678 or teachers. Students participate in exhibition or scholarly activities regionally or
679 statewide. Students work in a broad range of styles with a high level of competence, or
680 have a broad understanding of methodologies and balance breadth of exposure with
681 depth of understanding in a specific area of interest. The candidate's reputation as a
682 master teacher/workshop leader is recognized on a regional or national level, as
683 evidenced by invited workshops, chaired conference sessions, publication in peer
684 reviewed pedagogical journals, and awards, for example.

685 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for
686 promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, an evaluation of excellent indicates
687 that, in addition to meeting the requirements for excellence at the Senior-Lecturer level,
688 the faculty member is clearly a master teacher who demonstrates an exceptional ability
689 to communicate and work effectively with students, providing them with current

690 concepts and practices consistent with mastery of the field. The candidate recruits high-
691 quality students and maintains steady enrollment in the studio or classroom. His or her
692 students are accepted into quality graduate programs and/or are sufficiently prepared
693 for professional careers. Students participate in exhibition or scholarly activities
694 regionally or nationally. Students have won awards or recognition in significant
695 competitions or scholarly forums. Students work in a broad range of styles with a high
696 level of competence, or have a broad understanding of methodologies and balance
697 breadth of exposure with depth of understanding in a specific area of interest. The
698 candidate rated as *excellent* at this level normally will demonstrate extensive, successful
699 involvement in individual student mentoring.

700 ***Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):*** The faculty member is clearly a master
701 teacher who demonstrates an exceptional ability to communicate and work effectively
702 with students, providing them with current concepts and practices consistent with
703 mastery of the field. The candidate recruits high-quality students and maintains steady
704 enrollment in the studio or classroom. His or her students are accepted into quality
705 graduate programs and/or are sufficiently prepared for professional careers. Students
706 participate in exhibition or scholarly activities regionally or nationally. Students have
707 won awards or recognition in significant competitions or scholarly forums. Students
708 work in a broad range of styles with a high level of competence, or have a broad
709 understanding of methodologies and balance breadth of exposure with depth of
710 understanding in a specific area of interest. A faculty member is evaluated as
711 *outstanding* if the committee determines that the quality of his/her accomplishments
712 exceeds the criteria of excellent. The candidate's reputation as a master
713 teacher/workshop leader is recognized on a national or international level, as evidenced
714 by invited workshops, chaired conference sessions, publication in peer reviewed
715 pedagogical journals, and awards, for example.

716 ***Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):*** In the context of review for
717 promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, an evaluation of *outstanding*
718 characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the department's pedagogical
719 mission. In addition to meeting the criteria for *outstanding* described above, he or she
720 has a record demonstrating that his/her classes and instructional programs manifest an
721 innovative pedagogical proficiency that has a broad, positive impact on other faculty
722 and on the departmental curriculum. This candidate takes a leadership role in the
723 department's instructional mission. The candidate's reputation as a master
724 teacher/workshop leader is recognized on an international level.

725 **B. Service**

726

727 **Poor:** The faculty member does not fulfill assigned service obligations and is not a
728 responsible citizen of the School.

729

730 **Fair:** The faculty member ineffectively fulfills assigned service obligations or is not a
731 responsible citizen of the School.

732

733 **Good:** The faculty member does not always effectively fulfill assigned service obligations
734 or is not consistently a responsible citizen of the School.

735

736 **Very Good:** The faculty member enthusiastically and effectively fulfills her/his assigned
737 roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite
738 advisement sessions, such faculty actively participate, using these meetings as
739 opportunities to most effectively govern the School and to achieve positive results for
740 undergraduate and graduate students.

741

742 **Excellent:** The faculty member has been diligent and highly effective in carrying out
743 assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the School over a
744 sustained period. The faculty member normally exhibits a track record of providing
745 assistance to School advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other
746 non-tenure track instructors. In addition to continued growth in the areas of service
747 described above, the faculty member's growth in service should also take one or more
748 of the following forms: highly effective service as an area coordinator or in a role with a
749 similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the
750 profession or community.

751

752 **Outstanding:** In excess of the stated expectations required to achieve a rating of
753 *excellent* in service, the faculty member will be judged to be *outstanding* in service if he
754 or she has not only fulfilled any assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable
755 personal initiative to seek out best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the
756 success of the School in meeting its stated goals. The faculty member will have been
757 recognized by his/her peers, students, or university administrators as having established
758 a long track record of success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable
759 ways. Highly effective service as an area coordinator or in a role with a similar level of
760 responsibility, or extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also
761 indications of *outstanding* service.

762 **APPENDIX II: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Academic Professional-Track**
763 **Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative**
764 **Reviews**

765

766 **A. Service**

767 **Poor:** Not only has the faculty member not performed his or her duties, but has been
768 derelict to an extent that other School, college, and/or university functions have been
769 impeded.

770 **Fair:** The faculty member's responsibilities have not been fulfilled, and others have had
771 to take over the performance of those duties.

772 **Good:** The faculty member's responsibilities have been only marginally performed.

773 **Very Good:** The faculty member has accomplished some but not all of the assigned
774 duties in Sections IV.B.1.a and IV.B.1.b above, does not present evidence of the
775 successful completion of many of these duties, or provides evidence that does not
776 illustrate high quality work or is unrelated to those duties.

777 **Excellent:** The faculty member fulfills consistent, effective, innovative, and dependable
778 service in all of the administrative duties outlined in Section IV.B.1.a, as well as high
779 quality work in at least five of the job functions listed in Section IV.B.1.b, as determined
780 by the School Director and according to the university-approved job description for the
781 position.

782 **Outstanding:** The faculty member performs high quality work in all administrative
783 duties outlined in Section IV.B.1.a, as well as high quality work in at least eight of the job
784 functions listed in Section IV.B.1.b.

785

786 **B. Teaching**

787 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced
788 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in
789 School curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques
790 and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the
791 course content to students.

792 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as
793 evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little
794 involvement in School curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
795 pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the
796 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

797 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance minimally exceeds adequate.
798 This candidate's supporting material provides evidence of appropriate preparation and
799 pertinent content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or
800 decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of

801 a full-time college instructor.

802 **Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent candidate whose supporting material
803 includes evidence not only of conscientious preparation and instruction but also of
804 some mentoring of students and effective pedagogy. Class assignments are creative and
805 methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning.

806 **Excellent:** The faculty member is a highly competent teacher whose supporting material
807 includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and enthusiastic instruction but also
808 of conscientious mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a strong commitment
809 to the mission of the School. The candidate's effectiveness as a teacher is clearly evident
810 in all documents that rate performance, including student evaluations and peer
811 observations if available.

812 **Outstanding:** The faculty member's performance and supporting material demonstrate
813 the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays
814 evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal
815 intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the school. Supporting
816 material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, including
817 exceptional preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful
818 mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent
819 philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The
820 candidate's superior effectiveness as a teacher should be clearly evident in all
821 documents that rate performance, including student evaluations and peer observations
822 if available.