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I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

A. Process Overview

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

1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the School Director.

2. The School Director forwards the candidate’s materials to the School review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).

3. The School committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the School Director. The committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages. The School Director will provide a copy of the School committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the School Director within three business days.

4. The School Director submits her/his independent recommendation and the
recommendation of the School committee, including any minority reports and any
responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The School Director will provide
a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that the candidate
has the option to respond to the Dean’s Office within three business days. The
Dean’s Office will provide to the School Director a copy of any response from the
candidate to the School Director’s report.

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

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

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

III. LECTURER REVIEWS
A. General Considerations

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

1. Evaluation of Teaching

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the college’s policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).

Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the School of Art & Design.

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

a. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. In courses that involve written exams, exam questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. In courses that involve writing assignments, assignments should develop the students’ ability to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful questions. 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 course elements that reflect the faculty member’s efforts to foster student engagement and success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that connect students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as evidence of successful teaching. The School also encourages faculty to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the semester unfolds. The School recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, encourage student interest in the material and design assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that meaningfully improve existing courses: Evaluations will consider the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the
responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with a travel component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Initiatives in the development of new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are ones that affect significant numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant achievements such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research as well as the exhibition and/or performance of artistic works.

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

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

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

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

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

3. Additional Considerations
Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review include the following:

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

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

2. Role within the School of Art & Design:

Since needs of the School of Art & Design often change, the role of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or School 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 School and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the School.

C. Criteria for Promotion

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

1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

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

a. Teaching

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of excellent, the candidate demonstrates strong ability to communicate and work effectively with students and provides them with current concepts and practices consistent with the mastery of the field. The candidate consistently is engaged in efforts to recruit students to his/her discipline. Student enrollment is consistent with workload expectation. Select graduates are accepted to major graduate programs and/or have professional careers as artists, scholars, curators or teachers. Students participate in exhibition or scholarly activities regionally or statewide. Students work in a broad range of styles with a high level of competence, or have a broad understanding of methodologies and balance breadth of exposure with depth of understanding in a specific area of interest. The candidate's reputation as a master teacher/workshop
leader is recognized on a national or regional level, as evidenced by invited workshops, chaired conference sessions, publication in peer reviewed pedagogical journals, and awards, for example.

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

2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer
For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least excellent, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the School, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as at least excellent, which meets the university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion.

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

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

D. Other Lecturer Reviews

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

1. Annual Review of Lecturers

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

2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

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

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

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

IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS

A. General Considerations

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

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Service

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

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

**a. Administrative Duties**

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

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

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

**b. Job Functions**

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

To demonstrate the quality of one’s *job functions*, a candidate for promotion should include a list of programmatic duties and contributions to the overall development of
the School and University. Candidates should collect and provide evidence of one’s
diligence and effectiveness in performing the essential functions and responsibilities of
her or his position. Supporting materials should include documentation of the
performance of the duties related to the particular post. The materials should
demonstrate a level of quality commensurate with professional standards and best
practices for the candidate’s field(s) of expertise/competency. The materials should also
reflect conformity with the university-approved job description for the position under
review.

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

1. assistance to colleagues and graduate students, such as participation in teaching
seminars, work as a mentor, presentation of faculty and graduate student training
sessions, guest lecturing, and advising;

2. planning or participating in workshops connected to duties as academic professional;

3. service to the School, College, University or community related to her or his duties;

4. managing program development to foster intellectual development and excellence
within the School of Art & Design and across campus;

5. supervisory activities, including funding, training, and/or managing interns, work-
study students, graduate assistants, and other staff related to program;

6. budget management, including annual budget planning, monthly budget reports,
and/or distribution of resources to faculty, graduate students, and/or staff;

7. facilities management, including managing physical or digital spaces for the use of
faculty and students;

8. planning, implementing or participating in conferences and/or curriculum related
programming and events connected to duties as academic professional;

9. website development and development of online tools to improve program efficiency
and expand program outreach;

10. development of programmatic materials, including brochures, handbooks, handouts,
and other educational and promotional materials;

11. assessment to gauge the effectiveness of school, departmental, college, or university
programs;

12. serving on school, departmental, college, or university committees;

13. collaborating with other school, college, university and departmental entities to
foster intellectual development across campus;

14. establishing local, regional, and/or national recognition by presenting at conferences
or publishing about program initiatives as part of professional standards and/or best
practices for the academic professional’s field(s) of expertise/competency;
15. maintenance of current and relevant knowledge in field of expertise related to the
Academic Professional’s GSU program;
16. development and/or continuance of significant partnerships with regional, national
or international arts organizations with the aim of increasing the influence, recognition,
and/or effectiveness of the school, college and university;
17. additional substantive duties as outlined in the specific School Academic
Professional job description, performed at the request of the School of Art & Design’s
Director, or in fulfillment of additional School requirements, as necessary;
18. development and outcomes of any new initiatives that support, promote and/or
improve program(s) within the School of Art & Design.

2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)
As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
of the college’s policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates
to their assigned role in the School.
Not every Academic Professional in the School of Art & Design will be tasked with
teaching or may not teach on a regular basis. It is not necessary for an Academic
Professional to teach to attain promotion. For those with a teaching component to their
duties, evaluators as a general rule will consider in their assessments of teaching
effectiveness the following criteria:
a. Quality of course content:
The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, exam
questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and other elements
integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for promotion.
Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. In courses that
involve written exams, exam questions should require students to engage material that
is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. In courses that involve
writing assignments, assignments should develop the students’ ability to work with
primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful
questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation
to the current state of knowledge in the field. Academic professionals may provide
additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other course
elements that reflect the faculty member’s efforts to foster student engagement and
success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that
cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that connect
students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of
opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as evidence
of successful teaching. The School also encourages faculty to design courses with
sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the semester unfolds. The School recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, demonstrate a sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and designing assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

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

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

c. Student evaluations:

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

d. Direction of students:

The School will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses, student research or creative work presented at GSURC, as well individual student engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering additional
tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for underperforming in their Art & Design classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their Art & Design coursework. Faculty members’ willingness to write letters of recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

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

3. Additional Considerations
Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the academic professional review include the following:
a. Role within the School:
Since needs of the School of Art & Design often change, the role of the academic professional also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or School may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the academic professional within the context of the mission of the School and the ability of the academic professional to fulfill effectively changing needs of the School.

b. Professional Development Contributions:
Reviewers may consider professional development as it bears on the Academic Professional’s Service (Administrative Duties/Job Functions), Teaching, and Overall Performance.

It is expected that Academic Professionals will manifest a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in their field(s) of expertise/competency in their programmatic work as well as in any classes taught. One way (though not the only) of achieving such proficiency is through a program of scholarly or creative activities. In considering an Academic Professional’s performance in professional development during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the School will not determine a specific level of accomplishment (unlike service and instructional proficiency, which are rated “outstanding and excellent,” and so forth). Instead, the review committee will take careful account of the candidate’s professional development and use it to help determine the rating awarded in service and instruction. This reflects
our belief that a faculty member who is actively engaged in professional projects of
some kind will fulfill the responsibilities of their position in service and instruction as a
result: they will be better able to convey to students -- as a first-hand practitioner --
pedagogical insights about writing, studio practice, research, theory, pedagogy,
professional practice related to the arts, and other disciplinary matters.

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

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

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

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

1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional

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

a. Service

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

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

D. Other Academic Professional Reviews

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

1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals

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

2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals

The third-year review for academic professionals is designed to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior academic professional. A School subcommittee composed of three faculty, which will include tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from each), will prepare an evaluation of the academic professional’s service and teaching (if applicable). The School Director will provide an independent assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for further evaluation of the record.

The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in Appendix II. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year promotion review: it is meant to encourage an assessment of, and dialogue about, an academic professional’s achievements to date, and to generate advice about possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Academic Professionals

The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior academic professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if applicable). The review will cover the faculty member’s service and teaching (if applicable) records over the past five years and will employ the criteria described in
Appendix II. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of senior academic professional (with representation from each when the School has an available senior academic professional within its ranks). The School Director will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.
APPENDIX I: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

A. Teaching

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

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

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

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

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

Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer): In the context of review for promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, an evaluation of excellent indicates that, in addition to meeting the requirements for excellence at the Senior-Lecturer level, the faculty member is clearly a master teacher who demonstrates an exceptional ability to communicate and work effectively with students, providing them with current...
concepts and practices consistent with mastery of the field. The candidate recruits high-
quality students and maintains steady enrollment in the studio or classroom. His or her
students are accepted into quality graduate programs and/or are sufficiently prepared
for professional careers. Students participate in exhibition or scholarly activities
regionally or nationally. Students have won awards or recognition in significant
competitions or scholarly forums. Students work in a broad range of styles with a high
level of competence, or have a broad understanding of methodologies and balance
breadth of exposure with depth of understanding in a specific area of interest. The
candidate rated as excellent at this level normally will demonstrate extensive, successful
involvement in individual student mentoring.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outstanding: In excess of the stated expectations required to achieve a rating of excellent in service, the faculty member will be judged to be outstanding in service if he or she has not only fulfilled any assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to seek out best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the success of the School in meeting its stated goals. The faculty member will have been recognized by his/her peers, students, or university administrators as having established a long track record of success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways. Highly effective service as an area coordinator or in a role with a similar level of responsibility, or extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also indications of outstanding service.
APPENDIX II: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Academic Professional-Track Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

A. Service

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

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

Good: The faculty member’s responsibilities have been only marginally performed.

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

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

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

B. Teaching

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

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

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance minimally exceeds adequate. This candidate’s supporting material provides evidence of appropriate preparation and pertinent content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of
a full-time college instructor.

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

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

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