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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty members provide important components of the Geosciences instructional program. These faculty members also make important service contributions to the Department, College, University, and to their professional communities. The Department of Geosciences currently employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track (listed from most junior to most senior) are Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The review and promotion processes also note the special contributions that the lecturer corps makes in instruction and service to the Department, College, University, and to their professional communities. The workloads of lecturer-track faculty may vary year-to-year. These workloads are determined by the Chair for all Geosciences (GEOS) faculty members, consistent with relevant College and University workload policies.

The Department has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in NTT ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and Georgia State University guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual), and (2) the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), along with these departmental guidelines. In the event of a conflict between the departmental and college/university documents, the college/university documents take precedence.

Promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer are not accompanied by the award of Tenure. However, these promotions reflect the sense of the faculty that the candidate for promotion is a valuable asset to the department. Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires that the individual's performance over the five-year review period merits ratings of at least excellent in teaching and very good in service, consistent with the assigned service role (see below). For promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching and continued growth in the time period since the last promotion, and be ranked as excellent in teaching. The candidate must also be ranked as excellent in service, reflecting leadership in appropriate service roles within and external to Georgia State University.

This document describes the criteria to be used by the department in evaluation of a Lecturer seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer and for a Senior Lecturer seeking promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer. The departmental criteria follow the general framework established in the college manual but are more detailed and specific to the needs and expectations within the Department of Geosciences.

II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER AND PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the Department’s NTT faculty review process are outlined below. These steps must be carried out following a time schedule provided by the College of Arts and Sciences.

1. After consultation with the department chair, if the eligible candidate intends to pursue the promotion track, then the following review process begins. As
described in the College Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty, the Dean’s office notifies the candidate about their eligibility for promotion and forwards a copy to the department chair. The candidate will discuss his/her qualification with the chair and then subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the department chair according to the schedule provided by the college.

2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s review materials to a subcommittee of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the review. The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.

3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation with signatures to the department chair, including any minority report(s). Endorsements of the specific committee members should not be revealed to the candidate. Therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s).

4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the departmental committee review, including minority report(s), to the Dean’s Office, and provides copies of these documents to the candidate. The candidate has the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair reports, addressed to the Dean’s Office, within three business days after receiving the documents from the chair. The Dean’s Office will then provide the department chair with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the department committee and chair’s report.

At this point, the review process passes from the department to the college and then to the university. See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review process at the college and university level.

B. Departmental NTT Promotion Review Committee (Committee of the Whole)

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above (Senior Lecturer, Principle Senior Lecturer, and Senior Academic Professional) in the department, except the chair of the department and those members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the department chair will appoint a three- to five-member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole. The department chair shall also appoint a committee chair selected from the subcommittee. The subcommittee has the responsibility to thoroughly analyze the candidate’s dossier, coordinate deliberation with the committee members, and provide initial evaluation of the dossier. Final recommendation regarding promotion must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must discuss the
candidate’s eligibility for promotion, and arrive at a majority recommendation. All actions of the committee of the whole must be approved by majority vote.

Duties of the departmental committee of the whole include the following:
1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and review procedures adopted by the Department.
2. Approve, by majority vote, an overall recommendation for each candidate.
3. Deliver the written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of the whole to the departmental chair.
4. Submit signed minority reports (if any) of committee members who disagree with the written majority recommendation to the departmental chair. This report should include recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.

The vote for the recommendation will be in the form of signatures on the final recommendation report. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate’s current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean may augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments if the Department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at Senior level or above.

The committee of the whole must review all credentials and make a recommendation to the chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the Department in accord with the college and university guidelines.

C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service
The rating system for all promotion and structured reviews of NTT faculty is as follows: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Factors used in determining these ratings are listed in the Appendix A (teaching) and Appendix B (service).

III. ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

A. Criteria
The assessment of the candidate’s teaching ranking will be based on performance and evaluation of the following primary criteria: the quality of course content (Criterion 1); development of courses/program (Criterion 2); learning outcomes of classroom instruction
Quality of Course Content (Criterion 1): The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials. Syllabi should be reviewed and revised as necessary for conformity with university guidelines. Reading assignments should be appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. A teaching portfolio should be provided as indicated in the College format instructions.

Development of New Courses or Teaching Programs (Criterion 2): Evaluation will include the effective development and execution of new courses, creativity, and significant leadership in the development of teaching new courses and/or programs.

Learning Outcomes of Classroom Instruction (Criterion 3): Student learning can be documented in a number of ways. Examples include: results of exam questions administered to multiple sections of the same course; copies of answers to final exam questions; results of pre- and end of course exams; results of capstone projects or field exercises; presentation of student course work to audiences beyond the classroom. Candidates should describe briefly the method(s) for assessing the learning outcomes for their courses. The candidate is encouraged to write a section in their dossier for how they achieved the specific learning outcomes for each course.

Student Evaluations of Classroom Instruction (Criterion 4): The candidate will include the student evaluation scores (written and numerical). These student comments and scores will be evaluated in the context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary area. The information will also include other important variables, such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, response rate on the evaluations, written comments by students, and number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

The faculty will consider additional contributions in teaching by the candidate when Criteria 1-4 are clearly satisfied for promotion to the next rank. These supplemental contributions are defined as five Criteria (5-9), and achievement in at least one of these is expected for a rating of excellent. Criterion (5): direction and mentoring of student work such as, for example, independent studies, theses, practica. Criterion (6): Contributing significantly as a co-investigator, collaborator, or lead investigator on instruction-oriented projects that extend beyond the scope of development of new courses or refinement for an existing course. Criterion (7): Receipt of award(s) from the College, University, National, or State professional groups reflecting on instructional contributions. Criterion (8): Publication of peer-reviewed pedagogical, disciplinary materials, and peer review of manuscripts submitted to professional journals. Criterion (9): Receipt of intramural or extramural funding leading to new instructional methods or enhancements on current instruction.

Direction and Mentoring of Students (Criterion 5): The extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects, field training, and academic activities will be considered where these activities by the candidate are seen as exceptional and effective. Examples of such activities include: development and leading independent studies and practica; the direction of Masters theses and non-thesis projects; or comparable activities.
The exceptional nature and the effectiveness of these efforts will be judged in terms of the extent and quality of such advisement as evident by the practica, theses, or independent studies produced and/or such outcomes as student success in acceptance to graduate or professional schools, scores on national examinations, and special awards or achievements to the student.

**Instructional Projects (Criterion 6):** These projects are endeavors to improve instruction or address specific areas related to instruction of students in Geosciences and related fields (e.g., science education) beyond new course development. Lecturers involved in educationally focused grants/proposals serving as a named function (Collaborator, Co-Investigator or Primary Investigator) have the opportunity to investigate the effectiveness of instruction. Instructional or disciplinary projects for science majors communicating geosciences-related disciplines to students and trains them to be skilled and responsible researchers, practitioners, teachers, or other professionals. Examples of projects that can be included in this criteria include but are not limited to: CETL, USG-wide/cross-departmental (STE(A)M) projects, Georgia Geographic Alliance, participation on review panels of instructional proposals submitted to national agencies.

**Receipt of Awards and Recognition (Criterion 7):** The receipt of awards from College, University, University System of Georgia, national, state, and/or from professional societies reflecting the quality, impact, and/or effectiveness of the instruction and mentoring done by the candidate are considered high valued achievements. These awards reflect well on the instructional efforts by the candidate.

**Publication and Review of Instructional and/or Disciplinary Materials (Criterion 8):** These comprise contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning in the geosciences. The publication of papers on new instructional techniques, paradigms, and/or related topics in professional journals conveys new knowledge on instruction in geosciences and related disciplines. The direction of undergraduate and graduate theses/research projects may lead to peer-reviewed published work (abstracts and papers). Reviews of journal articles, proposals, textbooks likewise should be substantive, for prominent publishing houses and national organizations, and represent significant intellectual contributions.

**Receipt of Intramural and Extramural Funding for Instructional and/or Disciplinary Projects (Criterion 9):** The receipt of funding for instructional-related projects is valued and may have transformative effects for the candidate’s instruction. All intramural and extramural funding received by the candidate should be listed in this section.

**B. Scope**

The candidate will prepare a dossier containing the components named in the College of Arts and Sciences’ *Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty.* Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the college’s Policy on Assessment of Teaching for Full-time Faculty (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).

As part of the College’s policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness, the candidate should include the teaching portfolio that he/she has compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E below in the College policy for guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college’s teaching assessment policy, teaching portfolios shall include numerical evaluations for all courses for which the candidate has had primary responsibility including courses outside
GEOS (e.g. Honors College, NSCI, ISCI, study abroad, and in other departments). The candidate should also provide a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses directed by the candidate. In addition, the candidate shall include in the portfolio more complete data (syllabi, exams, written student evaluations and other materials) from two courses per year - if possible, one specialty course and one more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable). These portfolios will be assessed for appropriateness and completeness of course content and course development. The scope and level of the material for each course will be assessed for appropriateness and consistency with departmental policy for those courses.

The dossier will also be reviewed for demonstrated and/or anticipated effectiveness for achieving the learning/performance outcomes established by the department for those courses. Numerical scores on student evaluations will be judged based on the type and level of the course, and should be within departmental norms for the same type and level of course. In specific instances, a lecturer may be permitted (with Department and College approval) to teach graduate course where a lecturer has current knowledge and appropriate qualifications.

C. Ratings

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

A rating of at least *excellent* in teaching is required to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. A candidate for promotion to this rank whose dossier shows that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in all Criteria 1-4, plus achieved effectiveness in one of the supplemental Criteria (5-9), will receive a rating of *excellent* in teaching. A rating of *outstanding* is given where the candidate has achieved effectiveness in Criteria 1-4 plus achieved effectiveness in two or more criteria (5-9). A candidate whose dossier shows that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in four, three, two, one (or none) of the areas will receive a rating of *very good, good, fair, or poor*, respectively, in teaching. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are summarized in Appendix A.

**Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer**

A rating of at least *excellent* in teaching is required to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer. In addition, a candidate for promotion to this rank must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching in the Geosciences and related disciplines with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. To achieve a rating of *excellent* at this level, normally the dossier will show that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in all Primary Criteria 1-4, at least one supplementary Criteria (5-9) as well as provided evidence of continued growth. Because promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer is an exceptional achievement, it is expected that significant and new contributions since promotion to Senior Lecturer are demonstrated. Examples of continued growth include: teaching new courses or significant revision of existing courses, substantial direction of student work, improved student outcomes and learning. A rating of *outstanding* is given where the candidate has put forth the effort and achieved effectiveness in Criteria 1-4, plus two or more supplemental criteria (6-9). A candidate whose dossier shows that he/she has put forth significant effort and achieved effectiveness in four, three, two, one (none) of the areas will receive a rating of *very good, good, fair, or poor*, respectively, in teaching. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are summarized in Appendix A.
IV. ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE

A. Forms of Service

Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Senior Lecturers are crucial to the success of Geosciences. The service of lecturers is evaluated with respect to the quantity of service, and quality of service. The quality of service reflects the degree of diligence, and level of effectiveness in the performance of the service. Examples of important service roles for a Lecturer at the Department level would be (and not limited to): active participation by the candidate in the facilitation of introductory and upper division/graduate course laboratories; assistance to colleagues in areas that contribute to the mission and reputation of the department; effective participation in the department’s committee system, particularly in areas that directly support instruction; and performance of other service activities deemed appropriate by the department (e.g. grade appeals, web sites, awards night, undergraduate committee, graduate committee). In the Department of Geosciences, there is a large logistical burden regarding infrastructural upkeep and maintenance of equipment and facilities in geoscience (rock preparation, introductory, specialized discipline) labs, and vehicles for field activities. A Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer whose instruction depends on these facilities would be expected to demonstrate active participation leading to the smooth running of these laboratory and field facilities.

The quantity of service expected of Lecturers may vary, and will be consistent with the instructional load and years of service at rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Senior Lecturer. Moreover, given that the quantity may change from year to year, the Chair will be available to provide guidance to each Lecturer to help them understand their service assignments. After having established first a very good record of service at the department level (see below), the candidate may undertake service at College and University levels (Panther Preview, Freshmen Learning Communities, and College Committees, Senate membership) with consultation with the Chair.

B. Scope

Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service responsibilities and external service commitments. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a different departmental service load than those lecturers’ assigned major departmental and/or college roles. Such additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, and course lab manual responsibilities of courses with high enrollments. As noted previously, the service of lecturers is evaluated with respect to quantity and level of quality. Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Senior Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of very good in service.

Effective service outside the department and outside the university will also be considered for promotion of a Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and a promotion of a Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer. Examples of this type of activity would be participation in activities such as Saturday Schools (e.g. Professional Geology Exam Preparation courses), Science Olympiad, and talks to middle-school and high-school groups; leadership roles in the professional community (e.g. Georgia Geographic Alliance, SEDAAG, GSA), service activities in support of local and national professional societies (AAG, GSA). Depending on the quantity, effectiveness and role of service outside Geosciences, the candidate may be rated as excellent or outstanding. Exceptional Departmental service may lead to a rating of excellent without service at the College or University level under unusual circumstances where the candidate has made very strong contributions. Departmental service considered not executed
thoughtfully, diligently, or effectively will receive a rating below very good (good, fair or poor).

C. Ratings

Promotion to Senior Lecturer
Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer must be rated as very good in service to be recommended for promotion. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are summarized in Appendix B.

Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer
Candidates for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer must be rated as excellent in service to be recommended for promotion. The evaluation factors tied to these ratings are summarized in Appendix B.

V. OTHER REVIEWS OF LECTURER-TRACK FACULTY

All GEOS faculty members undergo annual and cumulative reviews as per College and University manuals. The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion reviews are all distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

A. Annual Review
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 updated CV, annual report information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate material. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the lecturer-track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

B. Third-Year Review
In keeping with the college manual, a Lecturer in the Department of Geosciences will undergo a cumulative review in their third year to assess whether the individual is on track for promotion to Senior Lecturer. This review will be conducted by a three-member departmental subcommittee consisting of tenured faculty, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Senior Lecturers, which is elected by the committee of the whole. If the Department does not have a Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer, then the Department shall seek and appoint a Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer from outside the Department to serve as one member of the three member committee in consultation with Deans Office. In cases when there are no other NTT faculty members of appropriate rank available, the committee will consist entirely of tenured faculty in the department. The subcommittee will investigate and evaluate the accomplishments and progress of the candidate in the areas of teaching and service, measured against the standards for teaching and service necessary for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer. The subcommittee will identify areas in which the candidate is strong and those in which the candidate is either weak or in need of improvement. The results will be used to inform the Committee of the Whole and the candidate as to the areas that must be improved before the candidate is considered for promotion at the end of the fifth year. The findings will be communicated to all tenured faculty, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Senior Lecturers in GEOS for any comment prior to sending to the Chair. The Chair will write a separate assessment. The committee members’
identity shall remain confidential and communication with the candidate done through the Chair.

C. Post-Promotion Review (Senior Lecturer and Principal Senior Lecturer)

All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the post-promotion review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer (candidate) will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the candidate to the department chair according to a schedule provided by the college in advance of the review. The departmental committee of the whole elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer (with representation from each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). This committee evaluates the candidate in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.
### Appendix A: Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outstanding** | Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction | **Criteria- 1-5 plus at least one or more from Criteria 6-9:**  
Course content (Criterion 1).  
(Criterion 2) Update/revise courses, creativity.  
(Criterion 3) Learning outcomes.  
(Criterion 4) Appropriate student perceptions and appropriate grades/drop rates, favorable test results relative to those of other faculty teaching the same or similar courses.  
(Criterion 5) Mentoring, direct independent study courses.  
(Criterion 6) Involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals.  
(Criterion 7) Awards.  
(Criterion 8) Publications, as related to instruction.  
(Criterion 9) Receipt of funding. |
| **Excellent**   | Innovative, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact) | Normally Criteria 1-4. Plus at least one or more from Criteria 5-9. |
| **Very Good**   | Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact) | Three Criteria of 1-4 including Criterion 1 and Criterion 4. |
| **Good**        | Meets obligations | Two Criteria of 1-4 including Criterion 4. |
| **Fair**        | Needs improvement | Criterion 4. |
| **Poor**        | Needs significant improvement | None of Criteria 1-4. |
## Appendix B. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Major effective leadership Roles.</td>
<td>Major effective role in department. Major effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Effective departmental leadership role(s).</td>
<td>Effective role in department. Effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization will also be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Helpful citizenship. Some leadership role.</td>
<td>Effective role in the department; meets departmental obligations effectively and is helpful; provides departmental leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Acceptable citizenship.</td>
<td>Meets minimum departmental obligations/requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Needs improvement.</td>
<td>Does not meet departmental obligations in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs major improvement; negative leader.</td>
<td>Hinders department Operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>