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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Gerontology Institute 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 (Institute 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 Gerontology Institute’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 Gerontology Institute employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the college manual.

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

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the Institute’s 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 Institute Director. The Director will review the materials for completeness and conformity to Institute and College policies.

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

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

4. The Institute Director submits her/his independent recommendation and the recommendation of the Institute committee, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The Institute 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 Institute Director a copy of any response from the candidate to the Institute 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 Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee

The Institute’s Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the Institute (Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the Institute Director and any members of the Institute serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university levels. Departments 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. The letter from the Institute committee of the whole must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. 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).

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 Institute Director, the dean will augment the Institute promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the home department 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 on the lecturer track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior lecturer, 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review); and 5) review for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer. 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 Institute 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 Institute.

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 or paper assignments, in-class exercises, readings, web pages, creative projects, and other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Reading assignments should be appropriate to course level and catalog description. Exam questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. Writing 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 Institute 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 Institute 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 materials 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 programs or initiatives, 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/or 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, which are useful indicators of student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the Institute 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 Institute. The review will also consider other important variables such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In addition to average scores, the Institute 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 Institute 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 Institute will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies, practica, honors theses, student research presented at GSURC, as well as 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 Gerontology classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their Gerontology 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 Institute 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 Institute as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The Institute 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.

2. **Evaluation of Service**

As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service; contributions to the institute, 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 Institute, but it is generally at the institute or college level.
Contributions to service in the Gerontology Institute typically fall into the following categories:
assigned service roles, such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing
assignments; teaching service beyond the classroom (i.e., instructional service), such as
developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching
methodology, and 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 Institute, college, and
university, such as program development (i.e., developing instructional collaborations with
other units), memberships on institute/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 as well as written contributions to public service (editorials,
interviews, white papers, magazine or newsletter articles, and any other dissemination of
academic research to the general populace).

The Institute’s review of candidates’ records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks
that chairs 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, but are not required as part of the
lecturer review, include the following:

a. Professional Development Contributions: The Institute shall consider professional
development activities (e.g., publications of their research and scholarship, conference
presentations, research grants applied for and/or funded, collaborations) as they bear on the
lecturer’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production of peer-
reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the Institute certainly
encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-reviewed publications, book
chapters, facilitation of workshops, publications or appearances in popular media,
participation in academic conferences, and/or the pursuit of grants to fund research in the
discipline all enhance the candidates’ case that they are modeling the best practices of the
profession to students. Such professional development can also help the candidate’s case for
promotion if it can be shown to augment the faculty member’s expertise in subjects relevant
to the classroom.

Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum will be considered as contributions to
b. Role within the Institute: Since needs of the Institute often change, the role of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or Institute 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 Institute and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the Institute.

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 Institute, 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’s record shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Generally, he or she earns scores on student evaluations that fall in the mid-4-out-of-5 range or higher. Additionally, he or she generally demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students (e.g., directed readings, independent study courses, facilitating student presentations, supporting applications to graduate programs, sharing professional knowledge with teachers in training, and/or writing letters of recommendation).

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 has been very diligent in meeting her/his assignments. The candidate consistently attends required committee meetings, performs all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and completes assignments thoughtfully and effectively.
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 excellent, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the institute, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as 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. This must include growth in the area of teaching, and may also include growth in the area of service. This growth may or may not result in a higher ranking in one or both of these areas as long as the candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made substantial new contributions.

a. Teaching

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating of excellent, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course materials illustrate a long-term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. His or her student evaluations are consistently strong, generally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range. He or she demonstrates a sustained track record of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, as well as developing new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate’s growth as a teacher generally will extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one’s teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more of the following activities: production of publication(s) suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of articles or other publications on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; invitations to conduct teacher training workshops at other institutions or regional/national/international conferences; technological pedagogical innovations; and/or student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students. Candidates whose record of achievement does not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and explain how their record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

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 he or she has diligently and highly effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the Institute over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to Institute advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors (e.g., through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). In addition to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate’s growth in
service should take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as an Institute
program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a leader on
campus or beyond; 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 Institute
executive committee, the Institute Director will evaluate the lecturer track faculty member’s
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. An Institute review committee 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 committee is elected
by the Institute NTT review committee of the whole. The Institute 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 an
elected committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal
senior lecturer (with representation from each when the Institute has an available principal
senior lecturer within its ranks). The committee is elected by the Institute NTT review
committee of the whole. The Institute Director will provide an independent assessment and
will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for response.
APPENDIX: 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 candidate displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and little to no student mentoring.

Fair: The lecturer displays a minimally acceptable record of classroom-based teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document, minimal involvement and effectiveness in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and minimally adequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Good: The candidate’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate, as evidenced through student evaluations, minimally effective course materials, and generally satisfactory but limited effort as a mentor of students.

Very Good: The candidate is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the Institute. Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the candidate is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the candidate’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or regularly fall short of Institute expectations.

Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer): The excellent teacher shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, his or her student evaluations scores fall in the mid- 4-out-of-5 range or higher. Additionally, he or she demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer): In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer will generally have a record of consistently high student evaluations in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range and will have demonstrated successful mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students and development of new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate’s growth as a teacher generally will extend into areas beyond those normally
associated with one’s assigned teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more of the following activities: production of publications suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of articles or other publications on pedagogy; invitations to conduct teacher training workshops at other institutions or regional/national/international conferences, technological pedagogical innovations, successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

**Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The candidate’s impact on students is of the highest level. On top of the expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching appropriate to his or her rank, as described above, the outstanding teacher commands a mastery of instruction in his or her area as evidenced by at least one of the following: successful pursuit of external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

**Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of outstanding in teaching above, the candidate for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as outstanding if he or she has achieved more than one of the following: production of publications suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of articles or other publications on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

**B. Service**

**Poor:** Candidates judged to be poor in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations and are not responsible citizens of the Institute.

**Fair:** Candidates judged to be fair in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service obligations or are not responsible citizens of the Institute.

**Good:** Candidates judged to be good in service do not always effectively fulfill assigned service obligations or are not consistently responsible citizens of the Institute.

**Very Good:** The candidate will be judged to be very good in service if they have been very diligent in meeting their assignments. The candidate consistently attends required committee meetings, performs all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and completes assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

**Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be excellent in service if they have been diligent and highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the Institute over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to Institute advising efforts or to graduate...
teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors (e.g., through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). In addition to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate’s growth in service generally will take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as an Institute program director 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 to achieve a rating of excellent in service, the candidate will be judged to be outstanding in service if they have not only fulfilled their assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to seek out best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the success of the Institute in meeting its stated goals. Faculty members judged to be outstanding in service will have been recognized by their 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 Institute program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility, as well as extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also indications of outstanding service.