

**Neuroscience Institute
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University**

**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES**

Policy Title:	Neuroscience Institute Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Institute Approval:	08/31/2015
College Approval:	09/14/2015
Effective:	09/14/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Neuroscience Institute
3 of Georgia State University filling critical instructional and service roles. The Neuroscience
4 Institute has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion
5 of faculty in non-tenure track ranks, which are in conformity with the minimum general
6 requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and
7 with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and Georgia State University
8 guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University Promotion
9 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual), and (2) the College of Arts and
10 Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual). In the event of
11 a conflict between the Institute and college/university documents, the college/university
12 documents take precedence.

13 The Neuroscience Institute employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer
14 track. The ranks of lecturer (listed from most junior to most senior) are: Lecturer, Senior
15 Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer.

16 The Neuroscience Institute will nominate for promotion to Senior Lecturer only
17 those candidates who are evaluated as *excellent* in teaching. A service evaluation of *very*
18 *good* is also required for promotion. For promotion of a Senior Lecturer to the rank of
19 Principal Senior Lecturer, evaluations of *excellent* or better in both teaching and service are
20 required.

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

23 **A. Process Overview**

24 The primary stages of the Neuroscience Institute's NTT faculty review process are
25 outlined below. These steps must be carried out following a time schedule provided by the
26 College of Arts and Sciences.

- 27 1. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Dean's office and will
28 subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
29 to the Institute Director according to the schedule provided by the College.
- 30 2. The Institute Director forwards the candidate's review materials to a subcommittee
31 of the Institute NTT Review Committee (Committee of the Whole) to initiate the
32 review. The final review must be made by the Committee of the Whole.
- 33 3. The Committee of the Whole submits its recommendation, including minority
34 report(s) (if any), to the Institute Director. Members of the Committee must not be
35 identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page
36 so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of
37 the committee's report(s). The Institute Director will provide a copy of the
38 Committee's report (including minority report(s)) to the candidate.
- 39 4. The Institute Director submits an independent review of the candidate, and the
40 Institute's Committee of the Whole review (including minority report(s)) to the
41 Dean's Office. The Institute Director provides a copy of the Director report to the
42 candidate. The candidate has the option of responding to the reports of the
43 Committee of the Whole and Institute Director, addressed to the Dean's Office,
44 within three business days. The Dean's Office will provide the Institute Director

45 with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the Institute committee and
46 Director's report.

47 At this point, the review process passes from the Institute to the College and University.
48 See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review process at the college
49 and university level.

50 **B. Institute Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee (Committee of**
51 **the Whole)**

52 The Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of all
53 tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above (Senior Lecturer, Principle
54 Senior Lecturer) in the Institute, except the Director of the Institute and those members of
55 the Institute serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion application at
56 the college or university level. For each candidate, the Institute Director will appoint a 3 to
57 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the
58 Committee of the Whole, to initially review each candidate. The Institute Director shall also
59 appoint a Committee Director (selected from the subcommittee) for each candidate. All
60 final recommendations must be made by the Committee of the Whole. The Committee of
61 the Whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a majority recommendation. The vote will be
62 in the form of signatures on the final recommendation. The letter from the Committee of
63 the Whole must be signed by the Committee Director and all committee members who
64 agree with the recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this
65 recommendation must provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their
66 recommendation and supporting rationale. Members of the committee must not be
67 identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so
68 that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the
69 Committee's report(s).

70 NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote
71 on the final recommendation of the Committee of the Whole. In consultation with the
72 Institute Director, the Dean may augment the Committee of the Whole with NTT members
73 from other institutes or departments if the Neuroscience Institute does not have a
74 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three voting members,
75 with at least one being a tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at
76 Senior level or above.

77 The Committee of the Whole shall review all credentials and make a
78 recommendation to the Director of the Institute using the review and promotion guidelines
79 adopted by the Neuroscience Institute in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of
80 the Committee of the Whole shall be approved by majority vote.

81 Duties of the Institute Committee of the Whole include the following:

- 82 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
83 review procedures adopted by the Neuroscience Institute.
- 84 2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate (majority
85 report).
- 86 3. If there are Committee members who do not sign the written majority
87 recommendation, these members should provide signed separate letter(s) (minority

- 88 report(s)) indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these
89 recommendations.
- 90 4. Deliver the majority report and minority reports if present to the Director of the
91 Institute.
 - 92 5. Place all signatures on a separate page, or on separate pages if there are minority
93 reports, so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her
94 copy of the committee's report(s) to avoid identification of Committee members to
95 the candidate.

96

97 **C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service**

98

99 The rating system for all structured reviews of NTT faculty will be: *outstanding*,
100 *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Factors used in the evaluation for NTT faculty for
101 teaching are listed in Table A of the Appendix. The corresponding factors for service are
102 listed in Table B of the Appendix.

103

104 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

105

106 **A. General Considerations**

107 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the Lecturer track: 1) annual
108 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
109 promotion to Senior Lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to Principal Senior
110 Lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
111 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
112 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
113 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's
114 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
115 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are
116 defined in the context of Institute expectations specific to candidates being considered for
117 promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer.

118

119 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

120 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

121 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
122 of the College's policy (http://www2.cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
123 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
124 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in courses ranging from introductory survey
125 courses to advanced undergraduate lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs, and
126 internship experiences.

127 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes,
128 but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Appendix, Table A, for details).
129 The evidence provided by the candidate normally will include the following:

- 130 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
131 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
132 3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching
133 materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
134 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially
135 if these include significant revision of the current documents.
136 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be
137 presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period,
138 as defined in the college manual (section V.E).
139 6. Development of supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or
140 printed materials.

141
142

143 **Additional Accomplishments** (if applicable)

- 144 7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
145 independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and
146 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional
147 meetings).
148 8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before
149 learned societies.
150 9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
151 teaching activities.
152 10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
153 participation in textbook development.
154 11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

155 **2. Evaluation of Service**

156 For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for
157 lecturers is normally at the Institute and college level and the quantity is dependent upon
158 specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the Institute. University,
159 college, Institute, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.

160 Institute service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:

- 161 (a) Ensuring the highest safety standards at all times.
162 (b) Maintaining and overseeing equipment. Where appropriate, it is expected
163 that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that Institute
164 equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and
165 repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use
166 of equipment.
167 (c) Participation on Institute committees. Effective participation on the NTT
168 Promotion Review Committee and other committee appointments is
169 expected.
170 (d) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.

171 The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality.
172 Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have
173 consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all

174 assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their
175 assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of, at least, *very good* in service.

176 Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
177 responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a
178 different service load than those assigned major Institute and/or college roles. Such
179 additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, course lab
180 manual responsibilities, direction of student teams (e.g., Science Olympiads), and
181 course/area web responsibilities.

182 Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and
183 timely manner to achieve the rating of *very good*.

184

185 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

186 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
187 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
188 relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. The single
189 measure for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and
190 service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in
191 both categories is included in the Appendix.

192

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

194 In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the
195 evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and
196 service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
197 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated
198 as, at least, *excellent* in teaching. Table A of the Appendix outlines in detail what is
199 necessary to obtain this. The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of
200 diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in
201 meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings
202 required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks and duties thoroughly and in a
203 timely manner, etc.) qualify for a rating of, at least, *very good* in service. Table B of the
204 Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

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

206 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a
207 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued
208 growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide
209 a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the Institute, college,
210 university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based
211 on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching
212 and service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
213 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must
214 be rated as, at least, *excellent* in instruction and, at least, *excellent* in service. Tables A (for
215 teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary to obtain
216 this.

217

218

219 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

220 The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion reviews are all
221 distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and
222 possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

223 **1. Annual Review**

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

231

232 **2. Third-Year Review**

233 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
234 dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period
235 and deliver it to the Director according to a schedule provided by the college. An Institute
236 review committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include tenured faculty
237 and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers, will evaluate the required materials and
238 provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service
239 to the Institute Director. This committee is elected by the Institute NTT review committee
240 of the whole. As discussed in Section II.B of this document, a subcommittee shall be formed
241 for each candidate to provide an initial draft evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but
242 the Committee of the Whole must meet, discuss, and vote on the final recommendation and
243 ranking. The Director will provide an independent assessment, which along with the
244 report of the Committee of the Whole and materials will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office.
245 As stated in the college manual, both the Committee of the Whole and Director will evaluate
246 the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very*
247 *good, good, fair, and poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating.
248 Split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided.

249 Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion)
250 review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and
251 dialogue of the lecturer’s accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In
252 addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address possible
253 deficiencies before the fifth-year review.

254

255 **3. Post-Promotion Review (Senior Lecturer and Principal Senior Lecturer)**

256 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every
257 five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the post-
258 promotion review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and
259 effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities
260 that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or
261 Principal Senior Lecturer (PSL) will be notified by the College in advance of the post-
262 promotion review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in
263 Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the Institute

264 Director according to a schedule provided by the College in advance of the review. The
265 Institute Director will appoint a 3 to 5 member evaluation subcommittee, chosen from the
266 Committee of the Whole and consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at
267 the rank of PSL (with representation from each when the Institute has an available
268 principal senior lecturer within its ranks). This committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the
269 categories of teaching and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The
270 Institute Director will provide an independent assessment, and both evaluations will be
271 sent to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college
272 manual.

APPENDIX

Table A. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	<p>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f):</p> <p>(a) update/revise courses (b) student perceptions consistent with Institute expectations¹ (c) direct independent study courses (d) publications in instructional journals (e) instructional creativity, as evidenced by development of new courses and/or awards for instructional innovation (f) learning outcomes, as evidenced by grade distribution and drop rates, consistent with Institute standards (g) involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals</p>
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at Institute level (broad impact)	<p>Normally 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)</p>
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	<p>3 items: (a), (b), and (f)</p>
Good	Meets obligations	<p>2 of 7 items, including (b)</p>

Fair	Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness	1 of 7 items
Poor	Substandard, ineffective teacher	0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints

¹Compared to the Institute four-year average for the area and course level.

Table B. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Candidates

Service¹ Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Major effective leadership roles	Major effective role in Institute. Major effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization
Excellent	Effective Institute leadership role(s)	Effective role in Institute. Effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization will also be considered
Very Good	Helpful citizenship. Some leadership role	Effective role in the Institute; meets Institute obligations effectively and is helpful; provides Institute leadership.
Good	Acceptable citizenship	Meets minimum Institute obligations/requests
Fair	Needs improvement	Does not meet Institute obligations in a timely manner
Poor	Needs major improvement; negative leader	Hinders Institute operations

¹Service to the Institute and college is expected to be minimal in the lecturer's first three years.