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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Neuroscience Institute of Georgia State University filling critical instructional and service roles. The Neuroscience Institute has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks, which 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). In the event of a conflict between the Institute and college/university documents, the college/university documents take precedence.

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

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

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

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the Neuroscience Institute’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. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Dean’s office and will subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the Institute Director according to the schedule provided by the College.

2. The Institute Director forwards the candidate’s review materials to a subcommittee of the Institute 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, including minority report(s) (if any), to the Institute Director. Members of the Committee must not be identified 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). The Institute Director will provide a copy of the Committee’s report (including minority report(s)) to the candidate.

4. The Institute Director submits an independent review of the candidate, and the Institute’s Committee of the Whole review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean’s Office. The Institute Director provides a copy of the Director report to the candidate. The candidate has the option of responding to the reports of the Committee of the Whole and Institute Director, addressed to the Dean’s Office, within three business days. The Dean’s Office will provide the Institute Director
with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the Institute committee and Director’s report.

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

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

The Institute 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) in the Institute, except the Director of the Institute and those members of the Institute serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the Institute Director will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the Committee of the Whole, to initially review each candidate. The Institute Director shall also appoint a Committee Director (selected from the subcommittee) for each candidate. All final recommendations must be made by the Committee of the Whole. The Committee of the Whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a majority recommendation. The vote will be in the form of signatures on the final recommendation. The letter from the Committee of the Whole must be signed by the Committee Director 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. Members of the committee must not be identified 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).

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. In consultation with the Institute Director, the Dean may augment the Committee of the Whole with NTT members from other institutes or departments if the Neuroscience Institute 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 shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to the Director of the Institute using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the Neuroscience Institute in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of the Committee of the Whole shall be approved by majority vote.

Duties of the Institute 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 Neuroscience Institute.
2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate (majority report).
3. If there are Committee members who do not sign the written majority recommendation, these members should provide signed separate letter(s) (minority
report(s)) indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.

4. Deliver the majority report and minority reports if present to the Director of the Institute.

5. Place all signatures on a separate page, or on separate pages if there are minority reports, so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s) to avoid identification of Committee members to the candidate.

C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service

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

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) 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 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 courses ranging from introductory survey courses to advanced undergraduate lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs, and internship experiences.

Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Appendix, Table A, for details). The evidence provided by the candidate normally will include the following:
1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if these include significant revision of the current documents.
5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period, as defined in the college manual (section V.E).
6. Development of supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or printed materials.

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

2. Evaluation of Service
   For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for lecturers is normally at the Institute and college level and the quantity is dependent upon specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the Institute. University, college, Institute, professional and/or community level service can be relevant. Institute service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:
   (a) Ensuring the highest safety standards at all times.
   (b) Maintaining and overseeing equipment. Where appropriate, it is expected that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that Institute equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use of equipment.
   (c) Participation on Institute committees. Effective participation on the NTT Promotion Review Committee and other committee appointments is expected.
   (d) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.
   The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. 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, at least, very good in service. Each lecturer’s service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a different service load than those assigned major Institute and/or college roles. Such additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, course lab manual responsibilities, direction of student teams (e.g., Science Olympiads), and course/area web responsibilities. Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and timely manner to achieve the rating of very good.

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 descriptors: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in both categories is included in the Appendix.

1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has 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. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as, at least, excellent in teaching. Table A of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) qualify for a rating of, at least, very good in service. Table B of the Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer

For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the Institute, college, university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has 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. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as, at least, excellent in instruction and, at least, excellent in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary to obtain this.
D. Other Lecturer Reviews

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.

1. Annual Review

Along with tenure track and other regular 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 information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with the Institute's 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

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

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

3. 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 (SL) or Principal Senior Lecturer (PSL) 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 SL/PSL to the Institute.
Director according to a schedule provided by the College in advance of the review. The Institute Director will appoint a 3 to 5 member evaluation subcommittee, chosen from the Committee of the Whole and consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of PSL (with representation from each when the Institute has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). This committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The Institute Director 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction</td>
<td>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f): (a) update/revise courses (b) student perceptions consistent with Institute expectations (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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at Institute level (broad impact)</td>
<td>Normally 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)</td>
<td>3 items: (a), (b), and (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Meets obligations</td>
<td>2 of 7 items, including (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Performance Description</td>
<td>Score Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness</td>
<td>1 of 7 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Substandard, ineffective teacher</td>
<td>0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Compared 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service¹ 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 Institute. Major effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Effective Institute leadership role(s)</td>
<td>Effective role in Institute. 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 Institute; meets Institute obligations effectively and is helpful; provides Institute leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Acceptable citizenship</td>
<td>Meets minimum Institute obligations/requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>Does not meet Institute obligations in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs major improvement; negative leader</td>
<td>Hinders Institute operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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