

**Department of Psychology**  
**College of Arts and Sciences**  
**Georgia State University**  
**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION**  
**GUIDELINES**

Policy Title:	Department of Psychology Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	02/13/2015
College Approval:	03/02/2015
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The lecturers and academic professionals housed in the Department of Psychology are  
3 vital components of our faculty. The review and promotion process of these non-tenure  
4 track (NTT) faculty is intended to reflect and highlight their contributions to our  
5 department and their unique mission within the university, focused on their instruction  
6 within the Department of Psychology and their service within department, college,  
7 and/or university-based programs. While promotion to the level of senior lecturer,  
8 principal senior lecturer, or senior academic professional is not equivalent to tenure,  
9 such a promotion indicates the carefully adjudicated decision made by our department,  
10 the college, and the university that these faculty are extremely valuable and effective  
11 members of our department with whom we hope to have a long-term affiliation.

12 The policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-  
13 tenure track ranks are outlined in this document (department guidelines), the College of  
14 Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual),  
15 and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty  
16 (university manual). Whereas the university and college NTT manuals provide general  
17 statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments,  
18 this document identifies the concrete forms these achievements should take. In  
19 particular, this document articulates the department’s criteria for the various rankings  
20 that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of teaching (if applicable for  
21 academic professionals) and service. Candidates should consult the college and  
22 university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and  
23 time-in-rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

24 The following two NTT faculty positions in use in the Department of Psychology are  
25 eligible for promotion. For each position, the ranks have been listed in parentheses  
26 starting with the lowest rank and ending with the highest possible rank. The general  
27 duties for each position are described in the college manual.

- 28 1. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
- 29 2. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)

30 **II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER,**  
31 **PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL**

32 **A. Process Overview**

33 The primary stages of the department’s NTT faculty promotion review process are as  
34 follows:

- 35 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for  
36 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to  
37 the department chair.

38 2. The department chair forwards the candidate's materials to the departmental review  
39 committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be  
40 made by the committee as a whole).

41 3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority  
42 reports, to the department chair. Members of the committee must not be identified to  
43 the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they  
44 can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's  
45 report(s). The department chair will provide a copy of the departmental committee's  
46 report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the  
47 candidate has the option to respond directly to the department chair within three  
48 business days.

49 4. The department chair submits her/his independent recommendation and the  
50 recommendation of the departmental committee, including any minority reports and  
51 any responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The department chair will  
52 provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that the  
53 candidate has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days.  
54 The Dean's Office will provide to the department chair a copy of any response from the  
55 candidate to the department chair's report.

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

58

## 59 **B. Composition of Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee**

60 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all  
61 tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank and above in the department, except  
62 the chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position  
63 that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels.  
64 Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and  
65 evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the  
66 committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on  
67 its final recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole  
68 must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the  
69 recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must  
70 provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and  
71 supporting rationale. Members of the committee must not be identified to the  
72 candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be  
73 removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's  
74 report(s).

75 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final  
76 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department  
77 chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT  
78 members from other departments when the home department does not have a

79 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with  
80 at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

### 81 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

#### 82 **A. General Considerations**

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

#### 94 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

##### 95 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

96 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria  
97 of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)).  
98 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core  
99 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education  
100 requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of  
101 teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to  
102 their assigned role in the department.

103

104 For the evaluation of instructional accomplishment, candidates should provide evidence  
105 of student accomplishments and achievement of learning; student perceptions of the  
106 effectiveness of the instructor; how the instructor's pedagogy contributes to the  
107 department's, the college's, and the university's curricular needs, innovations, and  
108 improvements; and the quality of their teaching materials.

109 Candidates may also provide evidence of recognition of their pedagogy by  
110 constituencies within the department, college, or university, or institutions outside the  
111 university; the degree to which their pedagogy has been innovative; the degree to which  
112 they have assessed their pedagogical innovations; the degree to which they have  
113 demonstrated effort to improve the effectiveness of their pedagogy; and their  
114 contributions to scholarship on pedagogy and/or curriculum.

115 **2. Evaluation of Service**

116 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality  
117 instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university;  
118 professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies  
119 depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the department, but it is  
120 generally at the department or college level. Contributions to service in the psychology  
121 department typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles, such as  
122 administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments; teaching  
123 service beyond the classroom (i.e., instructional service), such as developing teaching  
124 materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology,  
125 and supervising or mentoring faculty; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing,  
126 consulting about educational and teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews  
127 of manuscripts or grant applications; contributions to the department, college, and  
128 university, such as student advisement and mentoring, memberships on  
129 department/college/university committees, and development of teaching and service  
130 programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as memberships on professional  
131 societies and advisory boards; community and public service (if appropriate), such as  
132 giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to  
133 government agencies.

134 Candidates should document any arrangements made upon or after their initial  
135 appointment for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy  
136 service loads. Examples of such duties include assistant director of lower-division  
137 studies, assistant to the graduate director, and directing exchange programs. The  
138 overall effectiveness of such service is evaluated based on the criteria of efficiency,  
139 dependability, and innovation.

140 **3. Additional Considerations**

141 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review  
142 include the following:

143 **a. Professional Development Contributions:** It is expected that lecturers will manifest  
144 in their classes a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends  
145 and methods in the discipline. One way (though not required for promotion) of  
146 achieving such a proficiency is through a program of scholarly or creative activities.  
147 Other ways include attending or participating in panels at professional conferences,  
148 and remaining current on readings in the field.

149 In considering a lecturer's or senior lecturer's performance in professional  
150 development, the department will not determine a specific level of accomplishment.  
151 Instead, the review committee will take careful account of the candidate's  
152 professional development and use it to help determine the rating awarded in  
153 instruction and/or, when appropriate, the rating awarded in service. This reflects  
154 our belief that faculty members who are actively engaged in professional projects

155 will be better teachers and members of the professional community. As a result,  
156 lecturers will be better able to convey to students -- as first-hand practitioners --  
157 pedagogical insights about writing, research, theory, and other disciplinary matters.  
158 As teaching faculty of a research university, lecturers who have an active and  
159 successful record of professional development situate themselves as excellent  
160 colleagues of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. We recognize that lecturers,  
161 holding advanced degrees, have been trained for scholarly or creative activities, and  
162 should be fully encouraged to pursue these activities, which will enhance the overall  
163 accomplishments and reputation of the department.

164 Because a lecturer's professional development is evaluated as a subordinate  
165 element of the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to  
166 demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances his  
167 or her instructional effectiveness and/or service. One obvious way of doing this  
168 would be to show connections between the specific projects undertaken and the  
169 material taught in the classroom. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of  
170 demonstrating how a lecturer's experience in the field of professional development  
171 relates to her or his performance in instruction or service.

172 The specific forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are  
173 identical to those described in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
174 (under 'Criteria for Promotion and Tenure'): publications, editorial work, book  
175 reviews, hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences,  
176 awards and grants, and so forth.

177 Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the  
178 'Instruction' section of the dossier rather than under a 'Professional Development'  
179 section.

180 **b. Role within the department:** Because needs of the department often change, the  
181 role of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the  
182 college or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The  
183 review will include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the  
184 department and the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the  
185 department.

## 186 **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

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

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

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

200 **a. Teaching**

201 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a  
202 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's performance and supporting material demonstrate  
203 evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal  
204 intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department. Supporting  
205 material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as  
206 diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom,  
207 successful mentoring of students, a classroom environment that consistently supports  
208 learning, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of  
209 student learning should consistently show that students meet course objectives.  
210 Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and tone of comments  
211 across student course evaluations, taking into account such factors as the topic and  
212 format of course.

213  
214 If appropriate to her or his workload, the candidate should demonstrate commitment to  
215 mentoring through individual direction of students. This involvement in individual  
216 student mentoring may include supervision of directed readings, research, or  
217 independent study courses and/or provision of guidance to students in professional  
218 development or course selection. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate's  
219 assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of  
220 mentoring is gauged by evidence of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's  
221 mentorship; examples of such evidence include student presentations, applications to  
222 graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation. The candidate also should be  
223 involved with the department's overarching curricular goals (e.g., new course proposals,  
224 course revisions, or study abroad programs).

225 **b. Service**

226 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to senior  
227 lecturer with a rating of *very good* if the candidate is an active colleague who serves  
228 when asked, takes initiative in developing helpful service contributions, and succeeds  
229 according to his or her own initiative. Service at this level might include some  
230 experiences beyond the department (e.g., service to the Honors College, the Office of  
231 Student Life, or a university-recognized student group). A candidate evaluated as *very*

232 *good* in service may also have some service outreach responsibilities outside of the  
233 University.

## 234 **2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer**

235 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate  
236 a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as  
237 *excellent*, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a  
238 level of assigned service to the department, college, university, and/or to the  
239 professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the  
240 university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for  
241 promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time  
242 period since the last promotion. This growth might be in the area of teaching or service  
243 or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher ranking in one of these areas, but this  
244 need not necessarily be the case so long as the candidate has made improvements in  
245 discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made new  
246 contributions in teaching or service.

### 247 **a. Teaching**

248 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating  
249 of *excellent*, in addition to meeting the requirements for excellence at the senior  
250 lecturer level, the candidate's teaching effectiveness is visible through direct measures  
251 such as student learning outcomes and other departmental assessments. There should  
252 be evidence that, over the length of her or his teaching career, the candidate has grown  
253 pedagogically in ways that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of  
254 teaching. This growth may also include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which  
255 should be assessed by the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as  
256 student evaluations, see above); innovations need not always have been successful. This  
257 candidate should be able to document external recognition of teaching skill (e.g.,  
258 teaching awards, production of a significant article or other publication on pedagogy,  
259 external funding for pedagogical initiatives, or the development and diffusion of  
260 pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the larger teaching community).  
261 The candidate rated as *excellent* at this level normally will demonstrate extensive and  
262 successful involvement in individual student mentoring as described above.

### 263 **b. Service**

264 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to  
265 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if the candidate continues to meet the  
266 service requirements for promotion to senior lecturer and demonstrates growth in  
267 service since the time of the last review. This growth must include service in a long-  
268 term administrative role (e.g., practicum coordinator, Director of Undergraduate  
269 Studies) or in multiple short-term leadership roles (e.g., chair of multiple committees)  
270 and performance of distinctive service in these roles, as well as service on a wider range  
271 of committees. It may include service-related innovation (e.g., creating and supervising

272 a new program that supports the department’s instructional mission) and or significant  
273 service to graduate teaching assistants and faculty colleagues (e.g., through teaching  
274 consultation, mentorship, guest lecturing). It may also include significant service to the  
275 college, the university, a professional or practice community, and/or a professional  
276 organization.

#### 277 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

##### 283 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

284 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are  
285 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by  
286 the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report covering the prior  
287 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation  
288 with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the  
289 lecturer track faculty member’s teaching and service using the criteria described in  
290 Appendix I, depending on her/his current rank.

##### 291 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

292 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member’s  
293 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental  
294 subcommittee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured  
295 faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers will prepare an evaluation of the  
296 lecturer’s teaching and service. The department chair will provide an independent  
297 assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean’s Office for further  
298 evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point  
299 scale of adjectives listed in Appendix I. However, the spirit of the third-year review is  
300 different from that of the fifth-year promotion review; it is meant to review the  
301 lecturer’s achievements to date and provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies  
302 that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

##### 303 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers**

304 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior  
305 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy,  
306 and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member’s  
307 teaching and service records over the past five years and will employ the criteria  
308 described in Appendix I. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in  
309 the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are  
310 either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each  
311 when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). The

312 department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both  
313 evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

#### 314 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW**

##### 315 **A. General Considerations**

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

##### 327 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

###### 328 **1. Evaluation of Service**

329 Service comprises at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions. The quality  
330 of service of academic professionals is of paramount importance. Recognizing that each  
331 academic professional position is unique, the review committee will base its assessment  
332 of the candidate's quality of service on the specific duties assigned to each academic  
333 professional. Candidates, with the approval of the chair and the Dean's Office, should  
334 provide a summary of essential functions and responsibilities related to their program  
335 and position. Candidates will be evaluated in consideration with the areas below.

###### 336 **a. To demonstrate their service, candidates for promotion should**

337

- 338 i. collect and provide written evidence of their diligence and effectiveness in  
339 performing the essential functions and responsibilities of their position.
- 340 ii. include in the dossier a list of programmatic duties approved by the chair and  
341 the Dean's office, administrative roles, contributions to the development of their  
342 university and departmental initiatives, and committees served on, with brief  
343 descriptions of the work performed in each of these areas, such as reports or  
344 other documents prepared by the candidate.

345 **b.** Expectations regarding types of service activities will be detailed at the time of  
346 appointment in writing and may be modified at the annual evaluation. Service  
347 includes advising and serving the academic needs of students, and is typically

348 performed at the departmental and college levels, but may include university  
349 service. Professional service, as well as public service involving professional  
350 expertise, is also relevant.

## 351 **2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)**

352 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria  
353 of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)).

354 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates  
355 to their assigned role in the department.

356 For the evaluation of instructional accomplishment, candidates should provide evidence  
357 of student accomplishments and achievement of learning; student perceptions of the  
358 effectiveness of the instructor; how their pedagogy contributes to the department's, the  
359 college's, and the university's curricular needs, innovations, and improvements; and the  
360 quality of their teaching materials.

361 Additionally, when individual student instruction is included in the candidate's  
362 workload, the following information should be provided: supervision of directed  
363 readings or independent study courses; direction of honors theses; membership on  
364 student committees; advisement of students; and evidence of students' successful  
365 endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship (e.g., presentations and  
366 publications).

## 367 **3. Additional Considerations**

368 Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the academic  
369 professional review include the following:

370 **a. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role  
371 of the academic professional also may change. For example, if student enrollments  
372 shift, the college or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or  
373 fewer. The review will include the role of the academic professional within the  
374 context of the mission of the department and the ability of the academic  
375 professional to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

376 **b. Professional Development Contributions:** It is expected that academic professionals  
377 will manifest in their classes and in their programmatic work a rich intellectual  
378 background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. One  
379 way (though not required) of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of  
380 scholarly or creative activities. Other ways include attending or participating in  
381 panels at professional conferences, as well as remaining current on readings in the  
382 field.

383 In considering an academic professional's performance in professional development  
384 during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the department will not determine a  
385 specific level of accomplishment. Instead, the review committee will take careful

386 account of the candidate's professional development and use it to help determine  
387 the rating awarded in service and instruction. This reflects our belief that a faculty  
388 member who is actively engaged in professional projects of some kind will be a  
389 better teacher as a result, and will also serve better in the service role designated for  
390 his or her particular appointment as academic professional: better able to convey to  
391 students -- as a first-hand practitioner -- pedagogical insights about writing,  
392 research, theory, and other disciplinary matters; and better able to perform  
393 administrative duties because she or he has a significant professional standing.

394 Since an academic professional's professional development is evaluated as a  
395 subordinate element of the overall record in service and instruction, it is incumbent  
396 on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the  
397 dossier enhances her or his service and instructional effectiveness. One obvious way  
398 of doing this would be to show connections between the specific projects  
399 undertaken and the material taught in the classroom or service conducted on  
400 campus. Certainly there are many other ways, too, of demonstrating how an  
401 academic professional's experience in the field of professional development relates  
402 to his or her performance in instruction and service.

403 The specific forms of professional development that an academic professional may  
404 produce are identical to those described at the beginning of this manual (under  
405 'Criteria for Promotion and Tenure'): publications, editorial work, book reviews,  
406 hypertext projects, lectures, involvement with academic conferences, awards and  
407 grants, and so forth. All such work, whether produced during or before an academic  
408 professional's tenure at Georgia State University, may be included in the dossier.

409 Scholarship directly concerning pedagogy, curriculum, and so forth, should be  
410 included in the 'Instruction' section of the dossier rather than a 'Professional  
411 Development' section.

## 412 **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

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

### 419 **1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional**

420 For promotion to the rank of senior academic professional, the candidate must  
421 demonstrate a level of assigned service to the department, college and/or university,  
422 and/or the professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*. If the  
423 candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as  
424 demonstrating a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is also

425 evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the university standard for promotion to the rank of  
426 senior academic professional.

427 **a. Service**

428 The service of Academic Professionals is judged with respect to degree of diligence and  
429 level of effectiveness. Specifically, candidates will be judged *excellent* if they have (a)  
430 been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been highly effective in the service tasks  
431 assigned to them, and (c) effectively assumed substantial service roles that serve the  
432 mission of the university, within the scope of their appointment. In addition, candidates  
433 may have made significant contributions to professional associations or to other  
434 organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that benefit from the candidate's expertise.

435 **b. Teaching**

436 As stated in the college manual, promotion to senior academic professional is available  
437 only to those who are judged to be *excellent* in teaching. A candidate will be judged  
438 *excellent* in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at  
439 teaching, which is typically demonstrated in classroom-related instruction and  
440 mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective candidates will  
441 demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or  
442 execution. One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the  
443 pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are  
444 evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course.

445 Depending on workload assignment, the candidate may be expected to demonstrate a  
446 commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom. Involvement in  
447 mentoring may include, for example, involvement on thesis committee(s), supervision  
448 of directed readings, research or independent study courses, direction of honors theses,  
449 and advisement of students with regard to professional development, or course  
450 selection. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate's assigned workload and  
451 described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by  
452 evidence of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship; examples  
453 of such evidence include presentations, applications to graduate programs, and/or  
454 letters of recommendation.

455 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

461 **1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals**

462 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional  
463 track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the  
464 materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report  
465 covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate  
466 materials. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department  
467 chair will evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and  
468 teaching (if her/his workload includes teaching) using the criteria described in Appendix  
469 II, depending on her/his current rank.

470 **2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals**

471 The third-year review for academic professionals is designed to assess the faculty  
472 member's effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior academic  
473 professional. A departmental subcommittee composed of three faculty, which will  
474 include tenured faculty and senior academic professionals (with representation from  
475 each when the department has an available senior academic professional within its  
476 ranks), will prepare an evaluation of the academic professional's service and teaching (if  
477 applicable). The department chair will provide an independent assessment before  
478 forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record.  
479 The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in  
480 Appendix II. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the  
481 fifth-year promotion review: it is meant to encourage an assessment of, and dialogue  
482 about, an academic professional's achievements to date, and to generate advice about  
483 possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

484 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Academic Professionals**

485 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior  
486 academic professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if  
487 applicable). The review will cover the faculty member's service and teaching (if  
488 applicable) records over the past five years and will employ the criteria described in  
489 Appendix II. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college  
490 manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured  
491 or at the rank of senior academic professional (with representation from each when the  
492 department has an available senior academic professional within its ranks). The  
493 department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both  
494 evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

495 **APPENDIX I. Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be**  
496 **used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews**

497 **A. Teaching**

498 **Poor:** The lecturer displays an unacceptable record of classroom-based teaching based  
499 on the markers of effectiveness described in this document, minimal/ineffective  
500 involvement or no involvement in mentoring students or in departmental curricular or  
501 programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort  
502 as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to  
503 students.

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

509 **Good:** The lecturer does not meet criteria for a rating of *very good*, but at least  
510 demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching, based on the markers of  
511 effectiveness described in this document.

512 **Very Good:** The lecturer is a highly competent candidate whose supporting material  
513 includes evidence not only of effective classroom teaching, but also of some mentoring  
514 of students and a commitment to the mission of the department. Markers of classroom  
515 teaching effectiveness are described in the body of this document.

516 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The lecturer's performance and supporting  
517 material demonstrate the dedicated work of a teacher and faculty member who displays  
518 evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal  
519 intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department. Supporting  
520 material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as  
521 diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom,  
522 successful mentoring of students, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of  
523 teaching. Direct measures of student learning consistently show that students meet  
524 course objectives. Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and  
525 tone of comments across student course evaluations, taking into account such factors as  
526 the topic and format of course. The classroom environment consistently supports  
527 learning. If appropriate to the candidate's workload, involvement in individual student  
528 mentoring may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study  
529 courses. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate's assigned workload and  
530 described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by  
531 evidence of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship. The

532 candidate also should be involved with the department's overarching curricular goals  
533 (e.g., new course proposals, course revisions, or study abroad programs).

534 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for  
535 promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of **excellent** indicates  
536 that, in addition to meeting the requirements for excellence at the senior lecturer level,  
537 the candidate's teaching effectiveness is visible through direct measures such as student  
538 learning outcomes and other departmental assessments. There should be evidence that,  
539 over the length of her or his teaching career, the candidate has grown pedagogically in  
540 ways that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This growth  
541 may also include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which should be assessed by  
542 the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as student evaluations, see  
543 above); innovations need not always have been successful. This candidate should be  
544 able to document external recognition of teaching skill (e.g., teaching awards,  
545 production of a significant article or other publication on pedagogy, external funding for  
546 pedagogical initiatives, or the development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations  
547 that are used and/or cited by the larger teaching community). The candidate rated as  
548 *excellent* at this level normally will demonstrate extensive, successful involvement in  
549 individual student mentoring as described above.

550 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The record of highly effective instruction  
551 exceeds the criteria for *excellent* described above. For instance, the student evaluation  
552 scores and comments suggest inspirational performance in the classroom; the course  
553 material presented shows exceptional preparation; the faculty member demonstrates  
554 very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, as indicated,  
555 for example, by training grants or student awards; and there is other additional  
556 evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member  
557 may have published a textbook or curriculum or peer reviewed articles on the  
558 scholarship of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.

559  
560 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for  
561 promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of *outstanding*  
562 characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the department's pedagogical  
563 mission and the cutting edge of pedagogy in the field. In addition to meeting criteria for  
564 excellent described above, he or she will have a record demonstrating that his/her  
565 classes and instructional programs manifest an innovative pedagogical proficiency that  
566 has a broad, positive impact on other faculty and on the departmental curriculum at  
567 large. This candidate will take a leadership role in the department's instructional mission  
568 (e.g., learning outcome assessment, retention/progression/graduation initiatives, and  
569 curriculum development). There should be external validation, as well, of this  
570 candidate's prowess: teaching awards and prestigious pedagogical publications (which  
571 could be print or online resources) that have a demonstrated national impact are  
572 examples of this.

573 **B. Service**

574 **Poor:** The lecturer manifests no significant service accomplishments. The lecturer may  
575 serve on departmental committees, but without a documentable impact.

576 **Fair:** The lecturer manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments.  
577 The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but makes few effective  
578 contributions to the business of those committees.

579 **Good:** The lecturer has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the  
580 service tasks that were assigned.

581 **Very Good:** The lecturer is an active colleague who serves when asked, often suggests  
582 his or her own helpful service projects and roles, and succeeds according to her or his  
583 own initiative. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the  
584 department (e.g., service to the Honors College, the Office of Student Life, or a  
585 university-recognized student group). A candidate evaluated as very good in service may  
586 also have some service outreach responsibilities outside of the University.

587 **Excellent:** The lecturer continues to meet the service requirements for a rating of *very*  
588 *good* and demonstrates growth in service since the time of the last review. This growth  
589 must include service in a long-term administrative role (e.g., practicum coordinator,  
590 Director of Undergraduate Studies) or in multiple short-term leadership roles (e.g.,  
591 chair of multiple committees) and performance of distinctive service in these roles, as  
592 well as service on a wider range of committees. It may include service-related  
593 innovation (e.g., creating and supervising a new program that supports the  
594 department's instructional mission), as well as significant service to graduate teaching  
595 assistants and faculty colleagues (e.g., through teaching consultation, mentorship, guest  
596 lecturing). It may also include significant service to the college, the university, a  
597 professional or practice community, and/or a professional organization.

598 **Outstanding:** A lecturer will be judged *outstanding* in service if criteria for *excellent* are  
599 met and s/he has a track record of sustained, significant service accomplishments  
600 beyond the department and throughout the college and university; has been  
601 substantially active and engaged in a professional organization; and/or has won a  
602 prestigious service award.

603 **APPENDIX II. Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Academic Professional-Track**  
604 **Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative**  
605 **Reviews**

606 **A. Service**

607 **Poor:** The academic professional manifests no significant service accomplishments. The  
608 faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but without a documentable  
609 impact.

610 **Fair:** The academic professional manifests the bare minimum of significant service  
611 accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but  
612 makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

613  
614 **Good:** The academic professionals has been active in assistance to colleagues and  
615 carried out the service tasks assigned to them, within the scope of their appointment.

616 **Very Good:** The academic professionals has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues,  
617 (b) been effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) assumed service roles  
618 that serve the mission of the department or university, within the scope of their  
619 appointment.

620 **Excellent:** The academic professionals has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b)  
621 been highly effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) effectively assumed  
622 substantial service roles that serve the mission of the university, within the scope of  
623 their appointment. In addition, candidates may have made significant contributions to  
624 professional associations or to other organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that  
625 benefit from his or her expertise.

626 **Outstanding:** Academic professionals will be judged *outstanding* if the criteria for  
627 *excellent* are met and s/he has a track record of sustained, significant service  
628 accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university;  
629 has been substantially engaged in professional organizations; and/or has won a  
630 prestigious service award.

631 **B. Teaching (if applicable)**

632 **Poor:** The academic professional displays an unacceptable record of teaching based on  
633 the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal and ineffective or no  
634 involvement in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate  
635 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to  
636 students.

637 **Fair:** The academic professional displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching  
638 based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document, minimal involvement  
639 and effectiveness in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and  
640 inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course  
641 content to students.

642 **Good:** An academic professional will be judged *good* in teaching if the academic  
643 professional does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates  
644 competence in teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described in this  
645 document.

646 **Very Good:** The academic professional will be judged *very good* in teaching if the  
647 evidence indicates that the academic professional is effective in teaching, typically  
648 demonstrated by effective classroom instruction – based on the markers of  
649 effectiveness described above – and moderate involvement in mentoring students, if  
650 mentoring is expected in a candidate’s assigned workload.

651 **Excellent:** The academic professional will be judged *excellent* in teaching if the evidence  
652 indicates that the candidate is highly effective at teaching, which is typically  
653 demonstrated by effectiveness in classroom-related instruction and is engaged in  
654 effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective academic  
655 professionals will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development,  
656 preparation, and/or execution. One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom  
657 instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course  
658 evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course.  
659 Depending on workload assignment, the academic professional may be expected to  
660 demonstrate a commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom.  
661 Involvement in mentoring may include, for example, involvement on thesis  
662 committee(s), supervision of directed readings, research or independent study courses,  
663 direction of honors theses, and advisement of students. Other mentoring activities  
664 relevant to the academic professional’s assigned workload and described in the dossier  
665 will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’  
666 endeavors connected with the academic professional’s mentorship.

667 **Outstanding:** An academic professional will be judged *outstanding* in teaching if the  
668 record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for  
669 *excellent*. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest  
670 inspirational performance in the classroom, the course materials presented shows  
671 exceptional preparation, and the candidate demonstrates a high level of effective  
672 mentoring of students. The academic professional may have also published a textbook  
673 or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching  
674 awards.