

**College of Arts and Sciences  
Georgia State University  
PROMOTION MANUAL  
FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

Policy Title:	College Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty
Version:	2
College Approval:	Promotion and Review Procedures Committee Board, 11/9/2020
University Approval:	University Non-Tenure Track Promotion Manual Review Committee, 1/29/2021 Office of the Provost, 1/29/2021TBD
Effective:	01/01/2021

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty make important contributions to the teaching, service, and  
3 research missions of the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgia State University. The  
4 policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track  
5 ranks are outlined in this document, the university Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure  
6 Track Faculty, and departmental guidelines.

7 As noted in the university manual, promotion decisions for NTT faculty are based on  
8 discipline-specific criteria as determined by department and college faculty, but  
9 satisfaction of these criteria should reflect equivalent levels of accomplishment across the  
10 college and the university. Although NTT faculty members in different departments are  
11 engaged in varied forms of teaching, service and scholarly activity, with differential  
12 emphasis on each of these activities, the quality and significance of achievement  
13 appropriate to the discipline in question should be comparable.

14 Whereas the university NTT manual provides a general statement of the expected quality  
15 and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this college manual and related  
16 departmental guideline documents identify the concrete forms these achievements should  
17 take. Additionally, the college manual provides detailed procedural information about the  
18 college NTT promotion review process, as well as related periodic NTT reviews.

19 The Arts and Sciences NTT manual is reviewed and periodically revised by the college  
20 Promotion and Tenure Review Board. In keeping with university requirements, if there are  
21 substantive revisions in college or University NTT manuals, the college NTT manual also  
22 must be reviewed and approved by the provost.

23 The promotion policies and procedures established by the college and Georgia State  
24 University for NTT faculty conform to the requirements of the Board of Regents.  
25 Specifically, these policies and procedures conform to Section 8.3 of the BOR Policy Manual  
26 (<http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/policy/C245>).

27 Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for consideration  
28 for the award of tenure (BOR Policy Manual Section 8.3.8).

29 The following three NTT faculty positions in use in the College of Arts and Sciences are  
30 eligible for promotion. For each position, the ranks used within the College of Arts and  
31 Sciences have been listed in parentheses starting with the lowest rank and ending with the  
32 highest possible rank.

- 33 1. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
- 34 2. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional,  
35 Principal Academic Professional)
- 36 3. Research Faculty (Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor,  
37 Research Professor)

38 In addition to the NTT faculty titles listed above, the positions of Instructor, Professor of  
39 Practice, and Expert-in-Residence are in use in the college. However, at Georgia State  
40 University there is no promotion path for NTT faculty holding these positions.

41 **II. DESCRIPTIONS OF NTT FACULTY POSITIONS**

42 The following is a description of each of the three NTT faculty positions listed in Section I.  
43 Within each position, the duties and responsibilities are listed in order of importance for  
44 that position. The duties and responsibilities are divided into the categories of teaching,  
45 service, and research (professional development).

46 **A. Lecturer**

47 1. Teaching

48 The primary responsibility of lecturers is teaching.

49 2. Service

50 As part of their workload, lecturers are expected to engage in service activities. These  
51 activities may include advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on  
52 committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the  
53 department, college and/or university level. Service also may involve activities related to  
54 the professional and practice community.

55 3. Research

56 Lecturers are not required to engage in research, scholarly, and creative activities.  
57 Nonetheless, lecturers are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in their  
58 discipline.

59 **B. Academic Professional**

60 As per Board of Regents requirements, a title from the academic professional track “may  
61 not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or  
62 more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.8.3).

63 The designation Academic Professional would apply to a variety of academic assignments  
64 that call for academic background similar to that of a faculty member with professorial  
65 rank, but which are distinctly different from professorial positions (BOR Policy Manual  
66 Section 8.3.8.3).

67 The academic professional position requires an appropriate terminal degree, or in rare and  
68 extraordinary circumstances, qualification on the basis of demonstrably successful related  
69 experience, which exception is expressly approved by the institution president (BOR  
70 Policy178 Manual Section 8.3.8.3).

71 1. Service

72 The primary responsibility of an academic professional is service, which includes activities  
73 such as:

- 74 a. Managing instructional laboratories;
- 75 b. Assuming academic program management roles not suited for expectations applied  
76 to tenure track faculty members, operating instructional technology support  
77 programs;
- 78 c. Assuming professional student counseling center responsibilities, providing  
79 specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs; and,
- 80 d. Working with tenure track faculty members in course and curriculum development  
81 and in the laboratory.

82 2. Teaching

83 As part of their workload, academic professionals may be expected to engage in teaching  
84 activities.

85 3. Research

86 The College of Arts and Sciences does not require academic professionals to engage in  
87 research, scholarly, and creative activities. Nonetheless, academic professionals are  
88 expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in their discipline.

89 **C. Research Faculty**

90 1. Research

91 The primary responsibility of Research Faculty is to conduct research.

92 The purpose of Research Faculty appointments, based on available external funding, is to  
93 increase the research, scholarly, and creative efforts of the university. Research Faculty will  
94 work either in close collaboration with other faculty and/or will carry out independent  
95 research that builds upon an explicit area of focus for the University. Research Faculty  
96 salaries are primarily from research grants or other sources of external funds (non-general  
97 state funds). Research Faculty hold a terminal degree in their discipline, have  
98 demonstrated evidence of independent research careers (non-independent investigators  
99 should be appointed at the post-doctoral level), and concentrate primarily on research.  
100 Appointments of members of the Research Faculty are renewable on an annual basis upon  
101 satisfactory review and available external funding.

102 2. Teaching

103 As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in teaching.

104 3. Service

105 As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in service activities.

106 **III. COLLEGE NON-TENURE TRACK REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR**  
107 **LECTURER, PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL, AND**  
108 **PRINCIPAL ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL**

109 **A. Process Overview**

110 The primary stages of the college NTT promotion review process are described below.  
111 Specific dates will be assigned to each step in a review calendar issued in advance of the  
112 review cycle each year.

- 113 1. The Dean's Office notifies all candidates of their eligibility for promotion (with copy  
114 to the department chair).
- 115 2. The candidate submits review materials to chair of the department.
- 116 3. The department chair forwards the candidate's materials to departmental review  
117 committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must  
118 be made by the committee as a whole).
- 119 4. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority  
120 reports, to the department chair. Members of the committee must not be identified  
121 to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that  
122 they can be removed when the candidate is provided with their copy of the  
123 committee's report(s). The candidate will receive a copy of the departmental  
124 committee's recommendation, including any minority reports, and will have the  
125 option to respond to the department chair within three business days of receiving  
126 the departmental committee report.
- 127 5. The department chair submits their recommendation and the recommendation of  
128 the departmental committee, including any minority reports and any responses  
129 from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The candidate will receive a copy of the  
130 department chair's recommendation and will have the option to respond to the  
131 Dean's Office (with copy to the department chair) within three business days of  
132 receiving the department chair's report. The Dean's Office will forward the reports  
133 from the departmental committee and the department chair, including any minority  
134 reports and any responses from the candidate to the college NTT promotion review  
135 committee.
- 136 6. The college NTT promotion review committee submits the committee's  
137 recommendation, including any minority reports, to the Dean's Office. The candidate  
138 will receive a copy of the college committee's report and will have the option to  
139 respond to the dean within three business days of receiving the college committee's  
140 report.

141 7. The dean submits their recommendation and all review materials, including any  
142 prior responses from the candidate, to the Provost's Office. The candidate will  
143 receive a copy of the dean's report. If the dean's recommendation is negative, the  
144 candidate may appeal to the provost within ten business days, and the provost will  
145 provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including bases upon  
146 which the appeal is supported or rejected. If the dean's recommendation is positive,  
147 the candidate will not have the option to respond to the provost.

## 148 **B. Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committees**

149 The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured  
150 and NTT faculty of senior rank and above (see Appendix B) in the department, except the  
151 chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position that will  
152 review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels.  
153 Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and  
154 evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the  
155 committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its  
156 final recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be  
157 signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the  
158 recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide  
159 a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting  
160 rationale. Members of the committee must not be identified to the candidate; therefore, the  
161 signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the  
162 candidate is provided with their copy of the committee's report(s).

163 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final  
164 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department chair,  
165 the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members  
166 from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of  
167 faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured  
168 and one being NTT faculty.

## 169 **C. College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee**

170 The College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee includes three  
171 representatives from each of the academic areas of the college (humanities, natural and  
172 computational sciences, and social and behavioral sciences) and one at large  
173 representative. For each area, there should be at least one tenured faculty member and at  
174 least one NTT faculty member at the senior level or above (see Appendix B), with a simple  
175 majority of the committee's membership being tenured faculty. The college committee may  
176 operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each  
177 candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the  
178 whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its  
179 final recommendation. Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may  
180 not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole.

181 The members of the committee shall be elected by the faculty at a faculty meeting.  
182 Members of the committee shall hold staggered three-year terms.

#### 183 **D. Written Notifications of Recommendations to Candidate**

184 The chair will provide a copy of the departmental committee's report and any minority  
185 reports to the candidate as soon as it is received. The chair will provide a copy of their  
186 report to the candidate when it is forwarded to the college Non-Tenure Track Promotion  
187 Review Committee. The Dean's Office will provide the candidate a copy of the college  
188 committee's report. The Dean's Office will provide the candidate a written notice of the  
189 outcome of the review and a copy of its report. Minority reports, if they exist, will also be  
190 included. The reports, including minority reports, should remove the signature page or  
191 section which identifies committee members by name. As outlined above, the candidate has  
192 the right to respond in writing to the departmental committee's report, the chair's report,  
193 and the college committee's report, within three business days of receiving the reports, and  
194 copies of the candidate's response(s) will be included in the material reviewed at all higher  
195 levels.

196 The candidate's written response to recommendations of the department committee will  
197 be submitted to the chair, who will then forward them to the Dean's Office. The candidate's  
198 response to the chair's report and/or the college committee's report will be submitted to  
199 the Dean's Office (with copy to the department chair). Following receipt of the dean's  
200 recommendation, if negative, the candidate has ten business days to submit an appeal to  
201 the provost, as outlined above.

202 Candidates are referred to the university non-tenure track faculty promotion manual for  
203 information on the process and procedures for review of promotion cases at the university  
204 level, including the appeals process.

#### 205 **IV. LECTURER REVIEW**

206 There are five types of structured reviews for lecturers:

- 207 • annual review leading to re-appointment,
- 208 • third-year review,
- 209 • fifth-year review with promotion to senior lecturer,
- 210 • subsequent review with promotion to principal senior lecturer, and
- 211 • post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).

212 In these reviews, the primary consideration is contributions in teaching and service, with  
213 consideration given to contributions in the area of research (professional development) as  
214 applicable to teaching or service.

#### 215 **A. Annual Review**

216 An appointment to a lecturer position is for a one-year period. Lecturers are reviewed on

217 an annual basis as described in the College of Arts and Sciences Annual Review of Regular  
218 Faculty policy.

### 219 **B. Third-Year Review**

220 The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of teaching  
221 and service contributions. Lecturers in their third year will provide all required materials  
222 to the chair.

223 The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is an elected  
224 committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include both tenured faculty and  
225 senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers. This committee will use the departmental  
226 NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in teaching  
227 and service to the department chair.

228 The chair will provide a written assessment of the lecturer's effectiveness in teaching and  
229 service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will  
230 forward all materials, the committee report, and their comments to the Dean's Office.

231 The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and provide to the lecturer its decision  
232 regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for contract  
233 renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between the chair,  
234 an associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make  
235 further recommendations to the faculty member.

### 236 **C. Lecturer Promotion Reviews**

#### 237 1. Criteria for Promotion:

238 a. Terms of Evaluation: Candidates will be evaluated as having met or not met the  
239 standards for promotion in the categories of teaching and service using the  
240 evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The exact  
241 terms that represent the standard in teaching and service for promotion are  
242 specified under items b and c below. The evaluations will take into account  
243 expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the  
244 candidate's discipline, and the mission and resources of the department.  
245 Guidelines for the application of the terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, etc. as  
246 they apply within the candidate's field are specified in each department's NTT  
247 faculty review guidelines.

248 b. Promotion to Senior Lecturer: Lecturers in their fifth year of service must be  
249 considered for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer (to begin in the seventh  
250 year of service). Lecturers that do not meet the standards for promotion after five  
251 years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

252 For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a  
253 level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as *excellent*.  
254 Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the  
255 department, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice  
256 community that is evaluated as *very good*, which meets the university standard for  
257 promotion to the rank of senior lecturer.



258 c. Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer: Senior lecturers in their fifth year in rank  
259 or higher may be considered for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer  
260 (to take effect at the beginning of the subsequent fall semester).

261 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must  
262 demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is  
263 evaluated as *excellent* with continued growth in the time period since the last  
264 promotion. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to  
265 the department, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice  
266 community that is evaluated as *excellent*, which meets the university standard for  
267 promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer.

268 2. Promotion Review Process: The Dean's Office will notify all candidates of their  
269 eligibility for promotion (with a copy to the chair). Those seeking promotion to senior  
270 lecturer or principal senior lecturer will provide all required materials to the chair.

271 The chair will provide a departmental committee with this material. See section III.B  
272 above for a description of the composition of the departmental NTT promotion review  
273 committee.

274 The departmental committee will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines  
275 to provide a written report, which includes an assessment of the lecturer's  
276 effectiveness in teaching and service and a recommendation for or against promotion,  
277 to the department chair, along with any minority reports.

278 The chair will provide a written report, which includes an assessment of the lecturer's  
279 effectiveness in teaching and service, a recommendation for or against promotion, and  
280 an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair will forward all  
281 review materials (i.e., the chair's report, the committee report, any minority reports,  
282 and any responses from the candidate) to the Dean's Office, which will forward these  
283 materials to the college NTT promotion review committee.

284 The college NTT promotion review committee will review the material and make a  
285 recommendation to the dean.

286 The dean and associate dean will review the material and submit the dean's final  
287 recommendation to the university provost.

#### 288 **D. Scope of Evaluations:**

289 1. Evaluation of Teaching: Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the  
290 college's [Policy on Assessment of Teaching for Full-time Faculty](#). The specific nature of  
291 each lecturer's teaching activities may vary as a function of the mission of the  
292 department. Thus, evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it  
293 relates to their department's mission. Among the factors that evaluators should  
294 consider in their assessments are the following:

295 a. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through  
296 review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials.  
297 Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading  
298 assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course materials

- 299 should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of  
300 knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as  
301 customized texts, handouts, software, and other relevant information. In  
302 departments that give standardized and/or departmental examinations, scores on  
303 these examinations should be included for review. Credit should also be given to  
304 faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity,  
305 and critical acumen in their students.
- 306 b. Development of new courses or teaching programs: Evaluation will include the  
307 effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in  
308 the development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching  
309 techniques and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty  
310 member.
- 311 c. Teaching portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio they have  
312 compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E below for  
313 guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different  
314 review periods). As described in the college's Policy on Assessment of Teaching for  
315 Full-time Faculty, a teaching portfolio shall include a list of all independent  
316 studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall  
317 include in the portfolio more complete data (syllabi, exams, s and other materials)  
318 from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a more general course.  
319 In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses  
320 in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they  
321 have taught (including summers, if applicable).  
322
- 323 d. Student evaluations: The review will include student evaluation scores, in the  
324 context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e.,  
325 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary area. The  
326 information will also include other important variables, such as class size, whether  
327 the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and  
328 number of students enrolled in the course. In general, evaluations are indicators of  
329 student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged in the context of other  
330 information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness  
331 or for making fine-grained distinctions.
- 332 e. Direction of students: The extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of  
333 student projects and academic activities, such as independent studies, practica,  
334 theses, performances, and recitals will be considered. The effectiveness of these  
335 efforts will be judged by such outcomes as student success in acceptance to  
336 graduate or professional schools, scores on national examinations, and special  
337 awards or achievements.
- 338 f. Additional methods: Departments may consider developing additional assessment  
339 criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.
- 340 2. Evaluation of Service: Contributions in the area of service include high-quality  
341 instructional service, assistance to colleagues, contributions to the department,

342 college, or university, professional service, and community and public service. Service  
343 for lecturers is dependent on the mission as defined by the department, but it is  
344 generally at the departmental, college, or university level.

345 3. Additional Considerations: Other factors and contributions that may be considered as  
346 part of the lecturer review include the following:

347 a. Research (professional development) contributions (if appropriate): Activities  
348 such as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities,  
349 performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or  
350 funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the lecturer's knowledge as it relates  
351 to teaching performance, may be considered if specified in the departmental  
352 guidelines.

353 b. Role within the department: Since needs of the department often change, the role  
354 of the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the  
355 College or department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The  
356 review will include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the  
357 department and the ability of the lecturer to effectively fulfill changing needs of  
358 the department.

## 359 **E. Evaluation Materials**

360 For the third-year review and lecturer promotion reviews, candidates prepare a  
361 professional dossier containing the information on teaching and service indicated below  
362 for the review period appropriate to the specific review.

### 363 **Definition of Review Periods:**

- 364 • For third-year review, the dossier covers the period since the hire date.
- 365 • For the fifth-year review leading to promotion to senior lecturer, the dossier  
366 includes teaching portfolios from the last three full calendar years and student  
367 evaluation scores from the last three academic years<sup>1</sup>, while the rest of the dossier  
368 covers the period since the hire date.
- 369 • For the review leading to promotion to principal senior lecturer, the dossier  
370 includes teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years, while the rest of the  
371 dossier covers the last five academic years.
- 372 • For the five-year post-promotion structured review, the dossier includes annual  
373 reports and teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years, while the rest of

---

<sup>1</sup> The fifth-year review dossier consists of three years of all available student evaluation data and teaching portfolios due to several factors. First, it is the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences that departmental and college reviewers do not consider a candidate's student evaluations from their first academic year at Georgia State as part of the promotion review, so candidates are instructed to exclude this information from their dossier. Second, because fifth-year promotion reviews begin during the fall semester of each candidate's fifth year, student evaluation and teaching portfolio data are not available from either semester of the candidate's fifth year. Further, candidates only include the last three years of teaching portfolios, which are submitted by calendar year as part of the annual review process, because their teaching portfolios from their first two calendar years at Georgia State each include student evaluation data from a semester during their first academic year.

374 the dossier covers the last five academic years. Further information on the materials  
375 to be submitted for five-year post-promotion structured reviews is detailed in  
376 section V.F below.

377 **Electronic Dossier Preparation:**

378 All materials must be submitted as a single electronic document, prepared following  
379 current instructions for digital preparation from the Dean's Office. The method for  
380 transmitting and storing a candidate's dossier and other review materials will be  
381 secured in such a way that maintains strict confidentiality. Only individuals assigned as  
382 reviewers for a candidate's promotion case (e.g. review committee members,  
383 department chair, dean) will be granted time-limited access to the candidate's  
384 materials.

385 **Your dossier should include the following:**

- 386 1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department, and date of appointment at  
387 Georgia State University.
- 388 2. Curriculum Vitae
- 389 3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (**submitted by the department**  
390 **chair**): Describe the candidate's primary responsibilities under the general  
391 categories of Teaching and Service.
- 392 4. Information on Teaching
  - 393 a. Statement of Teaching Interests, Goals, and Qualifications (2-3 pages): Each  
394 lecturer should briefly describe an educational philosophy and a set of goals and  
395 objectives in teaching and student service projects, and a list of courses and/or  
396 areas they believe they are qualified to teach.
  - 397 b. Courses Taught during the review period (include summers, if applicable):
    - 398 i. Using the format in Appendix A, the candidate must provide a list of  
399 courses taught during the review period (see section V.E above for  
400 guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the  
401 different review periods).
    - 402 ii. The candidate must also provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for  
403 each course taught during the time period. Only one syllabus for each  
404 different course is required.
    - 405 iii. The development of new courses or significant revisions to existing courses  
406 should be noted in this section.
    - 407 iv. The candidate should indicate if the course is part of a study abroad,  
408 international student exchange program, signature experience, or field  
409 experience.
  - 410 c. Student Evaluations: The dossier must include all available student evaluation  
411 numerical scores and written comments from all courses the candidate has  
412 taught as the instructor of record at Georgia State University during the review  
413 period. Courses taught during summer are to be included if applicable. The

- 414 Dean's Office will pull this information and provide it to the candidate for  
415 inclusion in the dossier.
- 416 d. Teaching Funding (if appropriate): Describe all intramural and extramural  
417 funding of teaching initiatives.
- 418 e. Honors or Special Recognition for Teaching: These should be listed in tabular  
419 form.
- 420 f. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, Non-thesis projects, Theses, and  
421 Dissertations: These items should be listed as follows with the student name,  
422 title, and date completed for each:
- 423 i. Independent Studies
- 424 ii. Practica
- 425 iii. Honors Theses
- 426 iv. Non-Thesis Projects
- 427 v. Theses
- 428 vi. Dissertations
- 429 g. Published Materials: Textbooks and published articles related to the candidate's  
430 teaching. A copy of each must be provided.
- 431 h. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio they  
432 have compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E above for  
433 guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different  
434 review periods). As described in the college's Policy on Assessment of Teaching  
435 for Full-time Faculty, a teaching portfolio shall include a list of all independent  
436 studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall  
437 include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, assignments, and  
438 other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a  
439 more general course, if applicable. In consultation with the department chair,  
440 faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a  
441 broad representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if  
442 applicable).
- 443 i. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness: The candidate may include other  
444 materials not specified above and not specifically required by the department as  
445 part of the teaching portfolio. Such evidence of teaching effectiveness may  
446 include, but is not limited to, peer evaluations, students' passing rates on  
447 licensure/certification examinations, use of technology for teaching, program  
448 accreditation review results, and student accomplishments.
- 449 5. Information on Service
- 450 a. Assigned service roles: indicate administrative roles or other service duties that  
451 are ongoing assignments (e.g., undergraduate director, program coordinator). In  
452 this subsection the candidate may also include a brief statement on service (1  
453 page) discussing overarching service goals at the department, college, university,

- 454 and professional levels.
- 455 b. Teaching Service: a list of teaching service beyond the classroom. Examples of  
456 teaching service may include participating in developing teaching materials and  
457 curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology,  
458 supervising and/or mentoring faculty.
- 459 c. Assistance to Colleagues: guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and  
460 teaching issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, or  
461 assistance with new teaching technology), providing advice about or reviews of  
462 manuscripts or grant applications.
- 463 d. Contributions to the department, college, and university: student advisement  
464 and mentoring, memberships on departmental/college/university committees,  
465 development of teaching and service programs.
- 466 e. Professional service (if appropriate): memberships on professional societies,  
467 advisory boards, etc.
- 468 f. Community and public service (if appropriate): lectures, speeches,  
469 presentations, performances, short courses, assistance to governmental  
470 agencies.
- 471 6. Information on research (professional development) activities (if appropriate):  
472 Departmental guidelines may specify that a faculty member can provide information  
473 on research (professional development) activities, such as publications of their  
474 research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference  
475 presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on  
476 the lecturer's knowledge of the field or teaching performance.

#### 477 **F. Five-year Structured Review**

478 As stated in the university manual, structured reviews are intended to provide a longer-  
479 term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. Faculty members who have  
480 been promoted to the senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer ranks will go through a  
481 structured cumulative review in the fifth year following promotion and in each fifth year  
482 following the previous cumulative review (NTT Post-Promotion Review). Senior Lecturers  
483 are exempted from this requirement in the year(s) that they are considered for promotion  
484 to the principal senior lecturer rank.

485 Senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers will provide all required materials to the  
486 chair. The review materials consist of the items enumerated below. Departments may  
487 require additional materials.

- 488 1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department, and date of appointment at  
489 Georgia State University.
- 490 2. Updated curriculum vitae.
- 491 3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department  
492 chair): Describe the candidate's primary responsibilities under the general  
493 categories of Teaching and Service.

- 494 4. Annual reports for each of the years under review.
- 495 5. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio they have  
496 compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E above for guidelines  
497 on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different review  
498 periods). As described in the college's Policy on Assessment of Teaching for Full-  
499 Time Faculty, a teaching portfolio shall include a list of all independent studies,  
500 theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall include in  
501 the portfolio more complete data (syllabi, exams, assignments, and other materials)  
502 from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a more general course.  
503 In consultation with the department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in  
504 the portfolio so that it will contain a broad representation of the courses they have  
505 taught (including summers, if applicable).
- 506 6. Student Evaluations: The dossier must include all available student evaluation  
507 numerical scores and written comments from all courses the candidate has taught  
508 as the instructor of record at Georgia State University during the review period.  
509 Courses taught during the summer are to be included, if applicable. The Dean's  
510 Office will pull this information and provide it to the candidate for inclusion in the  
511 dossier.

512 The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is an elected  
513 committee composed of at least three tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers (with  
514 representation from each rank required). This committee will provide a written  
515 assessment of effectiveness in teaching and service to the departmental chair.

516 The chair will provide a written assessment of the faculty member's effectiveness in  
517 teaching and service, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position.  
518 The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., the chair's recommendation and the  
519 committee report) to the Dean's Office.

520 The assessment statements of the departmental committee and department chair will  
521 address whether the faculty member is performing at the level necessary for  
522 reappointment, whether the faculty member is progressing toward promotion, and they  
523 will identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach their full potential in  
524 terms of contribution to the university. The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and  
525 provide any necessary response by the date designated by the Board of Regents for  
526 contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between  
527 the chair and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further  
528 recommendations to the faculty member.

#### 529 **G. Lecturers Hired at the Senior Level**

530 All lecturers whose initial appointment at GSU is at the senior level or above (see Appendix  
531 B) shall have a review no later than three years after the initial appointment (Structured  
532 Third Year Review). After this review, subsequent structured reviews will take place every  
533 five years (Structured Fifth Year Review).

### 534 **V. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEW**

535 According to Board of Regents requirements, the academic professional title “may not be  
536 assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more  
537 of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual 803.10). Therefore, the primary consideration  
538 in the third- and fifth-year reviews of academic professionals is service contributions.  
539 Contributions in teaching will be considered as part of the review if a candidate’s workload  
540 includes teaching. Other activities, such as publications of research, creative activities, and  
541 scholarship, are not required; however, departments have the option of considering such  
542 activities in the reviews, particularly as they bear on service or teaching performance.

543 There are five types of structured reviews of academic professionals in use in the College of  
544 Arts and Sciences:

- 545 • annual review leading to re-appointment,
- 546 • third-year review,
- 547 • fifth-year review with promotion to senior academic professional and re-  
548 appointment,
- 549 • subsequent review with promotion to principal academic professional, and
- 550 • post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).

551 In each academic professional review, the primary consideration is contributions in service  
552 and teaching, with consideration given to contributions in the area of research  
553 (professional development).

#### 554 **A. Annual Review**

555 An appointment to an academic professional position is for a one-year period. Academic  
556 professionals are reviewed on an annual basis as described in the College of Arts and  
557 Sciences Annual Review of Regular Faculty policy.

#### 558 **B. Third-Year Review**

559 The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of service  
560 and teaching contributions. Academic professionals in their third year will provide all  
561 required materials to the chair.

562 The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is an elected  
563 committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include tenured faculty and NTT  
564 faculty at senior rank or above (see Appendix B). This committee will use the departmental  
565 NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in service  
566 and teaching to the departmental chair.

567 The chair will provide a written assessment of the academic professional’s effectiveness in  
568 service and teaching, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position.  
569 The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., the chair’s recommendation and the  
570 departmental committee report) to the Dean’s Office.

571 The Dean’s Office will evaluate the material and provide to the academic professional its  
572 decision regarding reappointment by the date designated by the Board of Regents for  
573 contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between



574 the chair, an associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review  
575 and to make further recommendations to the faculty member.

### 576 **C. Promotion Review**

#### 577 1. Criteria for Promotion:

578 a. Terms of Evaluation: Candidates will be evaluated as having met or not met the  
579 standards for promotion in the categories of service and teaching (if the candidate's  
580 workload includes teaching) using the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very*  
581 *good, good, fair, and poor*. The exact terms that represent the standard in service  
582 and teaching (if applicable) for promotion are specified under item b below. The  
583 evaluations will take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under  
584 consideration, the standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and  
585 resources of the department. Guidelines for the application of the terms *outstanding,*  
586 *excellent, very good, etc.* as they apply within the candidate's field are specified in  
587 each department's NTT faculty review guidelines.

588 b. Promotion to Senior Academic Professional: Academic professionals in their fifth  
589 year of service may be considered for promotion to the rank of senior academic  
590 professional (to begin in the sixth year of service). Academic professionals not  
591 reappointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

592 For promotion to the rank of senior academic professional, the candidate must  
593 provide a sustained level of service to the department, college and/or university,  
594 and/or to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*. If  
595 the candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must demonstrate  
596 *excellent* teaching, which meets the university standard for promotion to senior  
597 academic professional.

598 c. Promotion to Principal Academic Professional: Senior academic professionals in  
599 their fifth year in rank or higher may be considered for promotion to the rank of  
600 Principal Academic Professional (to take effect at the beginning of the subsequent  
601 fall semester). For promotion to the rank of Principal Academic Professional, the  
602 candidate must provide a sustained level of service to the department, college,  
603 and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is  
604 evaluated as *excellent* with continued growth in the time period since the last  
605 promotion. If the candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must  
606 demonstrate *excellent* teaching with sustained growth in the time period since the  
607 last promotion, meeting the university standard for promotion to Principal  
608 Academic Professional.

609 2. Promotion Review Process: The Dean's Office will notify all candidates of their  
610 eligibility for promotion (with a copy to the chair). Those seeking promotion to senior  
611 academic professional will provide all required materials to the chair.

612 The chair will provide a departmental committee with this material. See section III.B  
613 above for a description of the committee's composition. The departmental committee  
614 will use the departmental NTT faculty review guidelines to provide a written report,  
615 which includes an assessment of academic professional's effectiveness in service and

616 teaching (if applicable) and a recommendation for or against promotion, to the  
617 department chair, along with any minority reports.

618 The chair will provide a written report, which includes an assessment of the academic  
619 professional's effectiveness in in service and teaching (if applicable), a  
620 recommendation for or against promotion, and an assessment of the departmental  
621 need for this position. The chair will forward all review materials (i.e., their report,  
622 the committee report, any minority reports, and any responses from the candidate) to  
623 the Dean's Office, which will forward the materials to the college NTT promotion  
624 review committee.

625 The college NTT promotion review committee will review the material and make a  
626 recommendation to the dean.

627 The dean and an associate dean will review the material and submit the college's final  
628 recommendation to the university provost.

#### 629 **D. Scope of Evaluations**

- 630 1. Evaluation of Service: Given the variation in service roles assigned to academic  
631 professionals across the college, evaluators will assess the service performance of  
632 academic professionals primarily as it relates to the department's mission and the  
633 specific service responsibilities of the candidate. Reviewers should evaluate the  
634 candidate using the following criteria and any provided in departmental guidelines.
- 635 a. Job Knowledge: Knowledge, skills and abilities as they relate to performing job  
636 requirements.
  - 637 b. Productivity: The amount of work successfully produced while maintaining  
638 standards and meeting deadlines.
  - 639 c. Accuracy and Quality: The extent to which the candidate performs major job  
640 duties or responsibilities correctly and completely; professionalism and  
641 thoroughness of work produced.
  - 642 d. Adaptability: Ability to master new techniques or duties and understand  
643 explanations as required for the position. Demonstrates flexibility in meeting the  
644 changing demands of the work environment.
  - 645 e. Organizational Skills: Ability to effectively and efficiently plan, arrange, and  
646 complete work priorities; makes efficient use of available resources to optimize  
647 productivity.
  - 648 f. Communication Skills: Ability to express ideas effectively through verbal and  
649 written communication. Ability to communicate in a clear concise manner. Ability  
650 to listen and ask appropriate questions.
  - 651 g. Teamwork: Develops and maintains effective relationships with co-workers,  
652 supervisor, faculty, staff, students and others in the handling of job duties.
  - 653 h. Supervisory Ability: Ability to effectively delegate and monitor work and follow up  
654 with others; effectively coach, communicate with, reward and discipline.  
655 Demonstrates understanding and uses appropriate financial and budget controls.

656 Adheres to safety requirements and practices and communicates hazards to other  
657 employees in the workplace.

658 i. Additional Criteria: Departments may consider developing additional assessment  
659 criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.

660 2. Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable): Reviewers should evaluate the candidate's  
661 teaching contributions using the criteria listed below and those provided in  
662 departmental guidelines. The specific nature of the teaching duties assigned to  
663 academic professionals may vary across or within departments. Thus, evaluators  
664 should assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals primarily as it  
665 relates to the department's mission and the specific teaching responsibilities of the  
666 candidate.

667 a. Quality of Course Content: The quality of a course will be evaluated through  
668 review of syllabi, examinations, web pages, and other supplementary materials.  
669 Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading  
670 assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course  
671 materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the  
672 current state of knowledge in the field. Academic professionals may provide  
673 additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other  
674 relevant information. In departments that give standardized and/or  
675 departmental examinations, scores on these examinations should be included for  
676 review. Credit should also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in  
677 ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students.

678 b. New Courses/Teaching Programs Developed: Evaluation will include the effective  
679 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the  
680 development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques  
681 and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member.

682 c. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio they  
683 have compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section VI.E below for  
684 guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different  
685 review periods). As described in the college's Policy on Assessment of Teaching  
686 for Full-time Faculty, a teaching portfolio shall include a list of all independent  
687 studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall  
688 include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, assignments, and  
689 other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a  
690 more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty members  
691 shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad  
692 representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if applicable).

693 d. Student Evaluations: The review will include student evaluation scores, in the  
694 context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses  
695 (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary  
696 area. The information will also include other important variables, such as class  
697 size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the

698 evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In general,  
699 evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. The evaluations will be judged  
700 in the context of other information and should not be the sole basis for evaluating  
701 teaching effectiveness or for making fine-grained distinctions.

702 e. Additional Criteria: Departments may consider developing additional assessment  
703 criteria or methods, which may vary as specified in departmental guidelines.

704 3. Additional Considerations: Other factors and contributions that may be considered  
705 as part of the academic professional review include the following:

706 a. Role within the Department: Since needs of the department often change, the role  
707 of the academic professionals also may change. For example, if student  
708 enrollments shift, the College or department may need to offer more sections of a  
709 course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the academic professional  
710 within the context of the mission of the department and the ability of the  
711 academic professional to effectively fulfill changing needs of the department.

712 b. Research (Professional Development) Activities (if appropriate): Activities such  
713 as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities,  
714 performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or  
715 funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the academic professional's  
716 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance, may be considered if specified in  
717 the departmental guidelines.

718 **E. Evaluation Materials**

719 For the third-year review and academic professional promotion review, candidates prepare  
720 a professional dossier containing the information on teaching and service indicated below  
721 for the review period appropriate to the specific review.

722 **Definition of Review Periods:**

- 723 • For third-year review, the dossier covers the period since the hire date.
- 724 • For the fifth-year review leading to promotion to senior academic professional, the  
725 dossier includes teaching portfolios from the last three full calendar years and  
726 student evaluations from the last three academic years (if the candidate's workload  
727 includes teaching)<sup>2</sup>, while the rest of the dossier covers the period since the hire  
728 date.
- 729 • For the review leading to promotion to principal academic professional, the dossier

---

<sup>2</sup> The fifth-year review dossier consists of three years of all available student evaluation data and teaching portfolios due to several factors. First, it is the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences that departmental and college reviewers do not consider a candidate's student evaluations from their first academic year at Georgia State as part of the promotion review, so candidates are instructed to exclude this information from their dossier. Second, because fifth-year promotion reviews begin during the fall semester of each candidate's fifth year, student evaluation and teaching portfolio data are not available from either semester of the candidate's fifth year. Further, candidates only include the last three years of teaching portfolios, which are submitted by calendar year as part of the annual review process, because their teaching portfolios from their first two calendar years at Georgia State each include student evaluation data from a semester during their first academic year.

730 includes the teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years (if the candidate's  
731 workload includes teaching), while the rest of the dossier covers the period since  
732 promotion to senior academic professional.

- 733 • For the five-year post-promotion structured review, the dossier includes annual  
734 reports and teaching portfolios from the last five calendar years (if the candidate's  
735 workload includes teaching), while the rest of the dossier covers the last five  
736 academic years. Further information on the materials to be submitted for five-year  
737 post-promotion reviews is detailed in section VI.F below.

### 738 **Electronic Dossier Preparation:**

739 All materials must be submitted as a single electronic document, prepared following  
740 current instructions for digital preparation from the Dean's Office. The method for  
741 transmitting and storing a candidate's dossier and other review materials will be secured  
742 in such a way that maintains strict confidentiality. Only individuals assigned as reviewers  
743 for a candidate's promotion case (e.g., review committee members, department chair,  
744 dean) will be granted time-limited access to the candidate's materials.

### 745 **Your dossier should include the following:**

- 746 1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department, and date of appointment at  
747 Georgia State University.
- 748 2. Curriculum Vitae.
- 749 3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (**submitted by the department**  
750 **chair**): Describe the candidate's primary responsibilities under the general categories  
751 of Service and Teaching.
- 752 4. Information on Service: Describe objectives and contributions in the following service  
753 areas. Candidates are expected to address only those areas that apply.
  - 754 a. Facility / Services Management: Describe activities such as managing  
755 instructional laboratories or instructional technology support programs.
  - 756 b. Supervisory/Mentoring Activities: Describe activities such as supervision of  
757 graduate laboratory or teaching assistants, student assistants, staff, or part-time  
758 instructors.
  - 759 c. Teaching Service (if applicable): Describe activities such as coordination of  
760 clinical practica or field experiences, leading and/or supporting teaching  
761 training programs, or providing support for the development of new courses and  
762 programs.
  - 763 d. Academic Advisement and Curriculum: Describe activities such as providing  
764 academic advisement or managing advisement/recruitment programs,  
765 maintaining curriculum, course scheduling, or contributing to program  
766 evaluation and certification processes.
  - 767 e. Contributions to the Department, College, or University: List memberships on  
768 departmental/college/university committees; participation in university-

- 769 sanctioned outreach or service activities beyond the scope of regular job duties.
- 770 f. Professional Service: List memberships in professional societies, advisory  
771 boards, etc.
- 772 g. Community and Public Service: List non-university lectures, speeches,  
773 presentations, performances, short courses, assistance to governmental  
774 agencies.
- 775 h. Published Materials: Include copies of articles, training manuals, creative  
776 activities, or any other material publications related to the candidate's service  
777 responsibilities.
- 778 i. Additional Service: List service contributions not related to the categories above.  
779 Examples may include reviewing manuscripts or grant applications,  
780 contributions in support of research programs, or sponsored funding gained  
781 relating to service responsibilities. Departments may specify additional  
782 requirements in the departmental guidelines.
- 783 5. Information on Teaching (if applicable):
- 784 a. Statement of Teaching Interests, Goals, and Qualifications: Describe educational  
785 philosophy within the context of assigned teaching duties. Candidates should  
786 indicate all courses they are qualified to teach as an instructor of record and  
787 generally describe other types of contributions made in the classroom.
- 788 b. Courses Taught During the Review Period (include summers, if applicable):  
789 Using the format in Appendix A, the candidate must provide a list of courses  
790 taught during the relevant review period and the role they played in the course  
791 (i.e., instructor of record, assisted instructor, laboratory instructor, assisted  
792 laboratory instructor, etc.). For each course where the candidate was the  
793 instructor of record, please provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for  
794 the course. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. Please  
795 indicate on the syllabus if it was solely the work of the candidate, developed  
796 collaboratively, or based largely on the work of another faculty member.
- 797 c. Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should include the teaching portfolio they  
798 have compiled at Georgia State for the review period (see Section VI.E above for  
799 guidelines on the number of years of review materials to submit for the different  
800 review periods). As described in the college's Policy on Assessment of Teaching  
801 for Full-time Faculty, a teaching portfolio shall include a list of all independent  
802 studies, theses, and other such courses one has directed. In addition, faculty shall  
803 include in the portfolios more complete data (syllabi, exams, assignments, and  
804 other materials) from two courses per year - one a specialty course and one a  
805 more general course. In consultation with the department chair, faculty  
806 members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it will contain a broad  
807 representation of the courses they have taught (including summers, if  
808 applicable).
- 809 d. Student Evaluations (if workload includes teaching): The dossier must include  
810 all available student evaluation numerical scores and written comments from all

811 courses the candidate has taught as the instructor of record at Georgia State  
812 University during the review period. Courses taught during the summer are to  
813 be included, if applicable. The Dean's Office will pull this information and  
814 provide it to the candidate for inclusion in the dossier.

815 e. New Courses/Teaching Programs Developed: List and generally describe role  
816 played in the development of the course.

817 f. Teaching Funding: Describe all intramural and extramural funding of teaching  
818 initiatives.

819 g. Published Materials: Include copies of articles, textbooks, creative activities, or  
820 any other material publications related to the candidate's instruction.

821 h. Additional Teaching: Include other activities directly related to classroom  
822 teaching. Examples may include honors or special recognition for teaching.  
823 Departments may specify additional requirements in the departmental  
824 guidelines.

825 6. Research (Professional Development) Activities (if appropriate): Departments may  
826 specify that a faculty member can provide information on research activities, such  
827 as publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances,  
828 exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and  
829 collaborations, as they bear on the academic professional's assigned service and  
830 teaching responsibilities.

### 831 **F. Five-year Structured Review**

832 As described in the university manual, structured reviews are intended to provide a longer-  
833 term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. Faculty members who have  
834 been promoted to the senior academic professional or principal academic professional  
835 rank will go through a structured cumulative review in the fifth year following promotion  
836 and in each fifth year following the previous cumulative review (NTT Post-Promotion  
837 Review).

838 Senior academic professionals and principal academic professionals will provide all  
839 required materials to the chair. The review materials consist of the following:

840 1. Cover Page: Includes the candidate's name, department, and date of appointment at  
841 Georgia State University.

842 2. Updated curriculum vitae.

843 3. Summary of Essential Functions / Responsibilities (submitted by the department  
844 chair): Describe the candidate's primary responsibilities under the general  
845 categories of Teaching and Service.

846 4. Annual reports for each of the years under review.

847 5. (If their workload includes teaching) Teaching Portfolio: The candidate should  
848 include the teaching portfolio they have compiled at Georgia State for the review  
849 period (see Section VI.E above for guidelines on the number of years of review  
850 materials to submit for the different review periods). As described in the college's

851 Policy on Assessment of Teaching for Full-time Faculty, teaching portfolios shall  
852 include a list of all independent studies, theses, and other such courses one has  
853 directed. In addition, faculty shall include in the portfolios more complete data  
854 (syllabi, exams, assignments, and other materials) from two courses per year - one a  
855 specialty course and one a more general course. In consultation with the  
856 department chair, faculty members shall vary the courses in the portfolio so that it  
857 will contain a broad representation of the courses they have taught (including  
858 summers, if applicable).

859 6. Student Evaluations (if workload includes teaching): The dossier must include all  
860 available student evaluation numerical scores and written comments from all  
861 courses the candidate has taught as the instructor of record at Georgia State  
862 University during the review period. Courses taught during the summer are to be  
863 included, if applicable. The Dean's Office will pull this information and provide it to  
864 the candidate for inclusion in the dossier.

865 The chair will provide this material to a departmental committee. This is a committee  
866 composed of at least three tenured faculty and senior academic professionals or principal  
867 academic professionals, as appropriate (with representation from both tenured and  
868 academic professional tracks required). This committee will use the departmental NTT  
869 faculty review guidelines to provide a written assessment of effectiveness in service and  
870 teaching to the departmental chair.

871 The chair will provide a written assessment of the faculty member's effectiveness in service  
872 and teaching, as well as an assessment of the departmental need for this position. The chair  
873 will forward all review materials (i.e., the chair's recommendation and the committee  
874 report) to the Dean's Office.

875 The assessment statements of the departmental committee and department chair will  
876 address whether the faculty member is performing at the level necessary for  
877 reappointment, whether the faculty member is progressing toward promotion, and they  
878 will identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach their full potential in  
879 terms of contribution to the university. The Dean's Office will evaluate the material and  
880 provide any necessary response by the date designated by the Board of Regents for  
881 contract renewal. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between  
882 the chair and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further  
883 recommendations to the faculty member.

#### 884 **G. Academic Professionals Hired at the Rank of Senior Academic Professional or** 885 **Principal Academic Professional**

886 All academic professionals whose initial appointment at GSU is at the rank of senior  
887 academic professional or principal academic professional shall have a third-year review  
888 and subsequent reviews every five years.

## 889 **VI. RESEARCH FACULTY REVIEW**

890 The primary responsibility of Research Faculty is to conduct research. The purpose of  
891 Research Faculty appointments, based on available external funding, is to increase the



892 research, scholarly, and creative efforts of the University. Research Faculty will work either  
893 in close collaboration with other faculty and/or will carry out independent research that  
894 builds upon an explicit area of focus for the University. Research Faculty salaries are  
895 primarily from research grants or other sources of external funds (non-general state  
896 funds). Research Faculty hold a terminal degree in their discipline, have demonstrated  
897 evidence of independent research careers (non-independent investigators should be  
898 appointed at the post-doctoral level), and concentrate primarily on research. Appointments  
899 of members of the Research Faculty are renewable on an annual basis upon satisfactory  
900 review and available external funding.

901

902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907

**APPENDIX A:**  
**SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX TO 20XX**

Please provide a list of courses taught and the role the faculty member has played in the course (i.e., instructor of record, assisted instructor, laboratory instructor, or assisted laboratory instructor).

<b>Semester / year</b>	<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Role</b>
<i>Fall/02</i>	<i>Bio 1107</i>	<i>General Biology</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>Instructor of Record</i>

908

**APPENDIX B:**

909

**NTT RANK EQUIVALENCY CHART FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPOSING PROMOTION  
REVIEW COMMITTEES**

910

911

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

	<b>Junior Rank:</b>	<b>Senior Rank:</b>	<b>Highest Rank:</b>
<b>Lecturer Track:</b>	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Senior Lecturer
<b>Academic Professional Track:</b>	Academic Professional	Senior Academic Professional	Principal Academic Professional
<b>Research Faculty Track:</b>	Assistant Research Professor	Associate Research Professor	Research Professor