

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

Policy Title:	Neuroscience Institute Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	2
Institute Approval:	10/29/2019
College Approval:	1/29/2020
Effective:	1/29/2020

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

- 17 Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
- 18 Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)
- 19 Research Faculty (Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor,
20 Research Professor)

21
22 **2. DESCRIPTIONS OF NTT FACULTY POSITIONS**

23 **A. Lecturer**

24 The primary responsibility of lecturers is teaching. As part of their workload,
25 lecturers may be expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include
26 advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on committees, or
27 participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the department, college
28 and/or university level. Service also may involve activities related to the professional and
29 practice community. Lecturers may be considered for Graduate Faculty Status if it is
30 appropriate for their duties and consistent with University Graduate Faculty Policy.
31 Lecturers are not required to engage in research, scholarly, and creative activities.
32 Nonetheless, lecturers are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in
33 neuroscience.

34 **B. Academic Professional**

35 The primary responsibility of an academic professional is service, which includes
36 activities such as managing instructional laboratories, assuming academic program
37 management roles not suited for expectations applied to tenure track faculty members,
38 operating instructional technology support programs, and working with tenure track
39 faculty members in course and curriculum development and in the laboratory. As part of
40 their workload, academic professionals may be expected to engage in teaching activities.
41 Academic professionals are not required to engage in research, scholarly, and creative
42 activities. Nonetheless, academic professionals are expected to be familiar with current
43 trends and methods in neuroscience.

44 **C. Research Faculty**

45 The primary responsibility of research faculty is to conduct research. As part of their
46 workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in service and/or teaching.

47 **3. INSTITUTE REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER,**
48 **PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL**

49 **A. Process Overview**

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

- 53 1. The candidate receives notification of eligibility from the Dean’s office and submits the
54 required review materials outlined in the college manual to the Institute Director
55 according to the schedule provided by the College.
- 56 2. The Institute Director forwards the candidate’s review materials to a subcommittee of
57 the Institute NTT Review Committee (Committee of the Whole) to initiate the review.
58 The final review must be made by the Committee of the Whole.
- 59 3. The Committee of the Whole submits its recommendation, including minority report(s)
60 (if any), to the Institute Director. Members of the Committee must not be identified to
61 the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can
62 be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the Committee’s
63 report(s). The Institute Director provides a copy of the Committee’s report (including
64 minority report(s)) to the candidate as soon as they are received. The candidate has the
65 option of submitting a response to the reports to the Director within three business
66 days of receiving the report(s), and copies of the candidate’s response will be included
67 in the material reviewed at all higher levels.
- 68 4. The Institute Director submits an independent review of the candidate, the Institute’s
69 Committee of the Whole review (including minority report(s)), and the candidate’s
70 written response (if applicable) to the Dean’s Office. The candidate will receive a copy
71 of the Director’s recommendation and will have the option to respond to the Dean’s
72 Office (with copy to the Institute Director) within three business days of receiving the
73 director’s report. Copies of the candidate’s response will be included in the material
74 reviewed at all higher levels. The Dean’s Office provides the Institute Director with a
75 copy of any formal response the candidate has to the Institute committee and Director’s
76 report.

77 At this point, the review process passes from the Institute to the College and
78 University. See the college manual for details on the review process at the college and
79 university level.

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

82 The Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of
83 all tenured tenure track (TT) faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior/Associate rank and
84 above in the Institute, except the Director of the Institute and those members of the
85 Institute serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the
86 college or university level. For each candidate, the Institute Director will appoint a
87 subcommittee composed of three to five members, with at least one TT and one NTT
88 member, chosen from the Committee of the Whole, to initially review each candidate. The
89 Institute Director shall also appoint a Committee Director (selected from the
90 subcommittee) for each candidate. All final recommendations must be made by the
91 Committee of the Whole. The Committee of the Whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a

92 majority recommendation. The vote will be in the form of signatures on the final
93 recommendation. The letter from the Committee of the Whole must be signed by the
94 Committee Director and all committee members who agree with the recommendation.
95 Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter
96 (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. Members of
97 the committee must not be identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must
98 appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided
99 with his or her copy of the Committee's report(s).

100 NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote
101 on the final recommendation of the Committee of the Whole. In consultation with the
102 Institute Director, the Dean may augment the Committee of the Whole with NTT members
103 from other institutes or departments if the Neuroscience Institute does not have a
104 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three voting members,
105 with at least one being a tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at
106 Senior/Associate level or above.

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

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

- 112 1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and
113 review procedures adopted by the Neuroscience Institute.
- 114 2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate (majority
115 report).
- 116 3. If there are Committee members who do not sign the written majority
117 recommendation, these members should provide signed separate letter(s) (minority
118 report(s)) indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these
119 recommendations.
- 120 4. Deliver the majority report and minority reports if present to the Director of the
121 Institute.

122
123 Place all signatures on a separate page, or on separate pages if there are minority
124 reports, so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy
125 of the committee's report(s) to avoid identification of Committee members to the
126 candidate.

127 128 **C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service**

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

133 **4. LECTURER REVIEWS**

134 **A. General Considerations**

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

146
147 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

148 1. Evaluation of Teaching

149 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
150 of the [College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-](#)
151 [time Faculty](#). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to
152 their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in courses ranging from
153 introductory survey courses to advanced undergraduate lecture and laboratories, study
154 abroad programs, and internship experiences.

155 Candidates for promotion must submit the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled at
156 Georgia State for the review period (see Section V.E below for guidelines on the number of
157 years of review materials to submit for the different review periods). The evidence
158 provided by the candidate will typically include the following:

- 159 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
- 160 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
- 161 3. A list of innovative courses, programs, materials, and/or instructional techniques and
162 practices developed by the candidate.
- 163 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if
164 these include significant revision of the current documents.
- 165 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented
166 for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period, as defined in
167 the college manual. The student evaluation summaries should include other important
168 variables, such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, and the
169 response rate of the evaluations.
- 170 6. Supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or printed materials
171 developed by the candidate.

172
173 Additional Accomplishments (if applicable)

- 174 1. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
175 independent study reports, honors theses, publications in peer reviewed journals and
176 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
- 177 2. Publication of papers on instruction; posters and presentation of papers on teaching
178 before learned societies.

- 179 3. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
180 teaching activities.
- 181 4. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
182 participation in textbook development.
- 183 5. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
184

185 Syllabi will be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading
186 assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course materials will also
187 be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the
188 field. Credit will also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate
189 curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. In general, evaluations are
190 indicators of student perceptions. Evaluation will include the effective development and
191 execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new teaching
192 programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the
193 responsibilities of the faculty member. Student evaluations will be judged in the context of
194 other information, such as context of the range of scores for specific courses and for similar
195 level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the disciplinary
196 area, and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness or for making
197 fine-grained distinctions.
198

199 2. Evaluation of Service

200 For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service
201 for lecturers is normally at the Institute and college level and the quantity is dependent
202 upon specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the Institute.
203 University, college, Institute, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.
204 Institute service obligations that need to be handled effectively are: Participation on
205 Institute committees: Effective participation on the NTT Promotion Review Committee and
206 other committee appointments is expected.
207 Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties. Each lecturer's service rating will
208 be determined with respect to the assigned service responsibilities. Lecturers who are
209 assigned a full teaching load each term may have a different service load than those
210 assigned major Institute and/or college roles. Such additional assigned roles may include
211 service as Undergraduate Director, course lab manual responsibilities, direction of student
212 teams and organizations (e.g., Science Olympiads, Collegiate Neuroscience Society), and
213 course/area web responsibilities.

214 The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of
215 quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their assignments
216 (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have
217 performed all assigned tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) qualify for
218 a rating of, at least, *very good* in service.
219

220 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

221 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
222 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
223 relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. The single
224 descriptor for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and

225 service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in
226 both categories is included in the Appendix.

227

228 1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

229 In accordance with the College manual, Lecturers in their fifth year of service must be
230 considered for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer (to begin in the seventh year of
231 service). In accordance with the College manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on
232 the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and
233 service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and*
234 *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated
235 as, at least, *excellent* in teaching. Table A of the Appendix outlines in detail what is
236 necessary to obtain this. A service evaluation of *very good* is also required for promotion.
237 Table B of the Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the service of
238 NTT faculty.

239 2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer

240 Senior lecturers in their fifth year in rank or higher may be considered for promotion to
241 the rank of principal senior lecturer (to take effect at the beginning of the subsequent fall
242 semester). For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must
243 demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential
244 for continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate
245 must provide a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the Institute,
246 College, University, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be
247 evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for
248 promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding, excellent,*
249 *very good, good, fair, and poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior
250 Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as, at least, *excellent* in teaching and, at least,
251 *excellent* in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix outline in
252 detail what is necessary to obtain this.

253

254 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

258 1. Annual Review of Lecturers

259 Along with TT and other regular NTT faculty, all lecturer track faculty are evaluated
260 on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the faculty
261 member, including her/his updated CV, annual report information covering the prior
262 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with
263 the Institute's Executive Committee, the Institute Director will evaluate the lecturer track
264 faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendices.

265

266 2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

267 The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of
268 teaching and service contributions. Although the third-year review has many similarities to

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

273 As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will
274 prepare a dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate
275 review period and deliver it to the Director according to a schedule provided by the college.
276 An Institute review committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include
277 tenured faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lecturers, will evaluate the required
278 materials and provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in
279 instruction and service to the Institute Director. This committee is elected by the Institute
280 NTT Review Committee of the Whole. The Director will provide an independent
281 assessment, which along with the report of the Review Committee and materials will be
282 forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in the college manual, both the Review Committee
283 and Director will evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors:
284 *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are
285 used to arrive at a rating. Split ratings such as "very good/excellent" are to be avoided.
286 Instead, a phrase such as "very good but approaching excellent" may be appropriate.

287

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

289 All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review
290 every five years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The Senior Lecturer
291 or Principal Senior Lecturer will be notified by the College in advance of the post-
292 promotion review and the materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section
293 V.F of the College manual. These materials are submitted by the Senior Lecturer/Principal
294 Senior Lecturer to the Institute Director according to a schedule provided by the College in
295 advance of the review. The Institute Director will provide this material to a departmental
296 committee. The Committee of the Whole will elect a committee composed of at least three
297 faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least one principal senior lecturer). This committee
298 will provide a written assessment of effectiveness in teaching and service to the Institute
299 Director using the criteria summarized in the Appendices. The assessment statements of
300 the departmental committee will address whether the faculty member is performing at the
301 level necessary for reappointment, whether the faculty member is progressing toward
302 promotion, and they will identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach
303 his/her full potential in terms of contribution to the university. The Institute Director will
304 provide an independent assessment and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office.
305 For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.

306

307 **V. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

308 **A. General Considerations**

309 There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional
310 track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year
311 review with promotion to senior academic professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative
312 review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are
313 contributions in service and teaching. Supplemental consideration will be given to
314 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's

315 knowledge and departmental responsibilities. This document defines ratings that are used
316 in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are
317 defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered
318 for promotion to Senior Academic Professional.

319

320 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

321 **1. Evaluation of Service**

322 Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in
323 Section VI of the college manual which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements.
324 Service roles are assigned by the Institute depending on Institute needs and mission.
325 Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties. Service
326 roles normally assigned by the institute (individual assignments may include all or some of
327 these roles) include:

328 Facility/Service Management

329 Supervisory/Mentoring Activities

330 Instructional Service (laboratory coordination is one example)

331 Academic Advisement and Curriculum

332 Contributions to the Department, College or University

333 Professional Service

334 Community and Public Service

335 Published Materials

336 Additional Service

337

338 The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of
339 quality. To receive an *excellent* rating all assigned tasks must be performed
340 thoroughly and in a timely manner. The candidate must also play a leadership
341 role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, cost effectiveness and planning will also be
342 part of the evaluation.

343

344 Reviewers should also evaluate the candidate using the following criteria:

- 345 1. Job Knowledge: Knowledge, skills and abilities as they relate to performing job
346 requirements.
- 347 2. Productivity: The amount of work successfully produced while maintaining standards
348 and meeting deadlines.
- 349 3. Accuracy and Quality: The extent to which he/she performs major job duties or
350 responsibilities correctly and completely; professionalism and thoroughness of work
351 produced.
- 352 4. Adaptability: Ability to master new techniques or duties and understand explanations
353 as required for the position. Demonstrates flexibility in meeting the changing demands
354 of the work environment.
- 355 5. Organizational Skills: Ability to effectively and efficiently plan, arrange, and complete
356 work priorities; makes efficient use of available resources to optimize productivity.
- 357 6. Communication Skills: Ability to express ideas effectively through verbal and written
358 communication. Ability to communicate in a clear concise manner. Ability to listen and
359 ask appropriate questions.

- 360 7. Teamwork: Develops and maintains effective relationships with co-workers,
361 supervisor, faculty, staff, students and others in the handling of job duties.
362 8. Supervisory Ability: Ability to effectively delegate and monitor work and follow up with
363 others; effectively coach, communicate with, reward and discipline.
364 9. Financial: Demonstrates understanding and uses appropriate financial and budget
365 controls.
366 10. Safety: Ensures the highest safety standards at all times. Adheres to safety
367 requirements and practices, and communicates hazards to other employees in the
368 workplace
369 11. Maintaining and overseeing equipment: Takes a vigorous role in making sure that
370 Institute equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and
371 repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use of
372 equipment.
373

374 2. Evaluation of Teaching

375 For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching,
376 instructional assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental
377 needs. The effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department's
378 mission and the specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary
379 on certain occasions to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly
380 match their skills/background. The candidate will be shown special consideration under
381 these conditions. As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will
382 use the criteria of the [College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Assessment of Teaching](#)
383 [Effectiveness for Full-time Faculty](#). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of
384 academic professionals as it relates to their assigned role in the department.
385

386 Candidates for promotion must submit the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled at
387 Georgia State for the review period. The evidence provided by the candidate will typically
388 include the following:

- 389 1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
390 2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
391 3. A list of innovative courses, programs, materials, and/or instructional techniques and
392 practices developed by the candidate.
393 4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if
394 these include significant revision of the current documents.
395 5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented
396 for each course taught that has been evaluated during the review period, as defined in
397 the college manual. The student evaluation summaries should include other important
398 variables, including class size, whether the course is required or an elective, and the
399 response rate of the evaluations.
400 6. Supplementary materials in the form of online resources, video or printed materials
401 developed by the candidate.
402

403 Additional Accomplishments (if applicable)

- 404 1. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and
405 independent study reports, honors theses, publications in peer reviewed journals and

- 406 presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
407 2. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned
408 societies.
409 3. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative
410 teaching activities.
411 4. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs;
412 participation in textbook development.
413 5. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
414

415 Syllabi will be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines, reading
416 assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description. Course materials will also
417 be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the
418 field. Credit will also be given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate
419 curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Evaluation will include the
420 effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the
421 development of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and
422 practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. In general,
423 evaluations are indicators of student perceptions. Student evaluations will be judged in the
424 context of other information, such as context of the range of scores for specific courses and
425 for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) both within the department and within the
426 disciplinary area, and should not be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness or
427 for making fine-grained distinctions.
428

429 **C. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Academic Professional**

430 As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
431 submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in service and instruction
432 relative to the descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The single
433 descriptor for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and
434 service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in
435 both categories is included in the Appendix.
436

437 **Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional**

438 In accordance with the College manual, academic professionals in their fifth-year of
439 service may be considered for promotion to the rank of senior academic professional (to
440 begin in the sixth year of service). In accordance with the College manual, candidates will
441 be evaluated based on the evidence submitted as having met or nor met the standards for
442 promotion in service and teaching (if applicable) relative to the evaluative terms
443 *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. For promotion to the rank of senior
444 academic professional, the candidate must provide a sustained level of service to the
445 department, college and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community
446 that is evaluated as *excellent*. If the candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate
447 must demonstrate *excellent* teaching, which meets the university standard for promotion to
448 senior academic professional. Tables A and B of the Appendix outline in detail what is
449 necessary to obtain *excellent* ratings.

450 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

454

455 1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals

456 Along with TT and other regular NTT faculty, all Academic Professionals are
457 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the
458 faculty member, including updated CV, annual report information covering the prior
459 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with
460 the Institute’s Executive Committee, the Institute Director will evaluate the Academic
461 Professional’s teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

462

463 2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals

464 The third-year review provides a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of
465 teaching and service contributions. Although the third-year review has many similarities to
466 the fifth-year (promotion) review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to
467 encourage an assessment and dialogue of the academic professional’s accomplishments,
468 strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In addition, it will give advice on improving
469 performance and how to address possible deficiencies before the fifth-year review. As
470 discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a dossier
471 containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and
472 deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. An Institute review
473 committee composed of at least three faculty, which must include tenured faculty and NTT
474 faculty at senior rank or above, will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed
475 written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the Institute
476 Director. This committee is elected by the Institute NTT Review Committee of the Whole.
477 The Institute Director will provide an independent assessment which along with the
478 committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office. As stated in the
479 college manual, both the Review Committee and Institute Director will evaluate the
480 candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very*
481 *good, good, fair, and poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and
482 split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as “very
483 good but approaching excellent” may be appropriate.

484

485 3. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals

486 All Senior Academic Professionals must undergo a comprehensive review every 5
487 years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The purpose of the Post-
488 Promotion Review for Senior Academic Professionals is to assess the quality and
489 effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities
490 that will enable the candidate to reach their full potential. The Senior Academic
491 Professional will be notified by the College in advance of the Post-Promotion Review and
492 the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the
493 college manual. This material is submitted by the Academic Professional to the Institute
494 Director according to a schedule provided by the college. The Committee of the Whole will
495 elect a committee composed of at least three faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least

496 one NTT faculty member of rank equal or higher to that of the Senior Academic
497 Professional). This committee will provide a written assessment of effectiveness in
498 teaching and service to the Institute Director using the criteria summarized in the
499 Appendix. The assessment statements of the departmental committee will address whether
500 the faculty member is performing at the level necessary for reappointment, whether the
501 faculty member is progressing toward promotion, and they will identify opportunities that
502 will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential in terms of contribution to the
503 university. The Institute Director will provide an independent assessment and both
504 evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F
505 of the college manual.

506

507 **VI. RESEARCH FACULTY (R-NTT)**

508 **A. Purpose**

509 The purpose of Research Faculty (R-NTT) appointments, based on available external
510 funding, is to increase the research, scholarly, and creative efforts of the Institute and
511 University. Research faculty will work in close collaboration with other faculty and/or will
512 carry out independent research in neuroscience.

513

514 **B. Qualifications**

515 Research Faculty hold a terminal degree in neuroscience or a related discipline.
516 Qualifications for the three research faculty ranks are roughly equivalent to those in TT
517 ranks, with the exception that the primary focus is on research credentials.

518

519 **C. Appointment procedures**

520 Per the University R-NTT Policy, a majority vote of the Institute's TT faculty is needed to
521 support an appointment to the Research Faculty. These appointments are renewable on an
522 annual basis upon satisfactory review, available external funding, and a continuing need
523 for, and interest in, the research work of the individual as judged by the Institute. Renewal
524 is also contingent upon the Institute being able to provide the appropriate resources to
525 support the research (e.g., the physical space).

526

527 **D. Responsibilities, privileges, and expectations**

528 The primary responsibility of Research Faculty is to conduct research. As part of their
529 workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in teaching and/or service.
530 Research Faculty salaries are primarily from research grants or other sources of external
531 funds (non-general state funds).

532

533 The Neuroscience Institute Director should consult with the Institute Executive Committee
534 in determining specific expectations (research, teaching, and/or service) of each Research
535 Faculty member, which should then be outlined by the Institute Director in the
536 memorandum of understanding (MOU)/hiring memo.

537

538 The MOU should also outline why this position is important to the Institute and University.
539 Whether or not Research Faculty may teach graduate courses, serve on graduate student
540 committees, and/or direct theses and/or dissertations must follow the University Graduate
541 Faculty Policy guidelines.

542 If bridge funding is provided by the Institute, the University limits such support to a
543 maximum of 2 months of support for each year of continuous appointment, with a
544 maximum of 12 months total bridge support. Vacation earned while on a funded grant must
545 be taken during the period of active funding and may not be carried forward or taken while
546 on bridge funding.

547

548 Per the University R-NTT Policy, Research Faculty are not eligible for tenure, internal
549 faculty grants, professional development, or professional leave funding.

550

551 **E. Annual Review**

552 The Institute Director will evaluate Research Faculty annually in consultation with the
553 Executive Committee to determine whether they meet the expectations outlined in the
554 MOU and to provide constructive feedback to the faculty member concerning their
555 performance and progress. Any changes in expectations and responsibilities will be
556 outlined in the annual letter. The Institute Associate Director will conduct the evaluation in
557 those instances when the Institute Director has a perceived conflict of interest (e.g., when
558 the Research Faculty member works in the Director's laboratory or is a co-investigator on a
559 research grant with the Director). The review should include an assessment of whether
560 external funding will continue for the next year.

561

562 **F. Promotion**

563 The evaluation of Research Faculty for promotion should focus on areas specified by the
564 BoR policy, including significant growth and outstanding research and professional
565 development, and appropriate levels of instruction and service given their research
566 workload. The level of expectation increases with the rank. The process used for promotion
567 of Research Faculty will be the same one used for TT faculty. The review shall be conducted
568 with the same rigor and criteria used to evaluate the promotion of TT faculty with the
569 parallel title, taking into consideration that Research Faculty may have access to fewer
570 resources (e.g., start-up funds, office and laboratory space, personnel) than TT faculty with
571 the parallel title.

APPENDIX

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

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	<p>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (c):</p> <p>(a) evidence of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>(b) consistent updating and revision of courses</p> <p>(c) instructional creativity, as evidenced by development of new courses, programs, use of new teaching techniques and practices and/or awards for instructional innovation</p> <p>(d) significant involvement in professional development aimed at increasing teaching efficacy</p> <p>(e) direct several independent study courses, honors theses, practica, and/or internships</p> <p>(f) publications in instructional journals</p> <p>(g) key personnel in educationally focused grants/proposals</p>

Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at Institute level (broad impact)	<p>4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (c)</p> <p>(a) evidence of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>(b) consistent updating and revision of courses</p> <p>(c) instructional creativity, as evidenced by development of new courses, programs, use of new teaching techniques and practices and/or awards for instructional innovation</p> <p>(d) involvement in professional development aimed at increasing teaching efficacy</p> <p>(e) direct independent study courses, honors theses, practica, and/or internships</p> <p>(f) publications in instructional journals</p> <p>(g) significant involvement in educationally focused grants/proposals</p>
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	<p>(a) evidence of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>(b) updating and revision of courses</p> <p>(c) instructional creativity, as evidenced by development of new courses, programs, use of new teaching techniques and practices and/or awards for instructional innovation</p>
Good	Meets obligations	<p>(a) evidence of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>(b) updating and revision of courses</p>
Fair	Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness	<p>1 item: (a) or (b)</p> <p>(a) evidence of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>(b) updating and revision of courses</p>

Poor	Substandard, ineffective teacher	0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints
------	-------------------------------------	---

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

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

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