

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

Policy Title:	Department of Physics and Astronomy Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Departmental Approval:	September 22, 2016
College Approval:	October 10, 2016
Effective:	October 10, 2016

## I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty make important contributions in teaching and service areas to help achieve departmental goals and are a vital component of the Department of Physics and Astronomy (hereafter, Department) at Georgia State University. The Department has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and Georgia State University guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual), and (2) the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), along with the departmental guidelines. In the event of a conflict between the departmental and college/university documents, the college/university documents take precedence.

The Department employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer and academic professional tracks. The ranks of lecturer (listed from most junior to most senior) are Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The academic professional ranks employed at GSU are Academic Professional and Senior Academic Professional.

For Lecturer positions, the Department of Physics and Astronomy will recommend for promotion to Senior Lecturer only those candidates who are evaluated as at least *excellent* in teaching. A service evaluation of at least *very good* is also required for promotion. For promotion of a Senior Lecturer to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, evaluations of at least *excellent* in both teaching and service are required.

For Academic Professional positions, the Department will recommend for promotion to Senior Academic Professional only those candidates who present evidence of a sustained evaluation of at least *excellent* in service. For candidates whose workload includes teaching, an evaluation of at least *excellent* in teaching is also required for promotion.

## II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER, PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL

### A. Process Overview

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

1. After consultation with the department chair, if the eligible candidate intends to pursue the promotion track, then the following review process begins. As described in the College Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty, the Dean's office notifies the candidate about their eligibility for promotion and forwards a copy to the department chair. The candidate will discuss his/her qualification with the chair and then subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the department chair according to the schedule provided by the college.
2. The department chair forwards the candidate's review materials to a subcommittee of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the review. The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.

3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation with signatures to the department chair, including any minority report(s). Endorsements of the specific committee members should not be revealed to the candidate. Therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's report(s).
4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the departmental committee review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean's Office, and provides copies of these documents to the candidate. The candidate has the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair reports, addressed to the Dean's Office, within three business days after receiving the documents from the chair. The Dean's Office will then provide the department chair with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the department committee and chair's report.

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

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

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank or above (Senior Lecturer, Principle Senior Lecturer, and Senior Academic Professional) in the department, except the chair of the department and those members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole. The department chair shall also appoint a committee chair selected from the subcommittee. The subcommittee has the responsibility to thoroughly analyze the candidate's dossier, coordinate deliberation with the committee members, and provide initial evaluation of the dossier. Final recommendation regarding promotion must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must discuss the candidate's eligibility for promotion, and arrive at a majority recommendation. All actions of the committee of the whole must be approved by majority vote.

Duties of the departmental committee of the whole include the following:

1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion review procedures adopted by the Department.
  2. Approve, by majority vote, an overall recommendation for each candidate.
  3. Deliver the written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of the whole to the departmental chair.
  4. Submit signed minority reports (if any) of committee members who disagree with the written majority recommendation to the departmental chair. This report should include recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.
- The vote for the recommendation will be in the form of signatures on the final recommendation report. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate's current

rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean may augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments if the Department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a tenured TT and at least one being an NTT faculty member at Senior level or above.

The committee of the whole must review all credentials and make a recommendation to the chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the Department in accord with the college and university guidelines.

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

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

## **III. LECTURER-TRACK FACULTY REVIEWS**

### **A. General Considerations**

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

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

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

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging learning in courses at all undergraduate levels, ranging from introductory survey courses to advanced undergraduate lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs, and if applicable, graduate courses, directed readings and internship experiences.

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

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

#### **Additional Accomplishments** (if applicable)

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

## **2. Evaluation of Service**

For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for lecturers is normally at the departmental and college level and the quantity depends on specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the department. University, college, department, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.

Departmental service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:

- (a) Service roles assigned by the department
- (b) Participation on departmental committees. Effective participation and active role on committee appointments is expected.
- (c) Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.
- (d) Assistance to colleagues
- (e) Development of teaching and service programs
- (f) Enhancements in undergraduate education
- (g) Other contributions to the department, college and/or university

The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them when there was no schedule conflict, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.)

and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively, qualify at least for a rating of *very good* in service.

Each lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to departmental expectations and the assigned service responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a different service load than those assigned major departmental and/or college roles. Such additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, course lab manual responsibilities, direction of student teams (e.g., Science Olympiads), and course/area web responsibilities. Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and timely manner to achieve the rating of *very good* or higher.

### C. Criteria for Promotion

As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The descriptors for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and service for each rank are included below. The description of factors/items required for each descriptor is included in the Appendix.

#### 1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* or better in teaching, and as *very good* or better in service. Table A of the Appendix outlines in detail what factors/items are required to obtain this. Table B of the Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

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

For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued growth. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college, university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as *excellent* or better in teaching and in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary to obtain this.

## **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

### **1. Annual Review**

Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the faculty member, including updated CV, annual report information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate material. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the lecturer track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

### **2. Third-Year Review**

As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental review committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include tenured faculty and senior lecturers or principal senior lectures, will evaluate the required material and provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental review committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating. Split ratings such as "very good/excellent" are to be avoided.

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

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

All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the post-promotion review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or Principal Senior Lecturer (PSL) will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the department chair according to a schedule provided by the college in advance of the review. The departmental committee of the whole elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of PSL (with representation from each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). This

committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean's Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.

## **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL-TRACK FACULTY REVIEWS**

### **A. General Considerations**

There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with consideration to promotion to Senior Academic Professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in service and teaching (if the faculty member's workload includes teaching). Additional considerations will be given to contributions in the areas of professional development bearing on the candidate's knowledge and departmental responsibilities, research activities, implementation of new pedagogy that leads to students' success and development of supplemental resources that promotes students' learning. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to Senior Academic Professional.

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

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

Service is at least 50% of the academic professional's job functions as discussed in Section VI of the college manual, which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements. The department assigns service roles, which depend on departmental needs and mission. Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties. Service roles normally assigned by the department can vary and typically include some or all of the following:

- Facility Management
- Laboratory staff supervision
- Other Instructional Service (e.g., other curricular development, presenting on teaching methodology)
- Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- Academic Advisement (if applicable)
- Contributions to the Department, College or University
- Professional Service
- Community and Public Service
- Published Materials and data analysis reporting
- Additional Service

The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To receive an *excellent* or better rating in service, all assigned tasks must be performed



effectively and diligently and in a thorough and timely manner. The candidate must also play a leadership role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, security, cost effectiveness, and planning will also be factored into the evaluation. Improvements of the facility to promote better learning environment may add value to the candidate's service evaluation.

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

For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching, instructional assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department's mission and the specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary on certain occasions to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly match their skills/background. The candidate will be shown special consideration under these conditions.

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of academic professionals as it relates to their assigned role in the department.

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

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

## **Additional Accomplishments (if applicable)**

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

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

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

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

In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in service and teaching (if the candidate's workload includes teaching) relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must be rated as *excellent* or better in service. Table B of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. If the candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must also be rated as *excellent* or better in teaching using the criteria listed in Table A of the Appendix.

## **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

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

Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the faculty member, including updated CV, annual report information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate material of the candidate. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and teaching (if applicable) using the criteria described in the Appendix.

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

As discussed in detail in Section VI.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a dossier containing information on service and teaching (if applicable) for the appropriate review period and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. Following the college guidelines, a departmental review committee shall be formed consisting of at least three faculty, which will include tenured faculty and senior academic professionals/lecturers (with representation from each when the department has one or more available senior academic professionals/lecturers within its ranks). The review committee will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written assessment with ranking that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in service and teaching (if applicable) to the departmental chair. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee of the whole. The chair will provide an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean's Office. As

stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Tables A and B in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided.

Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion) review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and dialogue of the academic professional’s accomplishments. The third-year review should point out strengths and weaknesses in teaching and service, address possible deficiencies and suggest actions that could improve performance before the fifth-year review.

### **3. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals**

All Senior Academic Professionals must undergo a comprehensive review every five years after their last promotion or post-promotion review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion Review for Senior Academic Professionals is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term service and teaching (if applicable) and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Academic Professional will be notified by the college in advance of the post-promotion review and the materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section VI.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the Senior Academic Professional to the department chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental committee of the whole elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of Senior Academic Professional (with representation from each when the department has an available Senior Academic Professional within its ranks). This committee evaluates the Senior Academic Professional in the categories of service and teaching (if applicable) using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section VI.F of the college manual.

## APPENDIX

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

Teaching Rating	Definition	Evaluation Factors
Outstanding	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction	<b>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f):</b> (a) update/revise courses (b) student perceptions consistent with departmental expectations <sup>1</sup> (c) direct independent study or research projects, (d) publications, as related to instruction (e) instructional creativity, as evidenced by development of new courses or awards for instructional innovation (f) learning outcomes, as evidenced by appropriate grade distribution and drop rates (g) involvement with educationally focused grants, proposals, or research
Excellent	Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)	<b>Normally<sup>2</sup> 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)</b>
Very Good	Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)	<b>3 of 7 items: (a), (b), and (f)</b>
Good	Meets obligations	<b>2 of 7 items, including (b)</b>

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

<sup>1</sup>Compared to the departmental four-year average for the area and course level; this information will be provided by the department on an annual basis.

<sup>2</sup>For academic professionals assigned limited teaching responsibilities (< 25% of job functions), evaluation factor (f) is not required.

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

<b>Service<sup>1</sup> Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Evaluation Factors</b>
Outstanding	Major effective leadership roles	Major effective role in department. Major effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization
Excellent	Effective departmental leadership role(s)	Effective role in department. Effective role at college or university level or in a professional organization may also be considered
Very Good	Helpful citizenship. Some leadership role	Effective role in the department; meets departmental obligations effectively and is helpful; provides departmental leadership.
Good	Acceptable citizenship	Meets minimum departmental obligations/requests
Fair	Needs improvement	Does not meet departmental obligations in a timely manner
Poor	Needs major improvement; negative leader	Hinders department operations

<sup>1</sup>Service to the department and college is expected to be minimal in the lecturer's first three years. For academic professionals, service plays a more significant role.