Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design

College of the Arts

Georgia State University

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	2
School Approval:	10/04/2017
College Approval:	10/06/2017
Effective:	10/06/2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design are vital components of our faculty. The policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks are outlined in this document (School guidelines), the College of the Arts Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual). Whereas the university and college NTT manuals provide general statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document identifies the concrete forms these achievements should take. In particular, this document articulates the School's criteria for the various rankings that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of teaching and service. Candidates should consult the college and university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and time-in-rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

The Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer and academic Professional tracks. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer, while the ranks in use within the academic professional track include Academic Professional and Senior Academic Professional. The general duties for lecturer and academic professional track faculty are described in the college manual.

II. SCHOOL OF ART & DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER, PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the School-level NTT faculty promotion review process are as follows:

1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean's Office, the candidate standing for promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the School Director.

2. The School Director forwards the candidate's materials to the School review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).

3. The School committee submits its recommendation, including any minority reports, to the School Director. The committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages. The School Director will provide a copy of the School committee's report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the School Director within three business days.

4. The School Director submits their independent recommendation and the

40   recommendation of the School committee, including any minority reports and any
41   responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The School Director will provide
42   a copy of their own report to the candidate with a notification that the candidate
43   has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days. The
44   Dean's Office will provide to the School Director a copy of any response from the
45   candidate to the School Director's report.

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

48 **B. Composition of School of Art & Design Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review**
49 **Committee**

50 The School of Art & Design Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of
51 all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the School (Senior
52 Lecturer, Senior Academic Professional, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the Director of
53 the School and any members of the School serving in a position that will review the
54 candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels. According to the
55 college manual, units may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially
56 review and evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be
57 made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss
58 and vote on its final recommendation. Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's
59 current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole.
60 In consultation with the School Director, the Dean will augment the School promotion
61 review committee with NTT members from other units when the School does not have a
62 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with
63 at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.
64

65 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

66 **A. General Considerations**

67 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty in the lecturer track: 1) annual
68 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
69 promotion to Senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to Principal Senior
70 Lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
71 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
72 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
73 contributions in the area of research and creative activity bearing on the candidate's
74 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
75 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document
76 are defined in the context of School expectations specific to candidates being
77 considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer.

78 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

79 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**
80 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
81 of the college's policy. Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of Lecturers as it
82 relates to their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes
83 fulfilling general education requirements. However, if a Lecturer has primarily been
84 assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment
85 will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the School of Art & Design.

86 As a general rule, evaluators will consider in their assessments of teaching effectiveness
87 the following criteria:

88   **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be
89   evaluated through review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-
90   class exercises, readings, and other elements integrated into the learning
91   environment created by the candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be
92   reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. In courses that involve
93   written exams, exam questions should require students to engage material
94   that is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. In courses
95   that involve writing assignments, assignments should develop the students'
96   ability to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent
97   arguments that answer meaningful questions. Course materials should also
98   be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of
99   knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as
100   customized texts, handouts, software, and other course elements that reflect
101   the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement and success. In
102   particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that
103   cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses
104   that connect students with other university programs and resources and that
105   take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta
106   will also be viewed as evidence of successful teaching. The School also
107   encourages faculty to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to
108   allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to provide those
109   students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the semester
110   unfolds. The School recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods.
111   Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations,
112   however, encourage student interest in the material and design assessments
113   that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

114   **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching**
115   **resources that meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will
116   consider the effective development and execution of new courses, significant
117   involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of
118   new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the
119   responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with a travel

120	component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study
121	abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Course initiatives that
122	positively impact individual student achievement, such as the presentation of
123	undergraduate and/or graduate research including exhibitions or
124	performances of artistic work, are positive indicators of meeting promotion
125	and standards.
126	**c. Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will
127	include overall student evaluation scores, which are useful indicators of
128	student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the School will
129	not rely upon exclusively when determining minimum qualifications for
130	ratings, will be considered in the context of the normal range of scores for
131	specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the
132	School. The review will also consider other important variables such as
133	whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the
134	evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In addition to
135	average scores, the School will also be attentive to mean and median scores
136	and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative evidence
137	offered by the students' written comments on the student evaluation forms
138	will receive serious attention from the School as a meaningful supplement to
139	the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these
140	contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn
141	consistently strong evaluations and high scores.

Line-numbered text:

120 component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study
121 abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Course initiatives that
122 positively impact individual student achievement, such as the presentation of
123 undergraduate and/or graduate research including exhibitions or
124 performances of artistic work, are positive indicators of meeting promotion
125 and standards.

126   **c. Student evaluations:** The review of a candidate's materials will
127 include overall student evaluation scores, which are useful indicators of
128 student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the School will
129 not rely upon exclusively when determining minimum qualifications for
130 ratings, will be considered in the context of the normal range of scores for
131 specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the
132 School. The review will also consider other important variables such as
133 whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the
134 evaluations, and number of students enrolled in the course. In addition to
135 average scores, the School will also be attentive to mean and median scores
136 and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative evidence
137 offered by the students' written comments on the student evaluation forms
138 will receive serious attention from the School as a meaningful supplement to
139 the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these
140 contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn
141 consistently strong evaluations and high scores.

142   **d. Direction of students:** The School will assess the extent and
143 quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects and academic
144 activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses, student
145 research or creative work presented at GSURC, as well as individual student
146 engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or
147 communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering
148 additional tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for
149 underperforming and time spent offering additional guidance to students
150 who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their
151 coursework. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of
152 recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be
153 viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of teaching
154 effectiveness.

155   **e. Development of new skills:** The School encourages faculty to
156 continue to develop skills and to master new software, languages, and
157 technology in order to improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or
158 exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness
159 to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal
160 training to gain new certifications and competencies may present such
161 achievements to the School as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast
162 of best practices in pedagogy. The School recognizes that new skills need not

163		involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more interactive
164		classroom exercises geared toward fostering things such as critical
165		conversation, writing, and artistic responses might contribute to a faculty
166		member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

2. Evaluation of Service

As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service; contributions to the School, college, or university; professional service; and community and public service. Service for Lecturers varies depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the School, but it is generally at the School or college level. Contributions to service in the School of Art & Design typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles, such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments; instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, or supervising or mentoring faculty; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts or grant applications; contributions to the School, college, and university, such as student advisement and mentoring, memberships on School/college/university committees, and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards; community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

The review of candidates' records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks that the School Director might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should document any arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. The degree to which assigned service responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be part of the consideration of their service record.

3. Additional Considerations

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

1. **Research and Creative Activity Contributions:**

It is expected that Lecturers will manifest in their classes a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. Though not required for promotion, one way of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of scholarly or creative activities.

Since a Lecturer's research and creative activity is evaluated as a subordinate element of the overall record in instruction, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier enhances their instructional effectiveness. The specific forms of research and creative activity that a Lecturer may produce are identical to those described in the School promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure track faculty, depending on the discipline: publications, invited exhibitions,

204   artistic performances, commissions, lectures, awards and grants, and so forth.
205   Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction
206   section of the dossier rather than under a Research and Creative Activity section.

207   2. **Role within the School of Art & Design:**

208   Since needs of the School of Art & Design often change, the role of the Lecturer also
209   may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or School may need
210   to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the
211   Lecturer within the context of the mission of the School and the ability of the Lecturer to
212   fulfill effectively changing needs of the School.

213   **C. Criteria for Promotion**

214   As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
215   submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
216   relative to the evaluative terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*.
217   The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category for each
218   rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be
219   referenced in evaluations is included as an appendix to this document.

220   **1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**
221   For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of
222   competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least *excellent*,
223   according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of
224   assigned service to the School, college, university, and/or service to the professional and
225   practice community that is evaluated as at least *very good*, which meets the university
226   standard for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

227   **a. Teaching**

228   To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with a
229   rating of *excellent*, the candidate demonstrates a strong ability to identify and utilize
230   assignments and other material appropriate to the course level, as well as master
231   current concepts and practices in keeping with the field. Candidates should structure
232   their courses in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their
233   students, such that their efforts may result in student recruitment to their discipline.
234   The candidate's ability as a master educator may be indicated by publications of their
235   research and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference
236   presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the
237   Lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching. As evidence of their activities related to
238   direction of students, the candidate may demonstrate effectiveness through such
239   complementary actions as student participation in exhibition or scholarly activities,
240   student participation in field-related academic or community activities, and student
241   acceptance to graduate programs and/or professional careers in the field.

242   **b. Service**
243   To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with a

244 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills their
245 assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the
246 requisite advisement sessions, they actively participate, using these meetings as
247 opportunities to most effectively govern the School and to achieve positive results for
248 undergraduate and graduate students.

249 **2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer**
250 For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate
251 a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at
252 least *excellent*, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must
253 provide a level of assigned service to the School, college, university, and/or service to
254 the professional and practice community that is evaluated as at least *very good*, which
255 meets the university standard for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer. Successful
256 candidates for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer will demonstrate continued
257 growth in the time period since the last promotion.

258   **a. Teaching**

259 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer with a
260 rating of *excellent*, the candidate must meet the standard for excellence as defined for
261 promotion to Senior Lecturer though they need not have risen to the level required for a
262 rating of *outstanding*. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate continued growth in
263 the time period since the last promotion. Signs of "continued growth" might include:
264 continuing professional development (for example, participation in workshops, training
265 sessions, courses, round tables, and conferences); continuing efforts to improve course
266 content and delivery; growth in reputation (for example, from regional/national to
267 national/international); new awards and distinctions; and new publications of research
268 and scholarship, creative activities, performances, exhibitions, conference
269 presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the
270 Lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching.

271   **b. Service**
272 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
273 Principal Senior Lecturer with a rating of *very good* if the faculty member has been
274 diligent and highly effective in carrying out assigned responsibilities, and contributing
275 significantly to the mission of the School over a sustained period. The faculty member
276 normally exhibits a track record of providing guidance to School advising efforts, or
277 graduate teaching assistants, and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition to
278 continued growth in the areas of service described above, the faculty member's growth
279 in service should also take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as
280 an area coordinator or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a
281 campus leader; significant service to the profession or community.

282 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

283 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
284 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time

285 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
286 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
287 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

288 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**
289 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are
290 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by
291 the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report covering the prior
292 calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation
293 with the School Executive Committee, the School Director will evaluate the lecturer
294 track faculty member's service and teaching and service using the criteria described in
295 the Appendix.

296 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**
297 The third-year review for Lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's
298 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to Senior Lecturer. A School
299 subcommittee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured
300 faculty and Principal Senior Lecturers or Senior Lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of
301 the Lecturer's record. The School Director will provide an independent assessment
302 before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the
303 record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale used for
304 promotion reviews. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of
305 the fifth-year review; it is meant to review the Lecturer's achievements to date and
306 provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the
307 fifth-year review.

308 **3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers**
309 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that Senior
310 Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy
311 and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's
312 teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria
313 listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in
314 the college manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are
315 either tenured or at the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer (with representation from each
316 when the School has an available Principal Senior Lecturer within its ranks). The School
317 Director will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations
318 to the Dean's Office for response.

319 **IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS**

320 **A. General Considerations**

321 There are four types of structured reviews for faculty in the academic professional track:
322 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review
323 with promotion to Senior Academic Professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative
324 review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary consideration is
325 service contributions, while teaching contributions will be considered if the candidate's

326 workload includes teaching. Supplemental consideration is given to contributions in the
327 area of research and creative activity as they bear on the candidate's knowledge as it
328 relates to the faculty member's service, teaching (if applicable), and overall
329 performance. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed
330 above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of
331 School expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to Senior
332 Academic Professional.

333 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

334 **1. Evaluation of Service**

335 According to Board of Regents requirements, the academic professional track faculty
336 "may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities
337 total 50% or more of the total assignment" (BOR Policy Manual 803.10). The Welch
338 School of Art & Design understands instruction to include the teaching of credit courses
339 over the course of a semester, supervision of interns enrolled in internship courses, and
340 collateral instructional activities including, but not limited to, mentoring students in
341 activities related to professional practices involved in extended signature experiences.
342 As teaching and research must account for less than half of the Academic Professional's
343 duties, reviews will focus primarily on service contributions as well as non-research
344 professional activities appropriate to each individual's field(s) of expertise/competency.
345 Teaching will also be considered as part of the review, for Academic Professionals
346 engaged in duties that require teaching/training/instruction. Research activities, such as
347 publications of scholarship, creative activities, exhibitions, etc., are not required beyond
348 what constitutes "normal" and/or "best" practices for each area of expertise. The Welch
349 School of Art & Design reserves the right to consider any activities above and beyond
350 those required by professional standards and best practices, particularly as they bear on
351 the Academic Professional's overall performance.

352 Recognizing that each academic professional position is unique, the review committee
353 will base its assessment of the candidate's quality of service on the specific duties,
354 responsibilities and contributions of the Academic Professional. The basis for judgment
355 will be the professional standards and best practices of each area of
356 expertise/competency as well as the university-approved job description for each
357 position.

358   **a. Administrative Duties**

359 The Welch School of Art & Design recognizes that the administrative duties of our
360 Academic Professionals may take many forms depending on the necessities of each
361 position. With that stipulated, however, we expect that Academic Professionals in the
362 School will perform the following administrative duties:

363   1. serve on and contribute to departmental and university committees (both
364   standing and *ad hoc* as necessary)

365   2.   participate in local, regional, and national organizations appropriate to their
366   field(s) of expertise/competency

367   3.   manage assigned areas or functions, budgets, and equipment as required by the
368   needs of the position and in accordance with the University approved job
369   description

370   4.   perform any and all service requirements associated with individual job
371   functions (see: IV.B.1.b. 1 – 18).

372   To demonstrate the quality of one's **administrative duties,** a candidate for promotion
373   should include a list of administrative roles such as committee service, participation in
374   professional organizations, and oversight roles associated with their position. Reports or
375   other documentation prepared by the candidate are acceptable documentation.

376   **b. Job Functions**

377   The Welch School of Art & Design recognizes that the job functions of our Academic
378   Professionals take many forms. We wish to make clear that the projects and duties of
379   each Academic Professional may manifest themselves differently from year to year and
380   that quality is our highest priority. The list of duties below may relate to one major
381   project, which due to its complexity takes a greater length of time to bring to fruition, or
382   to several smaller projects, which may be developed over a shorter period of time. The
383   quality of the project(s) and the impact of each on students, faculty and the School as a
384   whole carry the greatest weight in our considerations.

385   To demonstrate the quality of one's **job functions**, a candidate for promotion should
386   include a list of programmatic duties and contributions to the overall development of
387   the School and University. Candidates should collect and provide evidence of one's
388   diligence and effectiveness in performing the essential functions and responsibilities of
389   their position. Supporting materials should include documentation of the performance
390   of the duties related to the particular post. The materials should demonstrate a level of
391   quality commensurate with professional standards and best practices for the
392   candidate's field(s) of expertise/competency. The materials should also reflect
393   conformity with the university-approved job description for the position under review.

394   **Depending on the candidates' essential duties and job functions, they should provide**
395   **evidence of the following where appropriate:**

396   1. assistance to colleagues and graduate students, such as participation in teaching
397   seminars, work as a mentor, presentation of faculty and graduate student training
398   sessions, guest lecturing, and advising;

399   2. planning or participating in workshops connected to duties as Academic Professional;

400   3. service to the School, College, University or community related to their duties;

401   4. managing program development to foster intellectual development and excellence
402   within the School of Art & Design and across campus;

403   5. supervisory activities, including funding, training, and/or managing interns, work-

404   study students, graduate assistants, and other staff related to program;

405   6. budget management, including annual budget planning, monthly budget reports,
406   and/or distribution of resources to faculty, graduate students, and/or staff;

407   7. facilities management, including managing physical or digital spaces for the use of
408   faculty and students;

409   8. planning, implementing or participating in conferences and/or curriculum related
410   programming and events connected to duties as Academic Professional;

411   9. website development and development of online tools to improve program efficiency
412   and expand program outreach;

413   10. development of programmatic materials, including brochures, handbooks, handouts,
414   and other educational and promotional materials;

415   11. assessment to gauge the effectiveness of school, departmental, college, or university
416   programs;

417   12. serving on school, departmental, college, or university committees;

418   13. collaborating with other school, college, university and departmental entities to
419   foster intellectual development across campus;

420   14. establishing local, regional, and/or national recognition by presenting at conferences
421   or publishing about program initiatives as part of professional standards and/or best
422   practices for the Academic Professional's field(s) of expertise/competency;

423   15. maintenance of current and relevant knowledge in field of expertise related to the
424   Academic Professional's GSU program;

425   16. development and/or continuance of significant partnerships with regional, national
426   or international arts organizations with the aim of increasing the influence, recognition,
427   and /or effectiveness of the school, college and university;

428   17. additional substantive duties as outlined in the specific School Academic
429   Professional job description, performed at the request of the School of Art & Design's
430   Director, or in fulfillment of additional School requirements, as necessary;

431   18. development and outcomes of any new initiatives that support, promote and/or
432   improve program(s) within the School of Art & Design.

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

434   As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
435   of the college's policy. Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of Academic
436   Professionals as it relates to their assigned role in the School.

437   Not every Academic Professional in the School of Art & Design will be tasked with
438   teaching or may not teach on a regular basis. It is not necessary for an Academic
439   Professional to teach to attain promotion. For those with a teaching component to their
440   duties, evaluators as a general rule will consider in their assessments of teaching

441   effectiveness the following criteria:

442   **a. Quality of course content:**

443   The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, exam
444   questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and other elements
445   integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for promotion.
446   Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. In courses that
447   involve written exams, exam questions should require students to engage material that
448   is appropriate for the course level and catalog description. In courses that involve
449   writing assignments, assignments should develop the students' ability to work with
450   primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful
451   questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation
452   to the current state of knowledge in the field. Academic Professionals may provide
453   additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other course
454   elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement and
455   success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that
456   cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that connect
457   students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of
458   opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as evidence
459   of successful teaching. The School also encourages faculty to design courses with
460   sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling
461   and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the
462   semester unfolds. The School recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods.
463   Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however,
464   demonstrate a sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and
465   designing assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

466   **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources**
467   **that meaningfully improve existing courses:**

468   Evaluations will consider the effective development and execution of new courses,
469   significant involvement in the development of new teaching programs, and the use of
470   new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the
471   faculty member. The design of courses with a travel component and the subsequent
472   successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential
473   achievement. Course initiatives that positively impact individual student achievement, such
474   as the presentation of undergraduate and/or graduate research including exhibitions or
475   performances of artistic work, are positive indicators of meeting promotion standards.

476   **c. Student evaluations:**

477   The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student evaluation scores, if
478   s/he is teaching consistently as part of their assignment. The overall scores are useful
479   indicators of student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the School will
480   not rely upon exclusively when determining minimum qualifications for ratings, will be
481   considered in the context of the normal range of scores for specific courses and for
482   similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the School. The review will also

483 consider other important variables such as the frequency with which the Academic
484 Professional is teaching over the course of the year, class size, whether the course is
485 required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students
486 enrolled in the course. In addition to average scores, the School will also be attentive to
487 mean and median scores and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages.
488 Qualitative evidence offered by the students' written comments on the student
489 evaluation forms will receive serious attention from the School as a meaningful
490 supplement to the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these
491 contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn consistently
492 strong evaluations and high scores, as defined below.

d. Direction of students:

494 The School will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student
495 projects and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses,
496 student research or creative work presented at GSURC, as well individual student
497 engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or
498 communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering additional
499 tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for underperforming in their Art &
500 Design classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing
501 additional research projects connected to their Art & Design coursework. Faculty
502 members' willingness to write letters of recommendation for undergraduate and
503 graduate students might also be viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category
504 of teaching effectiveness.

e. Development of new skills:

506 The School encourages faculty to continue to develop skills and to master new software,
507 languages, and technology in order to improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as
508 meeting or exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness
509 to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain
510 new certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the School as
511 evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The School
512 recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation
513 of more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation
514 and writing might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

3. Additional Considerations

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

a. Role within the School:

519 Since needs of the School of Art & Design often change, the role of the Academic
520 Professional also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or
521 School may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include
522 the role of the Academic Professional within the context of the mission of the School

523 and the ability of the Academic Professional to fulfill effectively changing needs of the
524 School.

525 **b. Research and Creative Activity Contributions:**

526 Reviewers may consider research and creative activity as it bears on the Academic
527 Professional's Service (Administrative Duties/Job Functions), Teaching, and Overall
528 Performance.

529 It is expected that Academic Professionals will manifest a rich intellectual background
530 and a familiarity with current trends and methods in their field(s) of
531 expertise/competency in their programmatic work as well as in any classes taught. One
532 way (though not the only) of achieving such proficiency is through a program of
533 scholarly or creative activities. In considering an Academic Professional's performance in
534 research and creative activity during third-year and fifth-year reviews, the School will
535 not determine a specific level of accomplishment (unlike service and instructional
536 proficiency, which are rated "outstanding and excellent," and so forth). Instead, the
537 review committee will take careful account of the candidate's research and creative
538 activity and use it to help determine the rating awarded in service and instruction. This
539 reflects our belief that a faculty member who is actively engaged in professional projects
540 of some kind will fulfill the responsibilities of their position in service and instruction as
541 a result: they will be better able to convey to students -- as a first-hand practitioner --
542 pedagogical insights about writing, studio practice, research, theory, pedagogy,
543 professional practice related to the arts, and other disciplinary matters.

544 Since an Academic Professional's research and creative activity is evaluated as a
545 subordinate element of the overall record in service and instruction, it is incumbent on
546 the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly or creative work included in the dossier
547 enhances their service and/or instructional effectiveness, such as by demonstrating
548 connections between the specific projects undertaken and the material taught in the
549 classroom or service conducted on campus.

550 The specific forms of research and creative activity that a Lecturer may produce are
551 identical to those described in the School promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure
552 track faculty, depending on the discipline: publications, invited exhibitions, artistic
553 performances, commissions, lectures, awards and grants, and so forth. Scholarship
554 focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction section of the
555 dossier rather than under Research and Creative Activity.

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

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

564 For promotion to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must
565 demonstrate a level of assigned service to the School, college and/or university, and/or
566 service to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as *excellent*. If the
567 candidate's workload includes teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as
568 demonstrating a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is also
569 evaluated as *very good*, which meets the university standard for promotion to the rank
570 of Senior Academic Professional.

571 **a. Service**

572 To meet the standard in service for promotion to Senior Academic Professional with a
573 rating of *excellent*, the candidate performs high quality work in all of the administrative
574 duties noted in Section IV.B.1.a above, as well as high quality work in at least five of the
575 job functions listed in Section IV.B.1.b, as determined by the School Director and
576 according to the university approved job description for each position.

577 **b. Teaching**

578 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion the rank of Senior Academic
579 Professional with a rating of *very good*, the candidate is a highly competent teacher
580 whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and
581 engaging instruction but also of conscientious mentoring of students, effective
582 pedagogy, and a strong commitment to the mission of the School. The candidate's
583 effectiveness as a teacher is also clearly evident in all assessments of teaching
584 performance, including student evaluations and peer observations if available.

585 **D. Other Academic Professional Reviews**

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

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

592 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all academic professional
593 track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the
594 materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report
595 covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate
596 materials. In consultation with the School Executive Committee, the School Director will
597 evaluate the academic professional track faculty member's service and teaching (if
598 her/his workload includes teaching) using the criteria described in Appendix II.

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

600 The third-year review for Academic Professionals is designed to assess the faculty
601 member's effectiveness and progress toward promotion to Senior Academic

602 Professional. A School subcommittee composed of three faculty, which will include
603 tenured faculty and Senior Academic Professionals (with representation from each), will
604 prepare an evaluation of the Academic Professional's service and teaching (if
605 applicable). The School Director will provide an independent assessment before
606 forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record.
607 The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in
608 Appendix II. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the
609 fifth-year promotion review: it is meant to encourage an assessment of, and dialogue
610 about, an Academic Professional's achievements to date, and to generate advice about
611 possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

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

613 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that Senior
614 Academic Professionals remain effective and current in their service and pedagogy (if
615 applicable). The review will cover the faculty member's service and teaching (if
616 applicable) records over the past five years and will employ the criteria described in
617 Appendix II. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college
618 manual) for evaluation by a committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured
619 or at the rank of Senior Academic Professional (with representation from each when the
620 School has an available Senior Academic Professional within its ranks). The School
621 Director will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations
622 to the Dean's Office for response.

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

625 **A. Teaching**

626 *Poor:* The faculty member demonstrates little evidence of mastery of teaching
627 techniques and content. Students show little or no progress.

628 *Fair:* The faculty member demonstrates minimum competence as an artist or scholar
629 and as a recruiter of students. There is little evidence that students have progressed in
630 their growth as artists or scholars.

631 *Good:* The faculty member demonstrates acceptable competence as an artist or scholar

632 and recruits an adequate number of students to the discipline. The candidate's
633 reputation as a teacher/workshop leader is recognized on the local and state level.

634 *Very Good:* The faculty member demonstrates the ability, skills and dedication needed
635 to provide students with current concepts and practices consistent with mastery in the
636 field. Consistently strong, high performing students are attracted and retained in the
637 discipline. The candidate's students demonstrate successful performance within the
638 candidate's coursework and in limited venues beyond the classroom. The candidate's
639 reputation as a teacher/workshop leader is recognized on *at least a* regional level as
640 evidenced by professional activities.

641 *Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):* The faculty member demonstrates a strong
642 ability to identify and utilize assignments and other material appropriate to the course
643 level, as well as master current concepts and practices in keeping with the field. The
644 candidate structures their courses in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical
645 acumen in their students, such that their efforts may result in student recruitment to
646 their discipline. The candidate's ability as a master educator may be indicated by
647 publications of their research and scholarship, creative activities, performances,
648 exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, and
649 collaborations, as they bear on the Lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching. The
650 candidate may demonstrate effectiveness related to direction of students through such
651 complementary actions as student participation in exhibition or scholarly activities,
652 student participation in field-related academic or community activities, and student
653 acceptance to graduate programs and/or professional careers in the field.

654 *Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):* In addition to meeting the
655 requirement for *excellent*, though not *outstanding*, at the Senior Lecturer level, the
656 faculty member demonstrates continued growth in the time period since the last
657 promotion. Signs of "continued growth" might include: continuing professional
658 development (for example, participation in workshops, training sessions, courses, round
659 tables, and conferences); continuing efforts to improve course content and delivery;
660 growth in reputation (for example, from regional/national to national/international);
661 new awards and distinctions; and new publications of research and scholarship, creative
662 activities, performances, exhibitions, conference presentations, grants applied for
663 and/or funded, and collaborations, as they bear on the Lecturer's knowledge as it
664 relates to teaching.

665 *Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):* The faculty member is clearly a master
666 teacher who demonstrates an exceptional ability to communicate and work effectively
667 with students, providing them with current concepts and practices consistent with
668 mastery of the field. A candidate is evaluated as *outstanding* if the committee
669 determines that the quality of their accomplishments exceeds the criteria of *excellent*.

670 *Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):* The faculty member is at the
671 forefront of the department's pedagogical mission. In addition to meeting the criteria
672 for *outstanding* described above, they have a record demonstrating that their classes
673 and instructional programs manifest an innovative pedagogical proficiency that has a

674 broad, positive impact on other faculty and on the departmental curriculum. This
675 candidate takes a leadership role in the department's instructional mission.

676 **B. Service**

677 *Poor:* The faculty member does not fulfill assigned service obligations and is not a
678 responsible citizen of the School.

679 *Fair:* The faculty member ineffectively fulfills assigned service obligations or is not a
680 responsible citizen of the School.

681 *Good:* The faculty member does not always effectively fulfill assigned service obligations
682 or is not consistently a responsible citizen of the School.

683 *Very Good:* The faculty member enthusiastically and effectively fulfills their assigned
684 roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite
685 advisement sessions, such faculty actively participate, using these meetings as
686 opportunities to most effectively govern the School and to achieve positive results for
687 undergraduate and graduate students.

688 *Excellent:* The faculty member has been diligent and highly effective in carrying out
689 assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the School over a
690 sustained period. The faculty member normally exhibits a track record of providing
691 assistance to School advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other
692 non-tenure track instructors. In addition to continued growth in the areas of service
693 described above, the faculty member's growth in service should also take one or more
694 of the following forms: highly effective service as an area coordinator or in a role with a
695 similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the
696 profession or community.

697 *Outstanding:* In excess of the stated expectations required to achieve a rating of
698 *excellent* in service, the faculty member will be judged to be *outstanding* in service if
699 they has not only fulfilled any assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable
700 personal initiative to seek out best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the
701 success of the School in meeting its stated goals. The faculty member will have been
702 recognized by their peers, students, or university administrators as having established a
703 long track record of success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways.
704 Highly effective service as an area coordinator or in a role with a similar level of
705 responsibility, or extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also
706 indications of *outstanding* service.

707

708 **APPENDIX II: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Academic Professional-Track**
709 **Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative**
710 **Reviews**

711 **A. Service**

712 *Poor:* Not only has the faculty member not performed their duties, but has been derelict
713 to an extent that other School, college, and/or university functions have been impeded.

714 *Fair:* The faculty member's responsibilities have not been fulfilled, and others have had
715 to take over the performance of those duties.

716 *Good:* The faculty member's responsibilities have been only marginally performed.

717 *Very Good:* The faculty member has accomplished a majority of the assigned duties in
718 Sections IV.B.1.a and IV.B.1.b.

719 *Excellent:* The faculty member fulfills consistent, effective, innovative, and dependable
720 service in all of the administrative duties outlined in Section IV.B.1.a, as well as high
721 quality work in at least five of the job functions listed in Section IV.B.1.b, as determined
722 by the School Director and according to the university-approved job description for the
723 position.

724 *Outstanding:* The faculty member performs high quality work in all administrative
725 duties outlined in Section IV.B.1.a, as well as high quality work in at least eight of the job
726 functions listed in Section IV.B.1.b.

727 **B. Teaching**

728 *Poor:* The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced
729 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in
730 School curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques
731 and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the
732 course content to students.

733 *Fair:* The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as
734 evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little
735 involvement in School curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
736 pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the
737 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

738 *Good:* The faculty member's instructional performance minimally exceeds adequate.
739 This candidate's supporting material provides evidence of appropriate preparation and
740 pertinent content but fails to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or
741 decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of
742 a full-time college instructor.

743 *Very Good:* The faculty member is a competent candidate whose supporting material

744   includes evidence not only of conscientious preparation and instruction but also of
745   some mentoring of students and effective pedagogy. Class assignments are creative and
746   methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning.

747   ***Excellent:*** The faculty member is a highly competent teacher whose supporting material
748   includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and enthusiastic instruction but also
749   of conscientious mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a strong commitment
750   to the mission of the School. The candidate's effectiveness as a teacher is clearly evident
751   in all documents that rate performance, including student evaluations and peer
752   observations if available.

753   ***Outstanding:*** The faculty member's performance and supporting material demonstrate
754   the dedicated work of an exceptional teacher and faculty member who displays
755   evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, personal
756   intellectual growth, and vigorous engagement with the work of the school. Supporting
757   material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, including
758   exceptional preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful
759   mentoring of students, lucid grading standards, and, as a foundation, a coherent
760   philosophy of teaching that shows deep thought and imaginative insight. The
761   candidate's superior effectiveness as a teacher should be clearly evident in all
762   documents that rate performance, including student evaluations and peer observations
763   if available.