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I. Introduction

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Institute for Biomedical Sciences of Georgia State University, filling critical instructional and service roles. The Institute for Biomedical Sciences (the Institute or IBMS) 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 in the Georgia State University guidelines. Faculty members should consult the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual). In the event of a conflict between the Institute and university documents, the university documents will take precedence.

The Institute for Biomedical Sciences employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track and research faculty track. The ranks (listed from most junior to most senior) are: Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer) and Research Faculty (Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor).

II. Description of NTT Faculty Positions

A. Lecturer

The primary responsibility of lecturers is teaching. As part of their workload, lecturers may be expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service (including any related student success activities interwoven in each) may be at the Institute and/or university level. Service also may involve activities related to the professional and practice community. Lecturers may be considered for Graduate Faculty Status if it is appropriate for their duties and consistent with University Graduate Faculty Policy. Lecturers are not required to engage in research, scholarly, and creative activities. Nonetheless, lecturers are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in biomedical sciences.

B. Research Faculty

The primary responsibility of research faculty is to conduct research. As part of their workload, research faculty may be expected to engage in teaching and/or service (including any related student success activities interwoven in each).

III. Review Process for Promotion in Lecturer Track and Research Faculty Track
A. **Process Overview**

The Institute for Biomedical Sciences employs the following steps in the NTT faculty review process:

1. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Director’s office and will subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the Institute manual to the Director of IBMS. The structured reviews for faculty in promotable NTT positions (described in II.) are annual and structured third- and fifth-year review; thereafter, structured reviews will take place every five years. The results of annual reviews will be utilized as a part of structured reviews.

2. IBMS Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee is composed of two committees: (1) IBMS NTT Promotion Review ‘Working’ Committee and (2) IBMS NTT Promotion Review ‘Evaluation’ Committee. The Director forwards the candidate’s review materials to the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee to initiate the review.

3. The IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee will review the candidate’s dossier and draft the initial recommendation letter for review and consideration by the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Evaluation Committee. All members of the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Evaluation Committee must either sign the recommendation letter from the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee or provide a dissenting letter if any. Subsequently, the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee Chair submits its recommendation letter, including minority report (if any), to the IBMS Director. The IBMS Promotion Review Working Committee members will sign the recommendation letter. The Director will provide a copy of the IBMS Promotion Review Working Committee’s report (including minority report if any) to the candidate. In the case of a split decision, the report, listing all committee members, should include both majority and minority views.

4. The IBMS Director reviews the candidate's dossier and the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee recommendation and dissent letters, if any. The Director submits an independent review of the candidate, along with the IBMS Promotion Review Working Committee review to the Office of the Provost. The Director provides a copy of their report to the candidate.

5. Candidates who are not recommended by the Director must receive a written decision and rationale. Candidates who are not recommended by the Director may appeal the Director’s decision to the Provost. Upon receipt of the written decision by the Director, the candidate shall have 10 business days to appeal the negative recommendation to the Provost. If a candidate does not appeal a negative decision by the Director, the case will not be considered at subsequent levels of review.
After this point, the review process passes from the Institute to the University.

**B. Institute Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee**

For each candidate up for promotion, the Institute Director will appoint a 3-member IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee, with at least one tenure-track (TT) and one NTT member, chosen from the entire faculty, to initially review each candidate’s dossier and draft the initial recommendation letter for review and consideration by the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Evaluation Committee. The Institute Director shall also appoint the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee Chair for each candidate’s committee. To the extent possible, NTT faculty members on the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee shall be from an NTT position that is similar to that of the candidate(s) in terms of emphasis on teaching, research, and service. The appropriate rank of NTT faculty who can serve on the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee would include NTT faculty at ranks above the rank of the faculty being considered for promotion.

The Chair of the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee will call for the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Evaluation Committee; the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Evaluation Committee is composed of IBMS faculties TT and NTT (at ranks above the rank of the candidate being considered for promotion) and must either sign the recommendation letter from the IBMS NTT Promotion Review Working Committee or provide a dissenting letter.

The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e. : outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor).

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

The rating scale for all structured reviews of NTT faculty will be: 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 and research are listed in Table B and C, respectively, of the Appendix.

**IV. Lecturer 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 for promotion to Principal Senior
Lecturer, and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with 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 ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above.

**B. Scope of Evaluations**

**1. Evaluation of Teaching**

Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers which shall include any related student success activities as it relates to their core mission of engaging learning in courses ranging from introductory survey of biomedical sciences to advanced lectures, laboratories and internship experiences. Instruction for IBMS majors communicates the discipline of biomedical sciences to students and trains them to be skilled and responsible researchers, practitioners, teachers, and other professionals.

Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations (see Table A for details). The candidate must include such evidence in the dossier.

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.
6. 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).
7. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.
8. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative teaching activities.
9. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs; participation in textbook development.
10. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

**2. Evaluation of Service**

For NTT faculty, service and any related student success activities as defined by the Institute can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for lecturers is normally at the Institute level and the quantity is dependent upon specific requirements and workload assignments. University, Institute, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.
Institute’s service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:

1. Ensuring the highest safety standards at all times.
2. Maintaining and overseeing equipment. Where appropriate, it is expected that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that institute’s equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use of equipment.
3. Participation on institute’s committees. Effective participation on the NTT Promotion Review Committee and other committee appointments, including curriculum committee and grade appeal committees, is expected. Other service avenues may include student advisement/mentoring, assistance to colleagues, and role on college committees, etc.
4. Course oversight/coordination or other assigned duties.

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, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of very good in service. Each lecturer’s service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term may have a different service load than those assigned major institute roles. Such additional assigned roles may include service as Undergraduate Director, direction of student teams, etc.

Lecturers must carry out their assigned duties effectively and diligently in a thorough and timely manner to achieve the rating of very good.

C. Criteria for Promotion

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 descriptions: 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 Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Each candidate 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 terms 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 in teaching. Table A of
the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. The service of lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their assignments qualify for a rating of very good in service (for example, participated in committee meetings, search committees, performed other tasks and duties in a thorough and timely manner). 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 promoting 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 in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the Institute, university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that they have met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative terms 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 in instruction and excellent in service. Tables A (for teaching) and B (for service) of the Appendix outline in detail what is necessary.

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 their updated CV, annual report information covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with the Associate Director, the Director of the Institute will evaluate the lecturer track faculty member’s teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

2. **Third-year and fifth-year review**

The candidate will prepare a dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and deliver it to the Institute Director, in consultation with the Associate Director. An Institute review committee composed of at least 3 members, which will include tenured faculty and senior lecturers, will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the Institute Director. The committee and Associate Director 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.

Although a third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion) review, its purpose is different. The third-year review 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 is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and to possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach their full potential. The review committee consists of two tenured and one non-tenure track faculty members. This committee evaluates the Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer in the categories of teaching and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The Associate Director of the Institute will provide an independent assessment and both evaluations will be sent to the Institute Director.

V. **Research Faculty Reviews**

A. **General Considerations**

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

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

The renewal of appointments of research faculty is contingent upon the Institute being able to provide the appropriate resources to support the research (e.g. available external funding).

B. **Scope of Evaluations**

The primary responsibility of Research Faculty is to conduct research, scholarship, and creative activities (including any related student success activities). As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in teaching and/or service.
Research Faculty salaries are primarily from research grants or other sources of external funds (non-general state funds).

The Institute Director will determine specific expectations (research, teaching, and/or service) of each Research Faculty member, which should then be outlined by the Institute Director in a hiring memo.

Whether or not Research Faculty may teach graduate courses, serve on graduate student committees, and/or direct theses and/or dissertations must follow the University Graduate Faculty Policy guidelines.

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

1. Evaluation of Research

The research faculty must provide evidence of excellence in scholarly research that builds upon an explicit area of focus for the IBMS.

Evidence submitted should be organized according to the categories of professional development.

1. Publications and Patents: Scholarship is indicated most clearly by publications in refereed journals or patents. Publications are quality publications in major peer reviewed journals, invited chapters, and/or books appropriate to biomedical sciences. The quality and quantity of citations of the candidate’s research publications may also be assessed. It is recognized that each research area will have different expectations in regard to the numbers of publications and the importance of specific journals.

2. Extramural Grants

3. Presentations at Conferences: Invited seminars and presentations are also an indication of scholarship. The prestige of the conference or workshop will be part of the consideration.

4. Invitations to Give Talks on Research

5. Professional Service: Professional service considered under the Scholarship category includes memberships on editorial boards, peer reviews for scholarly journals, grant reviews for granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, and services as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations.

2. Evaluation of Service

Service is considered an important element of faculty accomplishment.

1. Oversight or training of Institute for Biomedical Sciences or university staff

2. Oversight of Institute for Biomedical Sciences or university facilities and
equipment

3. Substantial participation and planning of Institute for Biomedical Sciences, or university or professional events or meetings

### C. Review

The Institute Director will evaluate Research Faculty annually to determine whether they meet the expectations outlined in the hiring memo and to provide constructive feedback to the faculty member concerning their performance and progress. Any changes in expectations and responsibilities will be outlined in the annual letter. The review should include an assessment of whether external funding will continue for the next year.

The evaluation of Research Faculty for promotion, as in the III. A. Process Overview, should focus on areas specified by the BoR policy, including significant growth and outstanding research and professional development, and appropriate levels of instruction and service given their research workload. The level of expectation increases with the rank. The process used for promotion of Research Faculty will be the same criteria in *Research* used for TT faculty. While the review shall be conducted with the same rigor and criteria used to evaluate the promotion of TT faculty with the parallel title, full consideration will be given that Research Faculty may have access to fewer resources (e.g., start-up funds, office and laboratory space, personnel) than TT faculty with the parallel title.

### VI. Annual Review

#### A. **Purpose**

Faculty members are expected to participate in teaching, research/creative activities, and/or service as defined by their workload expectations, enhancing their professional development and contributing to their disciplines. An assessment of these activities will be included in the annual review of the faculty member.

#### B. **Procedure**

All faculty members are subject to an annual review as outlined in the Institute guidelines. This assessment should address the applicable accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and/or service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each). Faculty will be provided a written evaluation of their performance.
### Appendix

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 5 of the following activities: (a) Update/revise courses (b) Student perceptions (c) Direct independent study courses (d) Publications in instructional journals (e) Instructional creativity as evidenced by development of new courses and/or awards for instructional innovation (f) Learning outcomes as evidenced by the candidate’s course assessment results. A direct assessment can be developed by the candidate, deciding how to score the assignment (e.g., rubric, grades), identifying the target, and reporting on the findings. (g) Involvement with educationally focused grants/proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provided major leadership in development of instruction at institute level (broad impact)</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 4 of the above activities, including (a), (b) and (f).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 3 of the above activities, including (a), (b), and (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Meets obligations</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 2 of the above activities, including (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 1 of the above activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Substandard, ineffective teacher</td>
<td>Shows evidence of none of the above activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Rating</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Evaluation Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Major leadership roles</td>
<td>Major role in Institute or in a professional organization, including membership of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>editorial boards in journal(s) and/or study section(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Effective departmental</td>
<td>Effective role in Institute or in a professional organization will also be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership role(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Helpful citizenship; some</td>
<td>Effective role in Institute; meets Institute obligations effectively and is helpful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>provides Institute leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Acceptable citizenship</td>
<td>Meets Institute obligations/requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>Does not meet Institute obligations in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs major improvement;</td>
<td>Hinders Institute operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not a leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Research for NTT faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outstanding     | Superb, exceptional researcher, recognized as university-level leader in development of research | Shows evidence of 5 of the following activities:  
(a) Regularly publishing research findings in important and influential refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality  
(b) Sustained record of obtaining external funding for support of scholarship as either co-investigator/investigator/collaborator or principal investigator  
(c) Regularly making scholarly presentations at national and international professional meetings  
(d) Regularly serving as referee for scholarly journals, grant reviewers for granting agencies; serving as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations  
(e) Providing guidance and assistance to faculty colleagues and students related to research  
(f) Actively maintaining and enhancing technical/scientific competence as appropriate  
(g) Providing leadership in research endeavors |
| Excellent       | Exceptional researcher; provided major leadership in development of instruction at institute level (broad impact) | Shows evidence of 4 of the above activities, including (a), (b), and (d). |
| Very good       | Effective researcher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact) |
| Good            | Meets obligations |

Show evidence of 2 of the above activities, including (a)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Limited performance; researcher of marginal effectiveness</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 1 of the above activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Substandard, ineffective researcher</td>
<td>Shows evidence of none of the above activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>