

**NEUROSCIENCE INSTITUTE
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW GUIDELINES**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Policy Title:	Neuroscience Institute Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Guidelines
Version:	3
Department Approval:	01/20/2023
College Approval:	11/17/2023

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

**Neuroscience Institute
Georgia State University
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Guidelines**

Contents:

I.	Introduction	1
II.	General Evaluation Factors	2
	a. Teaching	2
	b. Service	4
	c. Research/Scholarship	5
	d. Student Success Activities	7
III.	Annual Review	8
	a. Scope of Evaluation	8
	b. Ratings Guidelines	
	i. Teaching (1-5 scale)	9
	ii. Service (1-5 scale)	11
	iii. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)	11
IV.	Third-Year Structured Review	13
	a. Scope of Evaluation	13
	b. Ratings Guidelines	
	i. Teaching (1-5 scale)	13
	ii. Service (1-5 scale)	15
	iii. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)	16
V.	Promotion Review	16
	a. Lecturer Track Faculty	17
	i. Standards for the Rank of Senior Lecturer	
	ii. Standards for the Rank of Principal Lecturer	
	b. Academic Professional Track Faculty	18
	i. Standards for the Rank of Senior Academic Professional	
	ii. Standards for the Rank of Principal Academic Professional	
	c. Research Track Faculty	20
	i. Standards for the Rank of Research Associate Professor	
	ii. Standards for the Rank of Research Professor	
VI.	Five-Year Structured Review	22
	a. Scope of Evaluation	22
	b. Ratings Guidelines	22
	i. Teaching (1-5 scale)	
	ii. Service (1-5 scale)	
	iii. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)	

1 **II. Introduction**

2
3 This set of guidelines provides the review criteria and performance expectations for non-tenure track
4 (NTT) faculty in the Neuroscience Institute. NTT faculty in the Neuroscience Institute include those in
5 the Lecturer Track (*Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer*), the Academic Professional Track
6 (*Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional, Principal Academic Professional*), and the
7 Research Faculty Track (*Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research*
8 *Professor*). Candidates should consult the College of Arts & Sciences Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review
9 Manual for information on review processes and procedures, dossier requirements, definitions of review
10 periods, and time-in-rank policies that determine eligibility for promotion consideration.
11

12 NTT faculty are a vital component of the Neuroscience Institute of Georgia State University, filling
13 critical roles in instruction, service, and/or research/scholarship. The Neuroscience Institute has
14 formulated policies and procedures for reviewing and promoting NTT faculty. The process of granting
15 promotion is an essential mechanism for ensuring the quality of scholarship, teaching, and service in the
16 university. The process is intended to be both thorough and fair. The goal of this document is to describe
17 the criteria and specific expectations for performance and achievement in line with promotion in the
18 Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State University. The Neuroscience Institute has formulated these
19 promotion guidelines with the intent of conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board
20 of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for
21 Non-Tenure Track Faculty (“university manual”), and the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion
22 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (“college manual”). Candidates are directed to both of these
23 manuals for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for promotion and for
24 details on the university and college expectations. In the event of conflict, the policies, procedures, and
25 standards of the Regents, University, and College take precedence over and govern the material in these
26 guidelines.
27

28 Before a candidate for promotion in the Neuroscience Institute can be nominated by the Neuroscience
29 Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee and the Neuroscience Institute Director for
30 consideration by the college area promotion committee, they must be judged to have met the expectations
31 and criteria given in the current promotion manual of the College of Arts and Sciences and the
32 supplemental criteria listed in this document. Any faculty member who might be considered for
33 promotion should carefully study the criteria, requirements, and procedures that are outlined in both
34 documents. The candidate is responsible for providing necessary evidence and justification that their
35 record of accomplishment meets the criteria set forth in these documents.
36

37 As described in the University Policy on Promotion, NTT candidates for promotion will be evaluated in
38 the areas of teaching, service, and/or research/scholarship, depending on the requirements of their
39 appointment. In addition, faculty members are required to document student success activities in
40 teaching and may document student success activities in service and/or research/scholarship, as
41 appropriate to position responsibilities. Teaching includes classroom teaching, mentoring students inside
42 and outside the classroom, and when appropriate, professional practice. Service includes departmental,
43 college, and university service, some types of professional service, and some types of public service that
44 involve professional expertise. Research/scholarship includes academic achievement in research, other
45 forms of scholarship, and some types of professional service. As described later in this document, the
46 Neuroscience Institute values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for
47 performance by its members in each one. At the time of promotion and/or structured review, candidates

48 will be evaluated as to whether or not they have met the expectations for their position, rank, and assigned
49 job duties.

50

51 **II. General Evaluation Factors**

52

53 **a. Teaching**

54

55 The record of teaching/mentoring developed and implemented by the candidate should demonstrate a
56 commitment to effectively communicating neuroscience principles to students and trainees. In this area,
57 the candidate will present evidence that includes their teaching portfolios from the years under review
58 in addition to other supporting documentation. The materials may document not only classroom
59 teaching, but also work with individual undergraduate and graduate students. Post-graduate
60 training/mentoring (*e.g.*, postdoctoral fellows; post-baccalaureate students) may also be evaluated, if it
61 is present. In addition, participation in pedagogical development or conferences is recognized as a valued
62 activity. Where appropriate, the candidate may include the development and/or presentation of local,
63 regional, or national/international instructional workshops as evidence of teaching.

64

65 The evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate's submission of documentation organized
66 according to the categories of teaching listed in the college manual. In addition to the categories listed
67 there, discipline-specific student success activities related to teaching must be documented (see relevant
68 student success activities on the Neuroscience Institute website).

69

70 Candidates with teaching workloads that differ from the standard workload in the Neuroscience Institute
71 (*e.g.*, those candidates with course buyouts from grants or administrative releases) will be evaluated on
72 the quality and quantity of teaching/mentoring activities that are part of their assigned duties. This must
73 be clearly documented and stated in the teaching materials submitted for review.

74

75 ***Categories for evaluation of teaching***

76

77 Based on the evidence submitted, the relevant Neuroscience Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion
78 Review Committee will evaluate the candidate's teaching according to the major categories described in
79 the college manual. The materials will be used to evaluate the candidate's instructional contribution in
80 four general areas: 1) Course content; 2) Course development; 3) Student evaluations; and 4) Student
81 Success, Instructional, and Mentoring activities (both course-related and non-course related); and may
82 include 5) Publications in education or pedagogical journals.

83

84 1) Course Content. Effective course content is evidenced by demonstrating coherence among
85 reading assignments, lecture materials, learning activities, and graded assignments. Clear
86 organization of the syllabus and effective communication to students regarding their responsibilities
87 and expectations are also indications of thoughtful course content development. In addition to these
88 elements, the category of course content also takes into consideration the level of rigor incorporated
89 into the course through such things as the nature and amount of reading required of students, types
90 of assignments, activities, and tests. Pedagogical innovation also belongs to the category of course
91 content and can include various aspects of supporting student success using evidence-based active
92 learning strategies.

93

94 2) Course Development: Effective course development is evidenced by the candidate’s instructional
95 contribution to the range and scope of courses offered by the Neuroscience Institute and the way in
96 which those courses fulfill the mission of the Institute and serve to address its curricular needs.
97 Effective course development should enhance the Institute’s offerings, and, when possible, align
98 with university teaching initiatives such as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) courses and/or
99 provide Signature Experience activities. Evidence of course development that aligns with the
100 university’s strategic plan and quality enhancement plan will also be considered in high regard. A
101 teaching philosophy may provide background and reflection on course development. Course
102 development, course revisions, and use of student-centered practices in addressing instructional
103 delivery and approaches to learning outcomes are also examples of student success activities.
104

105 3) Perception of Students. The Institute understands the category of student evaluations to be
106 inclusive of the totality of student perceptions of the instructor’s contribution to the learning
107 environment. Therefore, standardized student evaluations of instructor (SEIs) are considered as one
108 element that will be used to evaluate a candidate’s performance within this category. Reviewers
109 should be cognizant that empirical evidence exists demonstrating that student evaluations can be
110 subject to biases. In addition to considering the written comments on the standardized student
111 evaluations, candidates may also submit feedback gained from students through other channels (*e.g.*,
112 pre- and post-learning assessments), where applicable. The advisory committee will attempt to
113 discern a pattern in student perceptions of the overall pedagogical environment created by the
114 candidate, attending to the scores on all questions as well as further evidence provided by students’
115 written remarks. Peer evaluations of instruction (*e.g.*, CETLOE’s “Assessment of Instruction”) can
116 also be used as a complementary tool in evaluating and improving teaching efficacy.
117

118 4) Student Success, Instructional, and Mentoring Activities. The Institute considers student success,
119 instructional, and mentoring activities inside and outside the traditional classroom setting central to
120 its educational mission. Instructional activities beyond the candidate’s classroom may include guest
121 lectures given in colleagues’ classes, among other activities. The Neuroscience Institute Non-Tenure
122 Track Promotion Review Committee will consider the candidate’s effective supervision of
123 independent studies, practica, undergraduate and graduate thesis development and writing, research
124 mentoring, supervision of internships, or the development of service learning and public outreach
125 opportunities. Student accomplishments (*e.g.*, publications, presentations, awards/honors) under the
126 candidate’s mentorship will be given more weight than the number of students mentored. The
127 committee will also consider research and career-oriented mentoring, including supporting students
128 preparing for conference presentations, integrating career competencies into coursework, reviewing
129 fellowship or grant applications, or supporting the development of mentorship skills among students
130 and colleagues. Faculty attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion is an additional element of
131 student success. Advising students on their post-graduate activities and writing letters of
132 recommendation on their behalf will also be considered in this category. As mentoring and advising
133 adapts to meet students’ needs, the committee recognizes that this description of student success,
134 instructional, and mentoring activities is not exhaustive. Further guidance is provided in lists made
135 available by the College of Arts & Sciences and the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning,
136 and Online Education, as well as Institute-specific guidance on student success activities posted on
137 the Neuroscience Institute website.
138

139 5) Publications in Education or Pedagogical Journals and/or External Grants for Teaching,
140 Pedagogy, and/or Research Training. Publications contributing to the scholarship of teaching and

141 learning are valued. Publications considered under teaching should be in rigorous peer-reviewed
142 literature or a well-respected educational outlet. In addition, grants specifically supporting
143 instructional, pedagogical, or training programs, fellowships and stipends for undergraduates,
144 graduate students, and postdocs may be included. Competitive internal grants supporting teaching
145 may also be applicable.
146

147 **b. Service**

148

149 The Neuroscience Institute is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the Institute, the
150 college, the university, and to local and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and
151 international professional organizations. Those service activities that are related to the candidate's areas
152 of professional expertise will be included in an evaluation of their service. The candidate may include
153 evidence of student success activities, as appropriate. While the expectations for the quantity and quality
154 of service work will be higher for those seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer, or Principal Academic
155 Professional than for those seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer, or Senior Academic Professional,
156 cooperation and a commitment to shared responsibility is a highly valued quality in all candidates
157 seeking promotion in the Neuroscience Institute. Although service is generally not a required category
158 of evaluation for faculty in the Research Professor track, for those with an appointment that includes
159 service, a similar principle applies.
160

161 *Categories for evaluation of service*

162

163 The candidate must submit documentation of service organized according to the categories of service
164 listed in the college manual. Complete descriptions for any service category must be provided by the
165 candidate along with explanatory documentation, when possible. Examples of service contributions are
166 provided below. However, this list is not intended to be exhaustive, as valued service can take many
167 forms at many different levels.
168

- 169 ● Contributions to Student Success Activities: Serving in student-oriented administrative roles or
170 on student-focused committees; supporting student organizations; promoting student recruitment
171 and retention; advancing alumni relationships and involvement; facilitating student involvement
172 in professional organizations or community partnerships; engaging in mentoring, advising, and
173 student wellness.
- 174 ● Contributions to the Institute: Chairing Institute-level committees, memberships on committees,
175 development of programs and activities, participation in major Institute-sponsored activities;
176 holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment;
177 supervision of the purchase, repair, and maintenance of department research infrastructure.
- 178 ● Contributions to the College, University, or University System: Committees served on or chaired
179 at the College or University level; serving on the University Senate; holding positions of
180 significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment (e.g., university research
181 centers).
- 182 ● Support of local, state, national, or international professional organizations: Consultations;
183 memberships on advisory boards; professional conference organization; professional offices
184 held.
- 185 ● Assistance to colleagues: Consultations concerning student issues; collaborations with other
186 University departments and programs; providing technical training in field, laboratory, or other
187 analytical methods; faculty mentoring.

- 188
- Significant discipline-related community service: Community lectures; speeches; presentations; short courses; hosting conferences; engaging in K-12 outreach activities that are not suitable for including as a teaching activity.
 - Meritorious public service: Providing subject-area expertise assistance to governmental agencies; major service awards that are discipline related.
- 193

194 The evaluation of service is based on two factors: *quality* of service work performed, and *quantity* of the
195 service work performed. Relative to the expectations outlined for each rank below, the relevant
196 Neuroscience Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee will use the following
197 questions to guide their assessment of the items listed in the candidate’s dossier under service which are
198 used to inform whether a candidate does or does not fulfill service obligations responsibly, thoroughly,
199 and effectively.

200

201 1. *Quality of Service Work Performed*: Can the candidate be relied upon to perform assigned tasks in a
202 timely and competent fashion? Do they attend scheduled meetings? Do they provide leadership initiative
203 and results when chairing a committee? Have they made substantive service contributions? Does the
204 candidate help to fulfill the charge of the committee? If being considered for promotion to Principal
205 Lecturer or Principal Academic Professional, has the candidate demonstrated initiative and vision for
206 the good of the Neuroscience Institute in their service roles?

207

208 2. *Quantity of Service Work Performed*: Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility
209 commensurate with their rank and workload allocation? Do they consistently accept reasonable service
210 requirements when asked? If being considered for promotion to Principal Lecturer or Principal Academic
211 Professional, has the candidate assumed major service roles beyond the Institute? Does the candidate
212 show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

213

214 The expectation in the Neuroscience Institute is that the faculty member will serve in a combination of
215 major and minor service roles per year. Examples for each category are provided below, however this is
216 not intended to be an exhaustive list.

217

218 Leadership Service Roles: Director or Associate Director (NI, Graduate, Undergraduate, College or
219 University Research Center), Committee Chair (Department, College, or University level).

220

221 Major Service Roles: Committee member (Department, College, or University level), Departmental
222 Program Coordinator (*e.g.*, internship, peer mentors, assessment), professional organization leadership.

223

224 Minor Service Tasks: Poster session judge, Panther Previews lecture, commencement attendance,
225 presentation to student organization.

226

227 **c. Research/Scholarship**

228

229 Among NTT faculty in the Neuroscience Institute, Research/Scholarship is a category of evaluation that
230 generally applies only to those in the Research Faculty Track (*Research Assistant Professor, Research*
231 *Associate Professor, Research Professor*). Research faculty in Neuroscience have as their primary role
232 research and scholarship, and *may* have teaching and/or service duties depending on the details of their
233 appointment. Categories of evaluation of Research/Scholarship and expectations for promotion generally
234 parallel those for Research/Scholarship of tenure-track faculty.

235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281

Categories of evaluation of Research/Scholarship

The evaluation of research/scholarship is based primarily on the candidate’s publication record of original scholarly research (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, and/or books) along with additional scholarly work significant to the profession (e.g., published abstracts, conference presentations, seminar invitations, significant professional service, disclosure of inventions and technology transfer), as well as extramural grant funding. The candidate may include evidence of student success activities, as appropriate. The candidate must submit evidence of research/scholarship organized according to the categories of research/scholarship activity listed in the College Manual.

The Neuroscience Institute recognizes that research/scholarship can take many forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in the profession. The following evidence may be considered in assessing research/scholarship.

1. Publications

The candidate is expected to have developed an independent research program that has resulted in senior/corresponding and/or first authored works published in rigorous, peer-reviewed journals of nationally or internationally significant presses. The dossier should provide evidence of the disciplinary importance of the publishing venues, and the impacts of the candidate’s publications. Examples of impacts and disciplinary importance may include, but are not limited to, publication citation rates, journal impact factors, journal quartile rankings, external reviewer assessments, and published indices of scholarly productivity.

A mix of lead-authored/corresponding authored and co-authored/co-led publications may be appropriate depending on the candidate’s specialty. For those in fields where collaborative work is common, the value of such research, particularly funded by the candidate’s external funds, and publication with trainees under the candidate’s supervision, may be recognized. As different subdisciplines have different customs in authorship, the candidate should provide a statement contextualizing their authorship in their subdiscipline. In all cases, a candidate’s independent research program should be represented by one or both of the following types of publishing records: a strong record of senior/corresponding authorship on publications or a major role in co-authored publications, especially when the candidate’s role in acquiring external funds or supervising trainee authors is clear. The contribution of the candidate to each publication should be explained in detail, particularly when the candidate is not the senior/corresponding author.

2. Extramural Funding

Extramural funding is typically in the form of grants, fellowships, contracts, and sub-contracts. Extramural funding is a significant indication of research productivity because 1) it allows the candidate to pay for research needs and to support undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral trainees; and 2) success in obtaining peer-reviewed or competitive grants is a strong indication of the significance of the proposed research. It is recognized that Research Assistant Professors may sometimes be supported by extramural funding of a tenure-track faculty member, and in other cases may have their own, independent funding. Research Associate Professors and Research Professors are expected to have significant independent funding, as described below.

282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328

3. *Conference Presentations*

Presentation at national or international conferences is recognized as an indicator of a candidate's participation in the larger academic community. While presentations do not hold the same weight as peer-reviewed publications, they are valuable activities that may lead to publication, develop peer networks, and lead to greater impact on the discipline.

4. *Invitations*

Some invitations may signify national or international impact of a candidate's research program (e.g., invited research seminars; visiting scientist). These invitations may also include funded invitations by government agencies, societies, universities, or institutions to present or to design research, or funded invitations to participate in significant national or international professional conferences, workshops, and roundtables.

5. *Significant Professional Service*

Although they may not constitute the conduct of research, some aspects of service to the profession may signify national or international impact of a candidate's research program. These activities may include: service as reviewer or panelist for national/international level funding agencies; service as peer-reviewer of manuscripts to journals in the candidate's area of interest; convening national or international conferences or symposia; serving on editorial boards of peer reviewed journals or as an associate editor, discipline editors, or editor-in-chief.

6. *Disclosure of inventions/technology transfer*

Inventions, commercialized copyrighted works, trademarks, and trade secrets are examples of valued intellectual property. The disclosures of inventions to Georgia State University Research Foundation (GSURF) that lead to submittal of applications for patent protection and the award of patents, trademarks, trade secrets, and copyrighted matter speak to the national and international importance of those disclosed works. Efforts to commercialize these discoveries by faculty members also contribute to the national or international importance of these discoveries.

7. *Other*

Other evidence of national or international impact of the candidate's research program may be presented. The burden of proof is on the candidate to demonstrate the national or international significance of any other research accomplishment.

d. A Note on Student Success Activities

As required by the University System of Georgia, in all evaluations, faculty with teaching effort must demonstrate engagement in student success activities in the area of teaching and may demonstrate engagement in student success activities in the areas of service and research/scholarship. Student success activities do not represent a fourth category of evaluation. Rather, faculty engagement in student success activities is documented and assessed as part of the evaluation of teaching, service, and/or

329 research/scholarship. Faculty are directed to the College of Arts & Sciences [faculty review services](#)
330 [website](#) for the current version of the college’s student success activities guide, which provides a sample
331 listing of possible student success activities and examples for documenting these activities.
332 Alternatively, faculty can refer to the [list of student success activities](#) developed by the Neuroscience
333 Institute.

335 **III. Annual Review**

337 **a. Scope of Evaluation**

339 All regular, full-time faculty members undergo annual evaluation. Each faculty member is evaluated
340 based upon their prior calendar year performance in teaching, service, and/or research/scholarship as
341 appropriate to the faculty member’s rank and assigned workload. The faculty member is responsible for
342 providing the required documentation and materials, which include an annual report, updated curriculum
343 vitae, and teaching portfolio, if teaching is part of the workload. Student success activities in teaching
344 and any other area of performance are to be noted in the documentation and materials provided (see
345 Neuroscience Institute [website](#) for a listing of possible student success activities).

347 The annual evaluation is conducted by the Institute Director in consultation with the Institute’s executive
348 committee. Annual reviews are intended to be progress-oriented, formative assessments. They aim to
349 evaluate the progress a faculty member has accomplished in a given year in teaching, service, or
350 research/scholarship, and the Institute acknowledges that the amount of work may vary from year to year
351 as projects start up, develop, and come to completion. The intent behind annual reviews is to support
352 faculty in developing professional reputations and upward trajectories.

354 All annual faculty evaluations utilize the following evaluation scale:

- 356 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 357 2 – Needs Improvement
- 358 3 – Meets Expectations
- 359 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 360 5 – Exemplary

362 Note that reviews for promotion are summative in nature and take into account the candidate’s overall
363 trajectory. Thus, a faculty member may Meet Expectations in the scope of one year but if they continue
364 on their current trajectory may not be successful in going up for promotion.

366 Faculty members who receive a 2 or lower on any area of an annual review will work with the Institute
367 Director to create a performance remediation plan (PRP). As stated in the college manual, a PRP must
368 “be measurable and relevant to the expectations within the faculty member’s academic discipline,” and
369 the “objectives must be attainable within one year”. The format the written PRP takes is described in the
370 college manual, and faculty completing PRPs in the Institute will be supported through structured
371 mentoring. Further details related to annual review and to the outcomes of annual reviews may be found
372 in the college manual.

374 **b. Ratings Guidelines**

376 For the purposes of annual reviews, teaching, service and research/scholarship shall normally be

377 evaluated according to the following standards and take into account the faculty member's rank and
378 workload. Annual reviews survey the work of a faculty member in one calendar year and focus on
379 progress in the areas appropriate to their appointment. See Section III above and in the college manual
380 for additional information about annual reviews.

381
382 **i. Teaching (1-5 scale)**

383
384 Faculty with teaching workloads that differ from the standard workload in the Neuroscience Institute
385 (*i.e.*, those with course buyouts from grants or administrative releases) will be evaluated on the quality
386 and quantity of teaching/mentoring activities that are part of their assigned duties. This must be clearly
387 documented and stated in the teaching materials submitted for annual review.

388
389 **Required elements:**

- 390 • Teaching is effective (*i.e.*, satisfactory student evaluations; peer evaluations)
- 391 • Courses are kept updated and course material reflects current knowledge in the field
- 392 • Several different pedagogical methods including active learning are incorporated into courses
393 (*i.e.*, beyond lecturing and giving exams)
- 394 • Evidence of substantial participation in student success activities

395
396 **Additional Teaching Elements:**

- 397
- 398 (a) Award(s) for instructional innovation and/or teaching/mentoring excellence
- 399 (b) Teaching- or training-focused publication in a peer-reviewed journal or well-respected education
400 outlet
- 401 (c) Significant involvement in education- and/or training-focused grant-funded programs/proposals
- 402 (d) Development of a new course
- 403 (e) Incorporation of major new pedagogical techniques and evidence-based practices in an existing
404 course
- 405 (f) Major redesign of an existing course (including modality changes)
- 406 (g) Nomination for an award for instructional innovation and/or excellence (may only claim (a) OR
407 (g) for a single award in a given year)
- 408 (h) Substantial involvement in professional development activities aimed at increasing teaching
409 efficacy
- 410 (i) Directing or instructing independent study courses (such as honors theses, practica, research, or
411 internship)
- 412 (j) Leadership role in improving pedagogy and/or mentoring throughout the Institute
- 413 (k) Peer-reviewed basic research publications with substantial undergraduate student authorship
414 beyond normal laboratory-based research activities (*e.g.*, outcomes from a course-based
415 undergraduate research experience (CURE))
- 416 (l) External conference presentations related to the science of teaching and learning
- 417 (m) Mentoring of graduate and/or undergraduate students or postdoctoral fellows/associates at a
418 level significantly above the average for the Institute.

419 Candidates in each Track will receive a rating in Teaching according to the following guidelines:

420

421

Teaching, Lecturer Track Annual Review

	Lecturer (Years 1-5)	Senior Lecturer (Years 6+)	Principal Lecturer
1 – Does not meet expectations	Missing at least one of the four required elements	Missing at least one of the four required elements	Missing at least one of the four required elements
2 – Needs Improvement	All four required elements but no additional elements	All four required elements but fewer than two additional elements	All four required elements but fewer than two additional elements
3 – Meets expectations	All four required elements, plus one additional element	All four required elements, plus two additional elements	All four required elements, plus two additional elements
4 – Exceeds Expectations	All four required elements, plus two additional elements	All four required elements, plus three additional elements	All four required elements, plus four additional elements
5 – Exemplary	All four required elements, plus four or more additional elements including at least one of a, b, or c	All four required elements, plus five or more additional elements including at least one of a, b, or c	All four required elements, plus six or more additional elements including at least one of a, b, or c

422

423

Teaching, Academic Professional Track Annual Review

	Academic Professional (Years 1-5)	Senior Academic Professional (optional years 6+)	Principal Academic Professional
1 – Does not meet expectations	Missing at least one of the four required elements	Missing at least one of the four required elements	Missing at least one of the four required elements
2 – Needs Improvement	All four required elements but no additional elements	All four required elements but fewer than two additional elements	All four required elements but fewer than two additional elements
3 – Meets expectations	All four required elements, plus one additional element	All four required elements, plus two additional elements	All four required elements, plus two additional elements
4 – Exceeds Expectations	All four required elements, plus two additional elements	All four required elements, plus three additional elements	All four required elements, plus four additional elements

5 – Exemplary	All four required elements, plus three or more additional elements including at least one of a, b, or c	All four required elements, plus four or more additional elements including at least one of a, b, or c	All four required elements, plus five or more additional elements including at least one of a, b, or c
---------------	---	--	--

424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465

ii. Service (1-5 scale)

Faculty in the Lecturer Track and Academic Professional Track have service as part of their workload assignment; those in the Research Track may have service as part of their assignment. See section II.b., above, for the categories for evaluation of service.

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations: The faculty member does not volunteer for or fulfill assigned or elected obligations responsibly, thoroughly, and effectively.

2 – Needs Improvement: The faculty member may not participate in service activities when provided the opportunity. The faculty member ineffectively fulfills assigned or elected duties or may not meet obligations in a timely manner.

3 – Meets Expectations: The faculty member conscientiously and effectively meets their service obligations at a level commensurate with their rank and/or position. The faculty member volunteers to be on the ballot for departmental, college, or university committees, but may not always be elected. In general, the faculty member effectively meets Institute obligations in a timely and effective manner and plays a major effective role in either the Neuroscience Institute, the college or university, or a professional organization when possible. This may include taking a major role in departmental, college, or university committees, oversight or training of staff, oversight of facilities and/or equipment, volunteering to serve on *ad hoc* committees or service tasks, substantial participation and planning of Institute events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. This may also include membership on committees of professional organizations, membership on advisory boards, or public outreach.

4 – Exceeds Expectations: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in both the Neuroscience Institute and in the College or University or in a professional organization, as described in the criteria for *Meets Expectations*. This may also include activities such as serving as the Chair, Vice Chair, or other important position of a significant college or university committee or service in a leadership role (*e.g.*, Chair or elected Officer) in a professional organization or advisory board. In addition, multiple activities related to student success are present.

5 - Exemplary: In addition to meeting the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the faculty member has a significant, leading effective role in more than one of the areas listed above. This may include activities such as serving as graduate or undergraduate director, or other similarly demanding activities. Substantial activities related to student success are also present.

iii. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)

Research/scholarship is only evaluated for NTT faculty in the research track. See section II.c., above for categories of evaluation for research/scholarship.

466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512

1 - Does Not Meet Expectations: The faculty member has a limited or no evidence of a significant research program during the review period, with no publications or meeting presentations and no internal or external funding or attempts to obtain external funding.

2 - Needs Improvement: The faculty member has not met the expectations of research/scholarship productivity commensurate with their rank and/or position as defined in the *Meets Expectations* rating. Limited evidence of productivity is present, such as some publications or presentations, seed grants, and submitting applications for substantial external funding, but the overall research/scholarship activities fall below those described for that faculty member's rank in *Meets Expectations*.

3 - Meets Expectations: The faculty member has an independent, productive research program commensurate with their rank. In general, the faculty member has continued to develop (for assistant research professors), or is maintaining and advancing a nationally/internationally recognized research program appropriate to rank.

For **Assistant Research Professors prior to third-year review**, the faculty member should have demonstrated activities related to developing their independent research program. This may include recruiting students and/or staff (e.g., technicians, post-doctoral fellows/associates), obtaining seed grant funding, publishing peer-reviewed article(s) (primary research articles or reviews), receiving small external funding, or submitting applications for substantial external funding. Assistant Research Professors may be publishing with a tenure-track mentor or may be carrying out research independent of any mentor. There may also be professional service activities appropriate to rank (e.g., manuscript peer review for reputable scholarly journals).

For **Assistant Research Professors after third-year review**, this should generally include published, high-quality, peer-reviewed primary research article(s), submission of applications for substantial external funding and/or obtaining substantial external funding, and may include additional items such as major conference presentations and/or invited seminars. This may also include professional service activities appropriate to rank (e.g., manuscript peer review for reputable scholarly journals).

For **Associate Research Professors and Research Professors**, this should include a sustained level of significant external funding and/or evidence of promising applications for renewing external funding or obtaining new funding. This should also generally include high quality publication(s), major conference presentation(s), and/or invited seminar(s). This also may include evidence of professional service considered under the research/scholarship category, such as peer review for scholarly journals, grant review for granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, or service as a critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations. Collaborative, interdisciplinary research in which the faculty member plays a significant role may also be included.

Additional examples of research/scholarship for all levels also include activities such as effective team management and mentoring of research staff (technicians, post-doctoral fellows, research assistant professors, staff scientists).

4 – Exceeds Expectations: The faculty member has a highly productive research program that exceeds the categories described above. The faculty member may have multiple sources of substantial external funding, multiple high-quality publications and/or presentations, multiple seminar invitations, and

513 substantial professional service, such as serving on the editorial board of relevant journals or service as
514 the chair of a grant review panel. Multiple activities related to student success are present.
515

516 **5 – Exemplary:** The faculty member has an extremely productive research program that contains
517 multiple pieces of evidence of productivity beyond the level for the categories described above.
518 Examples of productivity that fit this category may include highly significant publications in top-ranked
519 journals in the field, multiple sources of substantial external funding, prestigious national or international
520 invitations, or awards/recognitions, and very significant professional service, such as serving as the
521 senior editor of a high-quality scientific journal or as an officer of a national or international scientific
522 society. Substantial activities related to student success are present.
523

524 **IV. Third-Year Structured Review**

525
526 As outlined in the college manual, a Lecturer, Academic Professional, or Research Assistant Professor
527 in their third year prepares a dossier for review that describes their teaching, service, and/or
528 research/scholarship accomplishments as appropriate for the type of appointment and workload
529 distribution. Evidence of student success activities is required for teaching and may be reported for
530 service or research/scholarship, as appropriate.
531

532 **a. Scope of Evaluation**

533
534 The third-year review has similarities to promotion reviews, but the purpose of the third-year review is
535 to encourage an assessment and dialogue of the faculty member's accomplishments, strengths, and
536 weaknesses up to that point. The third-year review provides advice on improving performance and how
537 to address possible deficiencies before the fifth-year review. While the faculty member under third year
538 review should be familiar with the Neuroscience Institute guidelines and College Faculty Review
539 Manual as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit
540 of the third year review is different from that of the promotion review. While extremely important, the
541 third year review is more formative; it is meant to encourage a progress-oriented assessment of, and
542 dialogue about, the faculty member's achievements to date.
543

544 If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Institute
545 Director and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next two years. If the
546 faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion decision, the Institute Director
547 will acknowledge such progress. The Neuroscience Institute wishes to nurture the faculty member so
548 that, ideally, they will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion.
549

550 For details on the timing of the third-year review, the preparation of the dossier, the submission of
551 materials, and the performance remediation plan, see the college manual.
552

553 **b. Ratings Guidelines**

554
555 Ratings for Third-Year Structured Reviews use a 5-point scale similar to that used in Annual Reviews.
556

557 **i. Teaching**

558
559 Faculty with teaching workloads that differ from the standard workload in the Neuroscience Institute

560 (i.e., those with course buyouts from grants or administrative releases) will be evaluated on the quality
561 and quantity of teaching/mentoring activities that are part of their assigned duties. This must be clearly
562 documented and stated in the teaching materials submitted for review. See section II.a., above, for the
563 categories of evaluation for teaching.
564

565 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member displays an ineffective or unacceptable record of
566 teaching as evidenced by low student evaluations or evaluations well below average, low-quality or
567 absent teaching materials, and/or limited or ineffective teaching. A pattern of complaints or evidence of
568 unprofessional activity may also be considered. Limited or no student success activities are present.
569

570 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member's record shows evidence of adequate or effective teaching
571 based on the criteria listed for *Meets Expectations*. Activities related to student success are limited.
572

573 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member's record shows evidence for highly effective teaching in
574 the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship, which includes: strong, positive student
575 perceptions and evidence of teaching effectiveness from student evaluations; updated course materials
576 reflecting the current state of knowledge and/or learning outcome assessments; and evidence of
577 implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches. Peer evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
578 as evidence of effective performance in the classroom. Activities related to student success are also
579 present.
580

581 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to being highly effective based on the criteria for *Meets*
582 *Expectations*, the faculty member's record shows additional evidence for advanced teaching
583 performance, such as the development of new courses, strong evidence of teaching creativity supported
584 by material in the teaching portfolio, substantial involvement in professional development aimed at
585 improving teaching efficacy, serving as a chair of thesis or dissertation committees, or honors or special
586 recognition for teaching. Multiple activities related to student success are present. In addition to the
587 criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member presents evidence in support of two additional
588 elements as detailed below.
589

590 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the record shows additional evidence
591 for exceptional teaching performance such as development of new educational programs, obtaining
592 teaching grants, publishing in teaching journals, or special honors or recognitions for
593 teaching/mentoring. Substantial activities related to student success are also present. In addition to the
594 criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member presents evidence in support of four additional
595 elements, of which one of these must be in category (a), (b), or (c) as detailed below.
596

597 **Additional Teaching Elements:** 598

- 599 (a) Award(s) for instructional innovation and/or teaching/mentoring excellence
- 600 (b) Teaching- or training-focused publication in a peer-reviewed journal or well-respected education
601 outlet
- 602 (c) Significant involvement in education- and/or training-focused grant-funded programs/proposals
- 603 (d) Development of a new course
- 604 (e) Incorporation of major new pedagogical techniques and evidence-based practices in an existing
605 course
- 606 (f) Major redesign of an existing course (including modality changes)

- 607 (g) Nomination for an award for instructional innovation and/or excellence (may only claim (a) OR
608 (g) for a single award in a given year)
- 609 (h) Substantial involvement in professional development activities aimed at increasing teaching
610 efficacy
- 611 (i) Directing or instructing independent study courses (such as honors theses, practica, research, or
612 internship)
- 613 (j) Leadership role in improving pedagogy and/or mentoring throughout the Institute
- 614 (k) Peer-reviewed basic research publications with substantial undergraduate student authorship
615 beyond normal laboratory-based research activities (e.g., outcomes from a course-based
616 undergraduate research experience (CURE))
- 617 (l) External conference presentations related to science of teaching and learning
- 618 (m) Mentoring of graduate and/or undergraduate students or postdoctoral fellows/associates at a level
619 significantly above the average for the Institute.

620

621 **ii. Service**

622

623 This category is applicable to faculty in the Lecturer Track and Academic Appointment Track, and may
624 be applicable to faculty in the Research Track, depending on the nature of their appointment. See section
625 II.b., above, for the categories of evaluation for service.

626

627 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member does not volunteer for or fulfill assigned or
628 elected obligations, responsibly, thoroughly, and effectively.

629

630 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member may not participate in service activities when provided
631 the opportunity. The faculty member ineffectively fulfills assigned or elected duties or may not meet
632 obligations in a timely manner.

633

634 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member conscientiously and effectively meets their service
635 obligations at a level commensurate with their rank and/or position. The faculty member volunteers to
636 be on the ballot for departmental committees, but may not always be elected. In general, the faculty
637 member effectively meets Institute obligations in a timely and effective manner and plays a major
638 effective role in the Neuroscience Institute. This may include taking a major role in departmental
639 committees, oversight or training of staff, oversight of facilities and/or equipment, volunteering to serve
640 on *ad hoc* committees or service tasks, substantial participation and planning of Institute events, or heavy
641 involvement in student recruitment efforts. This may also include membership on committees of
642 professional organizations, membership on advisory boards, or public outreach.

643

644 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the
645 faculty member has a major effective role in both the Neuroscience Institute and in the college or
646 university or in a professional organization, as described in the criteria for *Meets Expectations*. In
647 addition, multiple activities related to student success are present.

648

649 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to meeting the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the faculty member has a
650 significant, leading effective role in more than one of the areas listed above. Substantial activities related
651 to student success are also present.

652

653

654 **iii. Research/Scholarship**

655

656 This category is applicable only to faculty in the research track and includes the evaluation of items listed
657 in Section II.c., above.

658

659 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member has no or only very limited research productivity,
660 with no or only one or two publications or meeting presentations.

661

662 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member has moderate research productivity. There are a few
663 publications in peer-reviewed journals or meeting presentations.

664

665 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member has an emerging nationally recognized research program
666 with high quality refereed publications, and presentations at national or international meetings. If the
667 faculty member is self-supporting there is sufficient external funding and evidence of obtaining new
668 funding, as appropriate. There is evidence of professional service. Professional service considered under
669 the research/scholarship category includes peer review for scholarly journals, grant review for granting
670 agencies, membership on evaluation panels, or service as a critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional
671 organizations.

672

673 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to meeting the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member
674 has obtained new independent external funding and has several high-quality publications as well as
675 additional professional service beyond that described for *Meets Expectations*.

676

677 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the record shows an emerging
678 internationally recognized research program with additional evidence for exceptional performance in
679 research/scholarship, such as highly significant publications and independent funding, prestigious
680 national or international invitations, and significant professional service. Prestigious invitations include
681 those for invited speaker at major national or international conferences, or important national or
682 international professional workshops, or invited seminar speaker at other universities.

683

684 **V. Promotion Reviews**

685

686 Lecturer and Academic Professional candidates for promotion are evaluated in two areas: teaching and
687 service (to the department, college, university, community, and profession). Faculty in the Research
688 Professor track are evaluated in research/scholarship and may be evaluated in other areas, depending on
689 the details of their appointment. In each of the areas, candidates are evaluated based on whether or not
690 the candidate has met expectations for promotion. Evaluations should take into account expectations
691 appropriate to the rank under consideration and the mission and needs of the Neuroscience Institute, the
692 College, and of the University. Evaluation for promotion will consider prior year annual reviews, is
693 summative in nature, and assesses the candidate's trajectory.

694

695 Candidates evaluated in teaching must address their student success activities. Candidates evaluated in
696 research/scholarship or service *may* address their student success activities in relation to these areas.

697

698 All NTT faculty in promotable ranks go through a cumulative review in their fifth year since hire.
699 Whereas Lecturers **must** apply for promotion, Academic Professionals and Research Assistant
700 Professors **may** apply for promotion in this review. Academic Professionals and Research Assistant

701 Professors who elect not to apply for promotion in the fifth year will undergo a five-year structured
702 review (see Section VI).

703

704 **a. Lecturer Track Faculty**

705

706 **i. Standards for the Rank of Senior Lecturer (*Initial Fifth-Year Review*)**

707

708 **Teaching**

709 As stated in the college manual, promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is available to candidates
710 whose teaching is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will have met the expectations if their
711 dossier indicates that they have been effective across instructional categories including course content,
712 course development, student perceptions, and student success, instructional, and mentoring activities
713 both in and beyond the classroom. In general, the candidate shows consistently high levels of
714 achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. Evidence presented in the dossier must
715 include the following three required elements:

716

717 1. Teaching is effective and/or mentoring roles are fulfilled as evaluated by a combination of course
718 materials that demonstrate diligent preparation and reflect the current state of knowledge in the field,
719 and student evaluations that suggest effective performance in the classroom and consistently reflect wide
720 student satisfaction. Peer evaluations of teaching may also be submitted as evidence of effective
721 performance in the classroom.

722

723 2. Candidates demonstrate implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches in courses or mentoring
724 that extend beyond didactic lecture. This may include teaching courses that involve university initiatives
725 (e.g., WAC, study abroad, experiential learning, or current quality enhancement plan (QEP) initiatives);
726 active learning strategies; innovative use of technology; and/or evidence-based strategies for inclusive
727 mentoring (e.g. individual development plans or IDPs).

728

729 3. Evidence of substantial participation in activities related to student success. Candidates are directed
730 to refer to the Neuroscience Institute guidelines on student success activities posted on the Institute
731 website.

732

733 **Service**

734 As stated in the college manual, promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is available to candidates
735 whose service is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will be judged as meeting expectations
736 if they have been effective in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed
737 Institute-level service tasks. In addition, candidates may be active in college or university service tasks
738 or have provided service to community, governmental, or professional organizations. Candidates should
739 provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible and should document service activities
740 relevant to student success.

741

742 **ii. Standards for the Rank of Principal Lecturer**

743

744 **Teaching**

745 As stated in the college manual, promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is available to candidates
746 whose teaching is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will have met expectations if their
747 dossier demonstrates high-quality teaching across instructional categories including course content,

748 course development, student perceptions, and student success, instructional, and mentoring activities
749 both in and beyond the classroom. In general, the candidate should show consistently high levels of
750 achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. In addition, candidates will have developed
751 new courses or engaged in a major redesign of an existing course (which may include modality changes).
752 Evidence presented in the dossier must include the following five required elements:
753

754 1. Teaching is highly effective as evaluated by a combination of course materials that demonstrate
755 impressive preparation and reflect the current state of knowledge in the field; student evaluations that
756 suggest effective performance in the classroom and consistently reflect wide student satisfaction;
757 evidence of effective student mentoring is present. Peer evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
758 as evidence of effective performance in the classroom.
759

760 2. Candidates demonstrate implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches that extend beyond
761 didactic lecture. This may include updating courses to incorporate new evidence-based pedagogical
762 techniques; teaching courses that involve university initiatives (*e.g.*, WAC, study abroad, experiential
763 learning, or current QEP initiatives); active learning strategies; innovative use of technology; and/or
764 evidence-based strategies for inclusive mentoring (*e.g.*, IDPs).
765

766 3. Involvement in non-course related training or mentoring (*e.g.*, supervising graduate student,
767 undergraduate student, and/or postdoctoral fellow/associate research; service on exam, thesis or
768 dissertation committees; supervision of undergraduate theses, practica, independent study projects). It is
769 expected that the candidate will have mentored students and effectiveness can be demonstrated by
770 evidence of student accomplishments.
771

772 4. Evidence of new course development and/or a major redesign of an existing course (including
773 modality changes).
774

775 5. Evidence of substantial participation in student success activities. Candidates are directed to refer to
776 the Neuroscience Institute guidelines on student success activities hosted on the Institute website.
777

778 **Service**

779 As stated in the college manual, promotion to the ranks of Principal Lecturer is available to candidates
780 whose service is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will be judged as meeting expectations
781 if they have been consistently effective in providing assistance to colleagues, sometimes in a leadership
782 capacity, and if they have consistently, willingly, and responsibly performed significant Institute-level
783 service tasks. Candidates are expected to have contributed significant service beyond the Institute level,
784 whether to the college, university, community or profession, including some leadership service.
785 Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible and should
786 document service activities relevant to student success.
787

788 **b. Academic Professional Track Faculty**

789 **i. Standards for the Rank of Senior Academic Professional**

792 **Teaching**

793 As stated in the college manual, promotion to the rank of Senior Academic Professional is available to
794 candidates whose teaching is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will have met the

795 expectations if their dossier indicates that they have been effective across instructional categories
796 including course content, course development, student perceptions, and student success, instructional,
797 and mentoring activities both in and beyond the classroom. In general, the candidate shows consistently
798 high levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. Evidence presented in the
799 dossier must include the following three required elements:

800
801 1. Teaching is effective and/or mentoring roles are fulfilled as evaluated by a combination of course
802 materials that demonstrate diligent preparation and reflect the current state of knowledge in the field;
803 student evaluations that suggest effective performance in the classroom and consistently reflect wide
804 student satisfaction. Peer evaluations of teaching may also be submitted as evidence of effective
805 performance in the classroom.

806
807 2. Candidates demonstrate implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches in courses or mentoring
808 that extend beyond didactic lecture. This may include teaching courses that involve university initiatives
809 (*e.g.*, WAC, study abroad, experiential learning, or current quality enhancement plan (QEP) initiatives);
810 active learning strategies; innovative use of technology; and/or evidence-based strategies for inclusive
811 mentoring (*e.g.* IDPs).

812
813 3. Evidence of substantial participation in activities related to student success. Candidates are directed
814 to refer to the Neuroscience Institute guidelines on student success activities posted on the Institute
815 website.

816
817 **Service**

818
819 Service is a major component of the role of Academic Professional, accounting for at least 51% of their
820 effort each year. As stated in the college manual, promotion to the rank of Senior Academic Professional
821 is available to candidates whose service is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will be judged
822 as meeting expectations if they have been effective in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and
823 responsibly performed Institute-level service tasks. In addition, candidates may be active in college or
824 university service tasks or have provided service to community, governmental, or professional
825 organizations. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible and
826 should document service activities relevant to student success.

827
828 **ii. Standards for the Rank of Principal Academic Professional**

829
830 **Teaching**

831 As stated in the college manual, promotion to the rank of Principal Academic Professional is available
832 to candidates whose teaching is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will have met the
833 expectations if their dossier demonstrates high-quality teaching across instructional categories including
834 course content, course development, student perceptions, and student success, instructional, and
835 mentoring activities both in and beyond the classroom. In general, the candidate should show
836 consistently high levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. In addition,
837 candidates will have developed new courses or engaged in a major redesign of an existing course
838 (including modality changes). Evidence presented in the dossier must include the following five required
839 elements:

840
841 1. Teaching is highly effective as evaluated by a combination of course materials that demonstrate

842 impressive preparation and reflect the current state of knowledge in the field; student evaluations that
843 suggest effective performance in the classroom and consistently reflect wide student satisfaction;
844 evidence of effective student mentoring is present. Peer evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
845 as evidence of effective performance in the classroom.

846
847 2. Candidates demonstrate implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches that extend beyond
848 didactic lecture. This may include updating courses to incorporate new evidence-based pedagogical
849 techniques; teaching courses that involve university initiatives (*e.g.*, WAC, study abroad, experiential
850 learning, or current QEP initiatives); active learning strategies; innovative use of technology; and/or
851 evidence-based strategies for inclusive mentoring (*e.g.*, IDPs).

852
853 3. Involvement in non-course related training or mentoring (*e.g.*, supervising graduate student,
854 undergraduate student, and/or postdoctoral fellow/associate research; service on exam, thesis or
855 dissertation committees; supervision of undergraduate theses, practica, independent study projects). It is
856 expected that the candidate will have mentored students and effectiveness can be demonstrated by
857 evidence of student accomplishments.

858
859 4. Evidence of new course development and/or a major redesign of an existing course (including
860 modality changes).

861
862 5. Evidence of substantial participation in student success activities. Candidates are directed to refer to
863 the Neuroscience Institute guidelines on student success activities hosted on the Institute website.

864
865 **Service**

866 Service is a major component of the role of Academic Professional, accounting for at least 51% of their
867 effort each year. As stated in the college manual, promotion to the ranks of Principal Senior Academic
868 Professional is available to candidates whose service is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate
869 will be judged as meeting expectations if they have been consistently effective in providing assistance
870 to colleagues, sometimes in a leadership capacity, and if they have consistently, willingly, and
871 responsibly performed significant Institute-level service tasks. Candidates are expected to have
872 contributed significant service beyond the Institute level, whether to the college, university, community
873 or profession, including some leadership service. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of
874 their service wherever possible and should document service activities relevant to student success.

875
876 **C. Research Track Faculty**

877
878 **i. Standards for the Rank of Associate Research Professor**

879
880 The core mission of Research Track faculty is to conduct neuroscience research. Teaching and/or Service
881 are generally not required, but may be included, depending on the details of the appointment. For
882 standards relating to teaching and service for the rank of Associate Research Professor, refer to those
883 listed in Section V.a.i, above.

884
885 **Research/Scholarship**

886 Promotion to the rank of Associate Research Professor requires that the candidate's research/scholarship
887 is judged as meeting expectations. To meet expectations for promotion to Associate Research Professor,
888 the candidate is expected to have developed an independent research program with an emerging national

889 reputation, and to be making significant contributions to the advancement and development of their
890 discipline within the broad field of neuroscience.

891

892 At a minimum, the candidate is expected to have published (or have in press) a body of several peer-
893 reviewed primary literature publications in nationally or internationally significant presses. The Institute
894 recognizes that the number of publications appropriate for promotion may vary, depending on
895 disciplinary norms, how comprehensive individual primary literature articles are, the impact factor
896 of journals, and/or other considerations.

897

898 The candidate is expected to have established a record as Principal Investigator (PI) on an extramural
899 grant or grants. While viewed favorably, funding as Co-PI or Co-I, or as PI on intramural seed grants, is
900 generally not sufficient to merit promotion to the rank of Associate Research Professor. In cases where
901 the candidate is Co-PI or Co-I, a central role and strong intellectual contribution is expected and should
902 be clearly documented. Efforts to secure extramural funding as PI, even if unsuccessful, may be
903 presented. Indication of effort to secure funding may include copies of proposals and reviewers'
904 comments on proposals. If a candidate elects to submit reviewers' comments for any proposal, then the
905 full set of comments and scores received from the agency must be provided.

906

907 The candidate is expected to have made presentations at national conferences/seminars and to have
908 played active roles in professional service.

909

910 The Neuroscience Institute recognizes that different disciplines have different levels of federal and
911 other funding available. The candidate should seek funding levels appropriate to their discipline.
912 Individual project budgets from grants, contracts, and subcontracts may vary widely, and the norm for
913 certain disciplines may be higher or lower. In general, a small extramural grant represents <\$50,000
914 per year in direct costs, while a medium size grant represents \$50,000-\$100,000 per year in direct costs
915 and a large, major extramural grant represents >\$100,000 per year in direct costs.

916

917 **ii. Standards for the Rank of Research Professor**

918

919 The core mission of research track faculty is to conduct neuroscience research. Teaching and/or Service
920 are generally not required, but may be, depending on the details of the appointment. For standards
921 relating to teaching and service for the rank of Research Professor, refer to those listed for the rank of
922 Principal Lecturer, Section V.a.ii.]

923

924 **Research**

925 Promotion to the rank of Research Professor requires that the candidate's research/scholarship is judged
926 as meeting expectations. To meet expectations for promotion to Research Professor, the candidate is
927 expected to have produced a substantial record of scholarship and achieved a clearly established
928 international reputation in their discipline. Expected accomplishments must include the establishment
929 and maintenance at Georgia State University of an independent research program that has yielded a
930 substantial body of peer-reviewed primary literature publications in nationally or internationally
931 significant presses. The Institute recognizes that the number of publications appropriate for promotion
932 may vary, depending on disciplinary norms, how comprehensive individual primary literature articles
933 are, the impact factor of journals, and/or other considerations.

934

935 The candidate has maintained a consistent record of securing major extramural grants (as defined above)

936 as PI according to subdisciplinary norms.

937

938 The candidate has made presentations at national and/or international conferences/seminars and has
939 played leadership and/or highly significant roles in service to the profession.

940

941 **VI. Five-Year Structured Review**

942

943 All NTT faculty in promotable tracks go through a comprehensive structured review every five years,
944 even if the faculty member is not applying for promotion or has reached the highest rank. Review without
945 application for promotion is denoted “structured review.”

946

947 **a. Scope of Evaluation**

948

949 The purpose of the five-year structured reviews is to employ a formative process that will connect the
950 review of prior work (*e.g.*, annual reviews) with ongoing discussion of a faculty member’s goal setting,
951 development, and workload profile. The five-year review dossier describes a faculty member’s teaching,
952 service, and/or research/scholarship accomplishments as appropriate for the type of appointment and
953 workload distribution. Evidence of student success activities in teaching must be documented (if relevant
954 to the faculty member’s appointment) and may also be present in other areas of evaluation.

955

956 For details on the timing of the five-year structured review, the preparation of the dossier, and the
957 submission of materials, see the college manual.

958

959 **b. Ratings Guidelines for Five-Year Structured Review:**

960

961 The evaluation and rating procedures for Structured Review are on a 5-point scale similar to that of
962 Annual Reviews and Third-Year Reviews. The Annual Reviews for the years covering the evaluation
963 period will be included in the overall review. For a description of evaluation factors see Section II, and
964 for Ratings Guidelines see Section III, above. Note that ratings for the five-year structured review may
965 differ from those of past annual reviews, however, as the five-year structured review is summative in
966 nature and takes the faculty member’s trajectory into account.