

**NEUROSCIENCE INSTITUTE
TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW GUIDELINES
COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Policy Title:	Neuroscience Institute Tenure Track Faculty Review Guidelines
Version:	5
Department Approval:	03/09/2023
College Approval:	11/17/2023

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts & Sciences 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
Tenure Track Faculty Review Guidelines**

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. General Evaluation Factors	1
A. Research/Scholarship	2
B. Teaching	5
C. Service	7
D. Student Success Activities	8
III. Annual Review	9
A. Scope of Evaluation	9
B. Ratings Guidelines	10
i. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)	10
ii. Teaching (1-5 scale)	11
iii. Service (1-5 scale)	12
IV. Pre-Tenure Review	13
A. Scope of Evaluation	13
B. Ratings Guidelines	14
i. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)	14
ii. Teaching (1-5 scale)	14
iii. Service (1-5 scale)	16
V. Promotion and/or Tenure Review	16
A. Standards for the Rank of Associate Professor	17
i. Research/Scholarship	18
ii. Teaching	18
iii. Service	19
B. Standards for the Rank of Professor	20
i. Research/Scholarship	20
ii. Teaching	21
iii. Service	22
VI. Post-Tenure Review	22
A. Scope of Evaluation	22
B. Ratings Guidelines	22
i. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)	22
ii. Teaching (1-5 scale)	23
iii. Service (1-5 scale)	24

1 **I. Introduction**

2
3 This set of guidelines provides the review criteria and performance expectations for tenure track faculty
4 in the Neuroscience Institute. Candidates should consult the College of Arts & Sciences Tenure Track
5 Faculty Review Manual for information on review processes and procedures, dossier requirements,
6 definitions of review periods, and time-in-rank policies that determine eligibility for promotion
7 consideration.

8
9 Faculty are directed to the College of Arts & Sciences [faculty review services website](#) for current
10 versions of the College manual, review calendars, and a student success activities guide, which provides
11 a sample listing of possible student success activities and examples for documenting these activities.
12 Alternatively, faculty can refer to the list of student success activities developed by the Neuroscience
13 Institute and posted on the Neuroscience Institute [website](#).

14
15 The process of granting promotion and/or tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring the quality of
16 scholarship, teaching, and service in the university. The process is intended to be both thorough and fair.
17 The Neuroscience Institute has formulated these promotion and/or tenure guidelines in conformity with
18 the general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the
19 Georgia State University Promotion & Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors, and
20 the Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual of the College of Arts & Sciences. The policies, procedures,
21 and standards of the Regents, University, and College take precedence over and govern the material in
22 these guidelines.

23
24 Before a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the Neuroscience Institute can be nominated by the
25 Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure and the Neuroscience Institute Director for
26 consideration by the College area promotion and tenure committee, they must be judged to have met the
27 expectations and criteria given in the current Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual of the College of
28 Arts & Sciences and the supplemental criteria listed in this document. Any faculty member who might
29 be considered for promotion and/or tenure should carefully study the criteria, requirements, and
30 procedures that are outlined in both documents.

31
32 The goal of this document is to describe the criteria and specific expectations for performance and
33 achievement in line with promotion and/or tenure in the Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State
34 University. To that end, this document is intended to be entirely consistent with University and College
35 policies on promotion and/or tenure. In the event of conflict, the policies, procedures, and standards of
36 the Regents, University, and College take precedence over and govern the material in these guidelines.
37 In many instances, wording in this document mirrors that in the University and College manuals.
38 Candidates are directed to both the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured
39 and Tenure-Track Professors and the College of Arts & Sciences Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual
40 for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion, and
41 for details on the University and College expectations. The candidate is responsible for providing
42 necessary evidence and justification that their record of accomplishment meets the criteria set forth in
43 this document.

44
45 **II. General Evaluation Factors**

46
47 The Neuroscience Institute is a complex and multifaceted organization with a wide variety of
48 responsibilities in research/scholarship, teaching and service. The conscientious participation of all

49 faculty members is highly valued. This document outlines the important aspects of effective and helpful
50 participation in the field of Neuroscience and in the Neuroscience Institute, with specific emphasis on
51 how participation is recognized in promotion and/or tenure.

52
53 As described in the University Policy on Promotion and Tenure, all candidates for promotion and/or
54 tenure will be evaluated in three areas: research/scholarship, teaching, and service. In addition, faculty
55 members are required to document student success activities in teaching and may document student
56 success activities in research/scholarship and service.

57
58 Research/scholarship includes academic achievement in research, other forms of scholarship, and some
59 types of professional service. Teaching includes classroom teaching, mentoring students inside and
60 outside the classroom, and when appropriate, professional practice. Service includes departmental,
61 college, university, some types of professional service, and some types of public service that involve
62 professional expertise. The Neuroscience Institute values all of these areas highly and has established
63 specific expectations for performance by its members in each one. At the time of promotion and/or
64 tenure, candidates will be evaluated as to whether or not they have met the expectations for promotion
65 and/or tenure. In accordance with the College of Arts & Sciences Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual,
66 in order to meet the expectations for promotion, the candidate must meet expectations in
67 research/scholarship, teaching, and service appropriate to rank.

68
69 For science education faculty, specific criteria apply such that research/scholarship may include
70 laboratory research and/or science education research, but teaching and service categories may not
71 include activities also listed under research/scholarship.

72 73 **A. Research/Scholarship**

74
75 The evaluation of research/scholarship is based primarily on the candidate's consistent publication
76 record of original scholarly research (*e.g.*, peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, and/or books) along
77 with additional scholarly work significant to the profession (*e.g.*, published abstracts, conference
78 presentations, seminar invitations, significant professional service, disclosure of inventions and
79 technology transfer), as well as extramural grant funding. The candidate may include evidence of student
80 success activities, as appropriate. The candidate must submit evidence of research/scholarship organized
81 according to the categories of research/scholarship activity listed in the College Manual.

82
83 The Neuroscience Institute recognizes that research/scholarship can take many forms and that individual
84 candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in the profession. The following
85 evidence may be considered in assessing research/scholarship.

86
87 Candidates with a primary contract (or mission) in the area of science education must present evidence
88 of research/scholarship in science education or laboratory/field research or both. Evidence of the
89 development of successful liaison programs with other Departments, Colleges, and sectors of the K-12
90 education system may be present. The documentation of independent scholarship or these liaison
91 programs should include evidence of vigorous involvement and success in procurement of intramural
92 and extramural support for program implementation. Pedagogical publications (*i.e.*, the scholarship of
93 teaching and learning) are typically considered as contributions to teaching. However, this type of
94 publication can be considered in the area of research/scholarship for candidates with a primary contract
95 appointment in the area of science education. If a candidate elects to present pedagogical publications
96 as evidence of research/scholarship impact, then the candidate should clearly demonstrate the work's

97 impact on the development of a nationally or internationally significant research program.

98

99 1. *Publications*

100

101 As appropriate to rank, the candidate is expected to have developed an independent research program of
102 national reputation that has resulted in senior/corresponding and/or first authored works published in
103 rigorous, peer-reviewed journals of nationally or internationally significant presses. The dossier should
104 provide evidence of the disciplinary importance of the publishing venues, and the impacts of the
105 candidate's publications. Examples of impacts and disciplinary importance may include, but are not
106 limited to, publication citation rates, journal impact factors, journal quartile rankings, external reviewer
107 assessments, and published indices of scholarly productivity. Typically, these peer reviewed
108 publications appear in journals that are ranked in the first-to-second quartile (Q1-Q2) according to the
109 following databases: Scopus, Scimago, or Web of Science/Clarivate.

110

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

122

123 2. *Extramural Funding*

124

125 Extramural funding is typically in the form of grants, fellowships, contracts, and sub-contracts.
126 Extramural funding is a significant indication of research productivity because 1) it allows the candidate
127 to pay for research needs and to support undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral trainees; and 2)
128 success in obtaining peer-reviewed or competitive grants is a strong indication of the significance of the
129 proposed research. Faculty members are expected to seek and/or acquire the extramural funding required
130 to carry out their research programs. Research grants, contracts, fellowships, and seed grants should
131 normally be nationally/internationally competitive and peer-reviewed.

132

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

139

140 The candidate's leadership in research design is signified by PI (including MPI), Co-PI, or Co-I status
141 on attempted or successful grants. Funding as Co-PI or Co-I is of value, but the candidate's record should
142 indicate attempts, even if unsuccessful, to obtain funding as PI, as an indication of an independent
143 research program. In cases where the candidate is Co-PI or Co-I, a central role and strong intellectual
144 contribution should be clearly explained. In cases where there is clear upward trajectory and a judgement

145 that a candidate's research program is highly competitive, small/medium extramural grants and/or
146 indication of efforts to secure major extramural funding may be considered.

147

148 Indication of effort to secure funding may include copies of proposals and reviewers' comments on
149 proposals. If a candidate elects to submit reviewers' comments for any proposal, then the full set of
150 comments and scores received from the agency must be provided.

151

152 3. *Conference Presentations*

153

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

158

159 4. *Invitations*

160

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

166

167 5. *Significant Professional Service*

168

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

175

176 6. *Disclosure of inventions/technology transfer*

177

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

184

185 7. *Other*

186

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

190

191

192 **B. Teaching**

193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240

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

The evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate's submission of documentation organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the College Manual. In addition to the categories listed there, discipline-specific student success activities related to teaching must be documented.

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

Based on the evidence submitted, the Neuroscience Institute Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee will evaluate the candidate's teaching according to the major categories described in the College Manual. The materials submitted will be used to evaluate the candidate's instructional contribution in four general areas: 1) Course content; 2) Course development; 3) Student evaluations; and 4) Student success, instructional, and mentoring activities (both course-related and non-course related); and may include 5) Publications in education or pedagogical journals.

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

2) Course Development: Effective course development is evidenced by the candidate's instructional contribution to the range and scope of courses offered by the Neuroscience Institute and the way in which those courses fulfill the mission of the Institute and serve to address its curricular needs. Effective course development should enhance the Institute's offerings, and, when possible, align with University teaching initiatives such as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) courses and/or provide Signature Experience activities. Evidence of course development that aligns with the University's Strategic Plan and Quality Enhancement Plan will also be considered in high regard. A teaching philosophy may provide background and reflection on course development. Course development, course revisions, and use of student-centered practices in addressing instructional delivery and approaches to learning outcomes are also examples of student success activities.

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
282
283
284
285
286
287
288

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

4) Student Success, Instructional, and Mentoring Activities. The Institute considers student success, instructional, and mentoring activities inside and outside the traditional classroom setting central to its educational mission. Instructional activities beyond the candidate’s classroom may include guest lectures given in colleagues’ classes, among other activities. The Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure will consider the candidate’s effective supervision of independent studies, practica, undergraduate and graduate thesis development and writing, research mentoring, supervision of internships, or the development of service-learning and public outreach opportunities. Student accomplishments (*e.g.*, publications, presentations, awards/honors) under the candidate’s mentorship will be given more weight than the number of students, though mentoring workload will also contribute to the overall evaluation. The Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure will also consider research and career-oriented mentoring, including supporting students preparing for conference presentations, integrating career competencies into coursework, reviewing fellowship or grant applications, or supporting the development of mentorship skills among students and colleagues. Advising students on their post-graduate activities and writing letters of recommendation on their behalf will also be considered in this category. As mentoring and advising adapts to meet students’ needs, the Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure recognizes that this description of student success, instructional, and mentoring activities is not exhaustive. Further guidance is provided in lists made available by the College of Arts & Sciences and the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Online Education, as well as Institute-specific guidance on student success activities available on the Neuroscience Institute website.

5) Publications in Education or Pedagogical Journals and/or External Grants for Teaching, Pedagogy, and/or Research Training. Publications contributing to the scholarship of teaching and learning are valued. Such publications may be considered in research/scholarship (with justification) or teaching, but not in both. As with publications considered under research/scholarship, publications considered under teaching should be in rigorous peer-reviewed literature. In addition, grants specifically supporting instructional, pedagogical, or training programs, fellowships and stipends for undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs may be included. Competitive internal grants supporting teaching may also be applicable.

C. Service

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
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336

The Neuroscience Institute is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the Institute, the College, the University, and to local and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and international professional organizations. Those service activities that are related to the candidate's areas of professional expertise will be included in an evaluation of their service. The candidate may include evidence of student success activities, as appropriate. While the expectations for the quantity and quality of service work will be higher for those seeking promotion to Professor than for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor, cooperation and a commitment to shared responsibility is a highly valued quality in all candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure in the Neuroscience Institute.

The candidate must submit documentation of service organized according to the categories of service listed in the College Manual. Complete descriptions for any service category must be provided by the candidate along with explanatory documentation, when possible. Examples for each category of service are provided below; however, this list is not intended to be exhaustive as valued service can take many forms at many different levels.

- Contributions to Student Success Activities: Serving in student-oriented administrative roles or on student-focused committees; supporting student organizations; promoting student recruitment and retention; advancing alumni relationships and involvement; facilitating student involvement in professional organizations or community partnerships; engaging in mentoring, advising, and student wellness.
- Contributions to the Institute: Chairing institute-level committees, memberships on committees, development of programs and activities, participation in major institute-sponsored activities; holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment; supervision of the purchase, repair, and maintenance of department research infrastructure.
- Contributions to the College, University, or University System: Committees served on or chaired at the College or University level; serving on the University Senate; holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment (e.g., University Research Centers).
- Support of local, state, national, or international professional organizations: Consultations; memberships on advisory boards; professional conference organization; professional offices held.
- Assistance to colleagues: Consultations concerning student issues; collaborations with other University departments and programs; providing technical training in field, laboratory, or other analytical methods; faculty mentoring.
- Significant discipline-related community service: Community lectures; speeches; presentations; short courses; hosting conferences; engaging 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.

Professional service (e.g., serving as a peer reviewer for journals in the candidate's discipline/area of interest; serving as a reviewer or panelist for national level funding agencies; serving on editorial boards of peer reviewed journals or as an associate editor, discipline editor, or editor-in-chief) is considered part of research/scholarship and does not circumvent or replace expected quality or quantity of service to the institution. Should there be disagreement about the classification of a service item, the view of the Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure will be decided by majority vote. No item may count in more than one category.

337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384

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

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

2. *Quantity of Service Work Performed*: Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with rank? Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with an equitable distribution of service responsibilities in the Institute? Do they consistently accept reasonable service requirements when asked? If being considered for promotion to Professor, has the candidate assumed major service roles beyond the Institute? Does the candidate show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

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

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

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

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

D. A Note on Student Success Activities

As required by the University System of Georgia, in all evaluations, faculty must demonstrate engagement in student success activities in the area of teaching and may demonstrate engagement in student success activities in the areas of research/scholarship/creative activity and service. 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 research/scholarship/creative activity. Faculty are directed to the College of Arts & Sciences [faculty review services website](#) for the current version of the college’s student success activities guide, which provides a sample listing of possible student success activities and examples for documenting these activities. Alternatively, faculty can refer to the list of student success activities developed by the Neuroscience Institute, posted on the same [website](#).

III. Annual Review

385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432

A. Scope of Evaluation

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

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

Individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in the profession. It is important to recognize that annual evaluations cover a limited window of time, and that the annual review process is meant to offer colleagues a formative or developmental evaluation of their "progress toward the next level of review," as stated in the University Manual. Annual reviews offer faculty members regular opportunities to document the development of short- and long-term academic projects. Rather than focusing exclusively on the outcomes of projects that often require multiple years to complete, annual reviews acknowledge the incremental investments a faculty member makes over the life of a project. The ratings descriptions for annual reviews are calibrated for documenting progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service with respect to indicating that a faculty member has met or not met expectations in the scope of one year, however, meeting expectations in an annual review is not directly comparable to meeting expectations for promotion and/or tenure. Progress-oriented, formative assessments in annual review will be used to advise faculty that while they may meet expectations in the scope of one year, if they continue on the current trajectory, they may not be successful in going up for promotion and/or tenure.

All annual faculty evaluations utilize the following evaluation scale:

- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 5 – Exemplary

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

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
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480

B. Ratings Guidelines

i. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)

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 and/or position at Georgia State University. In general, the faculty member has continued to develop (for assistant professors prior to pre-tenure review), has developed and is advancing (assistant professors after pre-tenure review) or is maintaining and advancing a nationally/internationally recognized research program appropriate to rank.

For **Assistant Professors prior to pre-tenure review**, the faculty member should have demonstrated activities related to developing their independent research program. This may include recruiting graduate 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. It is common for faculty to publish research with their former mentors in their first years as an Assistant Professor, but there should also be clear evidence that the faculty member has independent research that is being carried out at Georgia State University. This may also include professional service activities appropriate to rank (*e.g.*, manuscript peer review for reputable scholarly journals).

For **Assistant Professors after pre-tenure 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 Professors and 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

481 funding, multiple high-quality publications and/or presentations, multiple seminar invitations, and
482 substantial professional service, such as serving on the editorial board of relevant journals or service as
483 the chair of a grant review panel. Multiple activities related to student success are present.
484

485 **5 – Exemplary:** The faculty member has an extremely productive research program that contains
486 multiple pieces of evidence of productivity beyond the level for the categories described above.
487 Examples of productivity that fit this category may include highly significant publications in top-ranked
488 journals in the field, multiple sources of substantial external funding, prestigious national or international
489 invitations, or awards/recognitions, and very significant professional service, such as serving as the
490 senior editor of a high-quality scientific journal or as an officer of a national or international scientific
491 society. Substantial activities related to student success are present.
492

493 **ii. Teaching (1-5 scale)**

494

495 Candidates with teaching workloads that differ from the standard workload in the Neuroscience Institute
496 (i.e., those candidates with course buyouts from grants or administrative releases) will be evaluated on
497 the quality and quantity of teaching/mentoring activities that are part of their assigned duties. This must
498 be clearly documented and stated in the teaching materials submitted for annual review.
499

500 **1 – Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as
501 evidenced by low student evaluations, limited or ineffective teaching or mentoring and/or a pattern of
502 complaints or evidence of unprofessional activity. Minimal or no student success activities are present.
503 More than one required element as described in *Meets Expectations* is missing or ineffective and/or
504 student complaints or Institute concerns are present.
505

506 **2 – Needs Improvement:** The faculty member displays an adequate level of teaching and mentoring at
507 a level below that described for *Meets Expectations*. The record may indicate adequate but not strong
508 student perceptions, or course materials. Effective mentoring of individual students' research projects
509 may be limited or absent. Activities related to student success are limited. At least one required element
510 as described in *Meets Expectations* is missing or ineffective.
511

512 **3 – Meets Expectations:** The faculty member's record shows evidence for effective teaching in the
513 classroom and in individual teaching and mentoring in or out of the classroom. This should include
514 strong, positive student perceptions and evidence of teaching effectiveness from student evaluations;
515 updated course materials reflecting the current state of knowledge and/or learning outcome assessments;
516 evidence of implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches into courses and mentoring; and evidence
517 of effective trainee mentoring at the graduate and/or undergraduate level, including non-course related
518 training or mentoring activities. Activities related to student success are also present.
519

520 **4 – Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to being highly effective for the criteria for *Meets Expectations*,
521 the faculty member may have taken on teaching assignments beyond their normal teaching load
522 assignment, advised a substantially large number of mentees, developed new courses, incorporated new
523 and/or innovative teaching pedagogies, had substantial involvement in professional development aimed
524 at improving teaching efficacy, had mentoring of research projects that led to student accomplishments,
525 or served a major, significant role on student committees or programs. In addition, multiple activities
526 related to student success are present. In addition to the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty
527 member presents evidence in support of three additional elements as detailed below.
528

529 **5 – Exemplary:** In addition to the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the record shows additional
530 evidence for exceptional teaching performance such as development of new educational programs,
531 obtaining teaching grants, publishing in teaching journals, or special honors or recognitions for
532 teaching/mentoring. Substantial activities related to student success are also present. In addition to the
533 criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member presents evidence in support of four additional
534 elements, of which one of these must be in category (a), (b), or (c) as detailed below.

535

536 **Additional Teaching Elements:**

537

- 538 (a) Award(s) for instructional innovation and/or teaching/mentoring excellence
- 539 (b) Teaching- or training-focused publication in a peer-reviewed journal or well-respected education
540 outlet
- 541 (c) Significant involvement in education- and/or training-focused grant-funded programs/proposals
- 542 (d) Development of a new course
- 543 (e) Incorporation of major new pedagogical techniques and evidence-based practices in an existing
544 course
- 545 (f) Major redesign of an existing course (including modality changes)
- 546 (g) Nomination for an award for instructional innovation and/or excellence (may only claim (a) OR
547 (g) in a single year)
- 548 (h) Substantial involvement in professional development activities aimed at increasing teaching
549 efficacy
- 550 (i) Directing or instructing independent study courses (such as honors theses, practica, research, or
551 internship)
- 552 (j) Leadership role in improving pedagogy and/or mentoring throughout the Institute
- 553 (k) Peer-reviewed basic research publications with substantial undergraduate student authorship
554 beyond normal laboratory-based research activities (e.g., outcomes from a course-based
555 undergraduate research experience (CURE))
- 556 (l) External conference presentations related to the science of teaching and learning
- 557 (m) Mentoring of graduate and/or undergraduate students or postdoctoral fellows/associates at a level
558 significantly above the average for the Institute.

559

560 **iii. Service (1-5 scale)**

561

562 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member does not volunteer for or fulfill assigned or
563 elected obligations responsibly, thoroughly, and effectively.

564

565 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member may not participate in service activities when provided
566 the opportunity. The faculty member ineffectively fulfills assigned or elected duties or may not meet
567 obligations in a timely manner.

568

569 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member conscientiously and effectively meets their service
570 obligations at a level commensurate with their rank and/or position. The faculty member volunteers to
571 be on the ballot for departmental, College, or University committees, but may not always be elected. In
572 general, the faculty member effectively meets Institute obligations in a timely and effective manner and
573 plays a major effective role in either the Neuroscience Institute, the College or University, or a
574 professional organization when possible. This may include taking a major role in departmental, College,
575 or University committees, oversight or training of staff, oversight of facilities and/or equipment,
576 volunteering to serve on *ad hoc* committees or service tasks, substantial participation and planning of

577 Institute events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. This may also include membership
578 on committees of professional organizations, membership on advisory boards, or public outreach.

579

580 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the
581 faculty member has a major effective role in both the Neuroscience Institute and in the College or
582 University or in a professional organization, as described in the criteria for *Meets Expectations*. This
583 may also include activities such as serving as the chair, vice chair, or other important position of a
584 significant College or University committee or service in a leadership role (e.g., chair or elected officer)
585 in a professional organization or advisory board. In addition, multiple activities related to student
586 success are present.

587

588 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to meeting the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the faculty member has a
589 significant, leading effective role in more than one of the areas listed above. This may include activities
590 such as serving as graduate or undergraduate director, Chair of the Senate, or other similar activities.
591 Substantial activities related to student success are also present.

592

593 **IV. Pre-Tenure Review**

594

595 **A. Scope of Evaluation**

596

597 The purpose of the pre-tenure review, which considers the faculty member's effectiveness in
598 research/scholarship, teaching, and service, including student success activities woven into these areas,
599 as appropriate, is to ensure that faculty members have a formative and constructive evaluation of their
600 accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and/or tenure decision.

601

602 While the faculty member under pre-tenure review should be familiar with the Neuroscience Institute
603 guidelines and use the document, as well as guidance in the College Faculty Review Manual, as a general
604 guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the pre-tenure
605 review is different from that of the promotion and/or tenure process. While extremely important, the pre-
606 tenure review is more formative; it is meant to encourage a progress-oriented assessment of, and dialogue
607 about, the faculty member's achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those
608 concerns will be acknowledged, and the Institute Director and the faculty member will discuss specific
609 ways to improve over the next two years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a
610 successful promotion and/or tenure decision, the Institute Director will acknowledge such progress. The
611 Neuroscience Institute wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, they will be in the best
612 possible position at the time of application for promotion and/or tenure.

613

614 For details on the timing of the pre-tenure review and the performance remediation plan, the preparation
615 of the dossier, and the submission of materials, see the College Manual.

616

617 **B. Rating Guidelines**

618

619 **i. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)**

620

621 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member has no or only a limited independent research
622 program with no or only sparse publications or meeting presentations. No independent funding has been
623 obtained, nor is there significant evidence of attempts to secure funding.

624

625 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member has a moderate research program. The faculty member
626 lacks a complete research portfolio, as characterized by no substantial external funding and some but not
627 all of the following activities: some high-quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, internal grants
628 or small external grants, presentations at national or international meetings and some professional
629 service. Applications for substantial external funding are lacking.

630
631 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member has an emerging nationally recognized research program
632 with high quality refereed publications, presentations at national or international meetings, evidence of
633 promising applications for external funding (demonstrated by impact scores, reviews, etc), and evidence
634 of professional service. To meet expectations, a faculty member will have published one peer-reviewed
635 primary research article as first or corresponding/senior author, while at Georgia State University, in a
636 first-to-second quartile (Q1-Q2) journal according to the following databases: Scopus, Scimago, or Web
637 of Science/Clarivate. The peer-reviewed publication could include a former postdoctoral advisor as
638 author. Professional service considered under the research/scholarship category includes peer review
639 for scholarly journals, grant review for granting agencies, membership on evaluation panels, or service
640 as a critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations.

641
642 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to meeting the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty
643 member has obtained significant external funding and has several high-quality publications as well as
644 additional professional service beyond that described for *Meets Expectations*. In addition, multiple
645 activities related to student success are present.

646
647 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the record shows an emerging
648 internationally recognized research program with additional evidence for exceptional performance in
649 research/scholarship, such as highly significant publications and funding, prestigious national or
650 international invitations, and significant professional service. Prestigious invitations include those for
651 invited speaker at major national or international conferences, or important national or international
652 professional workshops, or invited seminar speaker at other universities. Substantial activities related to
653 student success are also present.

654 **ii. Teaching (1-5 scale)**

655
656
657 Candidates with teaching workloads that differ from the standard workload in the Neuroscience Institute
658 (*i.e.*, those candidates with course buyouts from grants or administrative releases) will be evaluated on
659 the quality and quantity of teaching/mentoring activities that are part of their assigned duties. This must
660 be clearly documented and stated in the teaching materials submitted for pre-tenure review.

661
662 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member displays an ineffective or unacceptable record
663 of teaching as evidence by low student evaluations or evaluations well below average, low-quality or
664 absent teaching materials, and/or limited or ineffective teaching or mentoring. A pattern of complaints
665 or evidence of unprofessional activity may also be considered. Limited or no student success activities
666 are present.

667
668 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member's record shows evidence of adequate or effective teaching
669 and mentorship based on the criteria listed for *Meets Expectations*. Activities related to student success
670 are limited.

671

672 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member's record shows evidence for highly effective teaching in
673 the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship, which includes: strong, positive student
674 perceptions and evidence of teaching effectiveness from student evaluations; updated course materials
675 reflecting the current state of knowledge and/or learning outcome assessments; evidence of
676 implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches into courses and mentoring; and evidence of highly
677 effective trainee mentoring at the graduate and/or undergraduate level, including non-course related
678 training or mentoring activities. Activities related to student success are also present.
679

680 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to being highly effective based on the criteria for *Meets*
681 *Expectations*, the faculty member's record shows additional evidence for advanced teaching
682 performance, such as the development of new courses, strong evidence of teaching creativity supported
683 by material in the teaching portfolio, substantial involvement in professional development aimed at
684 improving teaching efficacy, serving as a chair of thesis or dissertation committees, and honors or special
685 recognition for teaching. In addition, multiple activities related to student success are present. In
686 addition to the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member presents evidence in support of three
687 additional elements as detailed below.
688

689 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the record shows additional
690 evidence for exceptional teaching performance such as development of new educational programs,
691 obtaining teaching grants, publishing in teaching journals, or special honors or recognitions for
692 teaching/mentoring. Substantial activities related to student success are also present. In addition to the
693 criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member presents evidence in support of four additional
694 elements, of which one of these must be in category (a), (b), or (c) as detailed below.
695

696 **Additional Teaching Elements:**
697

- 698 (a) Award(s) for instructional innovation and/or teaching/mentoring excellence
- 699 (b) Teaching- or training-focused publication in a peer-reviewed journal or well-respected education
700 outlet
- 701 (c) Significant involvement in education- and/or training-focused grant-funded programs/proposals
- 702 (d) Development of a new course
- 703 (e) Incorporation of major new pedagogical techniques and evidence-based practices in an existing
704 course
- 705 (f) Major redesign of an existing course (including modality changes)
- 706 (g) Nomination for an award for instructional innovation and/or excellence (may only claim (a) OR
707 (g) in a single year)
- 708 (h) Substantial involvement in professional development activities aimed at increasing teaching
709 efficacy
- 710 (i) Directing or instructing independent study courses (such as honors theses, practica, research, or
711 internship)
- 712 (j) Leadership role in improving pedagogy and/or mentoring throughout the Institute
- 713 (k) Peer-reviewed basic research publications with substantial undergraduate student authorship
714 beyond normal laboratory-based research activities (e.g., outcomes from a course-based
715 undergraduate research experience (CURE))
- 716 (l) External conference presentations related to science of teaching and learning
- 717 (m) Mentoring of graduate and/or undergraduate students or postdoctoral fellows/associates at a level
718 significantly above the average for the Institute.
719

720 **iii. Service (1-5 scale)**

721

722 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member does not volunteer for or fulfill assigned or
723 elected obligations responsibly, thoroughly, and effectively.

724

725 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member may not participate in service activities when provided
726 the opportunity. The faculty member ineffectively fulfills assigned or elected duties or may not meet
727 obligations in a timely manner.

728

729 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member conscientiously and effectively meets their service
730 obligations at a level commensurate with their rank and/or position. The faculty member volunteers to
731 be on the ballot for departmental committees, but may not always be elected. In general, the faculty
732 member effectively meets Institute obligations in a timely and effective manner and plays a major
733 effective role in the Neuroscience Institute. This may include taking a major role in departmental
734 committees, oversight or training of staff, oversight of facilities and/or equipment, volunteering to serve
735 on *ad hoc* committees or service tasks, substantial participation and planning of Institute events, or heavy
736 involvement in student recruitment efforts. This may also include membership on committees of
737 professional organizations, membership on advisory boards, or public outreach.

738

739 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the
740 faculty member has a major effective role in both the Neuroscience Institute and in the College or
741 University or in a professional organization, as described in the criteria for *Meets Expectations*. In
742 addition, multiple activities related to student success are present.

743

744 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to meeting the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the faculty member has a
745 significant, leading effective role in more than one of the areas listed above. Substantial activities related
746 to student success are present.

747

748 **V. Promotion and/or Tenure Review**

749

750 The Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall be composed of all
751 tenured faculty who have primary appointments (i.e., are “core” members) in the Institute. The Associate
752 Director of the Neuroscience Institute serves as Chair of the Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion
753 and Tenure Committee. In the event that the Associate Director cannot serve, the Neuroscience Institute
754 Director will appoint a replacement. Full-time tenured Associate Professors and Professors in the
755 Neuroscience Institute who are familiar with the candidate’s area of neuroscience will constitute an Area
756 Committee that will serve as a subcommittee for primary review of each candidate for promotion to
757 Associate Professor. The Area Committee will be appointed by the Director.

758

759 The Neuroscience Institute Area Committee shall discuss and evaluate the record of each candidate using
760 criteria for promotion and/or tenure adopted by the Neuroscience Institute and the College of Arts &
761 Sciences. Robert’s Rules of Order (Revised) shall be followed throughout the deliberations, except that
762 all such deliberations are considered to be in executive session and are to remain confidential within the
763 Area Committee. The Area Committee shall submit a written report summarizing its findings to the
764 Chair of the Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure. The chair will distribute this
765 report to the members of that committee, who will review and evaluate the record of the candidate and
766 submit a written report to the Director of the Neuroscience Institute and to other appropriate committees
767 (e.g., College Area Committee). The Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and

768 Tenure shall review all candidates for promotion to Assistant Professor or Associate Professor. Members
769 of the overall Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure who are Professors
770 shall review all candidates for promotion to Professor.

771
772 Faculty may not participate in appointment, mentoring, or promotion and/or tenure recommendations if
773 a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest exists. Conflicts of interest include
774 personal interactions and relationships that would preclude objective and unbiased assessment of a
775 candidate's efforts.

776
777 Candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at rank are evaluated in three areas: research/scholarship,
778 teaching, and service (to the department, College, University, community, and profession). The
779 candidate must address their student success activities with respect to teaching and may address their
780 student success activities in relation to research/scholarship and service. Evaluation of promotion and/or
781 tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will consider prior year annual reviews, is
782 summative in nature, and assesses the candidate's trajectory. In each of the three areas, candidates are
783 evaluated based on whether or not the candidate has met expectations for promotion and/or tenure.
784 Evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the
785 standards of the candidate's subfield, and the mission and needs of the Neuroscience Institute, the
786 College, and the University.

787
788 The Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure and the Institute Director
789 will independently evaluate the credentials of all candidates with all deliberations to be completed
790 according to the College calendar.

791 792 **A. Standards for the Rank of Associate Professor**

793
794 In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the
795 candidate must be evaluated as meeting expectations in research/scholarship, teaching and service,
796 including student success activities, as determined by the Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee
797 for Promotion and Tenure and the external reviewers.

798
799 To meet expectations for promotion to Associate Professor and award of tenure, the candidate is expected
800 to have developed an independent research program supported by evidence that they are recognized as
801 having an emerging national reputation according to professionals in their field outside of the University
802 and are making significant contributions to the advancement and development of their discipline within
803 the broad field of neuroscience.

804
805 Candidates with a primary contract (or mission) in the area of science education must present evidence
806 of substantial scholarly achievement in science education or laboratory/field research or both. Evidence
807 of the development of successful liaison programs with other departments, colleges, and sectors of the
808 K-12 education system may be present. The documentation of these liaison programs should include
809 evidence of vigorous involvement and success in procurement of intramural and extramural support for
810 program implementation. Pedagogical publications (i.e., the scholarship of teaching and learning) are
811 typically considered as contributions to teaching. However, this type of publication may be considered
812 in the area of research/scholarship for candidates with a primary contract appointment in the area of
813 science education. If a candidate elects to present pedagogical publications as evidence of
814 research/scholarship impact, then the candidate should clearly demonstrate the work's impact on the
815 development of a nationally and/or internationally significant research program.

816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863

i. Research/Scholarship

To meet expectations, in general, the candidate will have published (or have in press) 3-5 peer-reviewed primary research publications appearing in nationally or internationally significant presses (Q1-Q2 journals) while at Georgia State University, of which at least 2 are as corresponding/senior author. The Institute recognizes that the number of publications appropriate for promotion may vary, depending on disciplinary norms, how comprehensive individual primary literature articles are, the impact factor of journals, and/or other considerations. These publications may include work at another institution for which the candidate has received probationary credit, however, the emphasis will be on work conducted in their independent research program at Georgia State University. Review articles are also valued, but do not, in general, replace the stated expectations for primary research publications.

Per disciplinary norms, the candidate is expected to have established a record as Principal Investigator (PI) on a major extramural grant. While viewed favorably, funding as Co-PI or Co-I, or as PI on intramural seed grants, is generally not sufficient to merit promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Similarly, efforts to secure extramural funding as PI, even if unsuccessful, should be presented and in cases where the candidate is Co-PI or Co-I, a central role and strong intellectual contribution is expected and should be clearly documented.

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

ii. Teaching

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

The evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate's submission of documentation organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the College Manual. In addition to the categories listed there, discipline-specific student success activities related to teaching must be documented.

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

Based on the evidence submitted, the Neuroscience Institute Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee will evaluate the candidate's teaching according to the major categories described in the College Manual. The materials will be used to evaluate the candidate's instructional contribution in four general areas: 1) Course content; 2) Course development; 3) Student evaluations; and 4) Student success, instructional,

864 and mentoring activities (both course-related and non-course related); and may include 5) Publications
865 in education or pedagogical journals.

866

867 As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is
868 available to candidates whose teaching is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will have met
869 the expectations if their dossier indicates that they have been effective across instructional categories
870 including course content, course development, student evaluations, and student success, instructional,
871 and mentoring activities both in and beyond the classroom. In general, the candidate shows consistently
872 high levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. Evidence presented in the
873 dossier must include the following four required elements:

874

875 1. Teaching is effective and/or mentoring roles are fulfilled as evaluated by a combination of course
876 materials that demonstrate diligent preparation and reflect the current state of knowledge in the field;
877 student evaluations that suggest effective performance in the classroom and consistently reflect wide
878 student satisfaction; and evidence of effective student mentoring. Evidence should be presented for
879 instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

880

881 2. Candidates demonstrate implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches in courses or mentoring
882 that extend beyond didactic lecture. This may include teaching courses that involve university initiatives
883 (e.g., WAC, study abroad, experiential learning, or current Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) initiatives);
884 active learning strategies; innovative use of technology; and/or evidence-based strategies for effective
885 mentoring (e.g., IDPs).

886

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

892

893 4. Evidence of substantial participation in student success activities. Candidates are directed to refer to
894 the Neuroscience Institute guidelines on student success activities hosted on the Institute website.

895

896 **iii. Service**

897

898 The Neuroscience Institute is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the Institute, the
899 College, the University, and to local and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and
900 international professional organizations. Those service activities that are related to the candidate's areas
901 of professional expertise will be included in an evaluation of their service. The candidate may include
902 evidence of student success activities, as appropriate. While the expectations for the quantity and quality
903 of service work will be higher for those seeking promotion to Professor than for those seeking promotion
904 to Associate Professor, cooperation and a commitment to shared responsibility are highly valued in all
905 candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure in the Neuroscience Institute.

906

907 The candidate must submit documentation of service organized according to the categories of service
908 listed in the College Manual. Complete descriptions for any service category must be provided by the
909 candidate along with explanatory documentation, when possible. Examples for each category of service
910 are provided below, however, this list is not intended to be exhaustive as valued service can take many
911 forms at many different levels.

912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate will be judged as meeting expectations if they have been effective in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed Institute-level service tasks. In addition, candidates may be active in College or University service tasks or have provided service to community, governmental, or professional organizations apart from those professional service tasks that would fall under the category of research/scholarship. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible and may document service activities relevant to student success.

B. Standard for the Rank of Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing at Georgia State University and in their professions nationally and internationally. The quality and quantity of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor surpass those required for a recommendation to Associate Professor. In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as meeting expectations in research/scholarship, teaching and service, including student success activities, as determined by the Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure and the external reviewers.

Candidates with a primary contract (or mission) in the area of science education must present evidence of substantial scholarly achievement in science education or laboratory/field research or both. Evidence of the development of successful liaison programs with other departments, colleges, and sectors of the K-12 education system may be present. The documentation of these liaison programs should include evidence of vigorous involvement and success in procurement of intramural and extramural support for program implementation. Pedagogical publications (i.e., the scholarship of teaching and learning) are typically considered as contributions to teaching. However, this type of publication may be considered in the area of research/scholarship for candidates with a primary contract appointment in the area of science education. If a candidate elects to present pedagogical publications as evidence of research/scholarship impact, then the candidate should clearly demonstrate the work's impact on the development of a nationally and/or internationally significant research program.

i. Research/Scholarship

To meet expectations for promotion to Professor, the candidate is expected to have produced a substantial record of scholarship and achieved a clearly established international reputation in their discipline according to professionals in their field outside of the University. Expected accomplishments must include the establishment and maintenance at Georgia State University of an independent research program that has yielded a substantial body of peer-reviewed primary literature publications. In general, the faculty member will have published (or have in press) an average of 1-2 corresponding/senior author peer-reviewed primary research publications per year since their last promotion appearing in nationally or internationally significant presses. This equates to ~8-12 peer-reviewed primary research publications if undergoing promotion review on the standard promotion eligible review schedule. The expectation is that these primary research publications largely appear in first quartile (Q1) journals for the field of study according to Scopus, Scimago or Web of Science/Clarivate. The Institute recognizes that the number of publications appropriate for promotion may vary, depending on subdisciplinary norms, how comprehensive individual primary literature articles are, the impact factor of journals, and/or other considerations. These publications may include work at another institution for which the candidate has

960 received probationary credit, however, the emphasis will be on work conducted in their independent
961 research program at Georgia State University. Review articles are also valued, but do not, in general,
962 replace the stated expectations for primary research publications.

963
964 The candidate has maintained a consistent record of securing major extramural grants (as defined above)
965 as PI according to subdisciplinary norms.

966
967 The candidate has made presentations at national and/or international conferences/seminars and has
968 played leadership and/or highly significant roles in service to the profession.

969
970 **ii. Teaching**

971
972 As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available to
973 candidates whose teaching is judged as meeting expectations. The candidate will have met the
974 expectations if their dossier demonstrates high-quality teaching across instructional categories including
975 course content, course development, student perceptions, and student success, instructional, and
976 mentoring activities both in and beyond the classroom. In general, the candidate should show
977 consistently high levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching and must
978 demonstrate significant involvement in trainee mentoring (*e.g.*, undergraduate students; graduate
979 students; and/or postdoctoral fellows/associates). In addition, candidates will have developed new
980 courses or engaged in a major redesign of an existing course (including modality changes). Evidence
981 presented in the dossier must include the following five required elements:

982
983 1. Teaching is highly effective and/or mentoring roles are fulfilled as evaluated by a combination of
984 course materials that demonstrate impressive preparation and reflect the current state of knowledge in
985 the field; student evaluations that suggest effective performance in the classroom and consistently reflect
986 wide student satisfaction; and evidence of effective student mentoring.

987
988 2. Candidates demonstrate implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches into courses or mentoring
989 that extend beyond didactic lecture. This may include course updating; teaching courses that involve
990 university initiatives (*e.g.*, WAC, study abroad, experiential learning, or current QEP initiatives); active
991 learning strategies; innovative use of technology; and/or evidence-based strategies for effective
992 mentoring (*e.g.*, IDPs).

993
994 3. High levels of involvement in non-course related training or mentoring (*e.g.*, supervising graduate
995 students, undergraduate students, and/or postdoctoral fellows/associate researchers; service on exam,
996 thesis or dissertation committees; supervision of undergraduate theses, practica, independent study
997 projects). It is expected that the candidate will have mentored both undergraduate and graduate students
998 and effectiveness can be demonstrated by evidence of student accomplishments.

999
1000 4. Evidence of new course development and/or a major redesign of an existing course (including
1001 modality changes).

1002
1003 5. Evidence of substantial participation in student success activities. Candidates are directed to refer to
1004 the Neuroscience Institute guidelines on student success activities hosted on the Institute website.

1005
1006 **iii. Service**

1007

1008 Candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor will be judged as meeting expectations
1009 if they have been consistently effective in providing assistance to colleagues, sometimes in a leadership
1010 capacity, and if they have consistently, willingly, and responsibly performed significant Institute-level
1011 service tasks. Candidates are expected to have contributed significant service beyond the Institute level,
1012 whether to the College, University, community or profession, including some leadership service.
1013 Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible and may document
1014 relevant service activities to student success.

1015

1016 **VI. Post-Tenure Review**

1017

1018 **A. Scope of Evaluation**

1019

1020 Post-tenure reviews assess a tenured faculty member's research/scholarship, teaching, and service as
1021 Associate Professors progress toward promotion to Professor and as Professors continue making
1022 contributions to their field, the University, and the profession. Post-tenure reviews at the Associate level
1023 assess a faculty member's work over multiple years as they advance along a trajectory toward promotion
1024 to Professor. Post-tenure reviews of Professors assess multiple years of research, instruction, and service
1025 in light of the faculty member's professional trajectory, impact, and leadership. The dossiers of faculty
1026 undergoing post-tenure review include the outcomes of the activities in which they have engaged over
1027 multiple years and provide a clear sense of the next phase(s) of their professional activities.

1028

1029 For details on the timing of the pre-tenure review and the performance remediation plan, the preparation
1030 of the dossier, and the submission of materials, see the College Manual.

1031

1032 **B. Ratings Guidelines:**

1033

1034 In addition to the criteria listed below, the annual reviews for the years covering the evaluation period
1035 will be included in the overall review.

1036

1037 **i. Research/Scholarship (1-5 scale)**

1038

1039 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member has either a limited or no significant research
1040 program, with either no, or only sparse publications and/or presentations. No funding has been obtained
1041 in the period under review.

1042

1043 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member has a moderate research program. Some publications in
1044 peer review journals may be present, and the faculty member may have obtained internal grants or small
1045 external grants, or may have significant professional service, however, significant external funding is
1046 absent in the period under review.

1047

1048 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a
1049 nationally/internationally recognized research program, appropriate to rank, with high-quality refereed
1050 publications in reputable scientific presses, presentations at scientific conferences, and a sustained level
1051 of significant external funding from state, national, and/or international agencies, industries, or
1052 foundations, and significant professional service. Publication quality is defined by quartile ranking of
1053 the journal within the area of specialization, journal impact factor, citation rates, acceptance rates, or
1054 other factors supplied by the candidate. Professional service considered includes peer review for
1055 scholarly journals, grant review for granting agencies, membership on evaluation panels, or service as a

1056 critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations. Collaborative, interdisciplinary research in
1057 which the faculty member plays a significant role may also be included.
1058

1059 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, the faculty member has a
1060 sustained track record of high-quality refereed publications in reputable scientific presses, has received
1061 multiple invitations to give seminars at external universities or meetings/conferences, and has obtained
1062 multiple sources of substantial external funding. Multiple activities related to student success are
1063 present.
1064

1065 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the faculty member has achieved
1066 an internationally recognized research program, with highly significant publications and multiple
1067 funding sources, prestigious national or international invitations, and very significant professional
1068 service. The faculty member may also present evidence of scholarly-based honors and/or awards.
1069 Substantial activities related to student success are present.
1070

1071 **ii. Teaching (1-5 scale)**

1072
1073 Candidates with teaching workloads that differ from the standard workload in the Neuroscience Institute
1074 (i.e., those candidates with course buyouts from grants or administrative releases) will be evaluated on
1075 the quality and quantity of teaching/mentoring activities that are part of their assigned duties. This must
1076 be clearly documented and stated in the teaching materials submitted for post-tenure review.
1077

1078 **1 - Does Not Meet Expectations:** The faculty member displays an ineffective or unacceptable record
1079 of teaching as evidenced by low student evaluations or evaluations well below average, and/or limited
1080 or ineffective teaching or mentoring. A pattern of complaints or evidence of unprofessional activity may
1081 also be considered. Minimal or no student success activities are present.
1082

1083 **2 - Needs Improvement:** The faculty member's record shows evidence for adequate or effective
1084 teaching in the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship but does not meet the criteria listed
1085 for *Meets Expectations*. Activities related to student success are limited.
1086

1087 **3 - Meets Expectations:** The faculty member's record shows evidence for highly effective teaching in
1088 the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship, which includes: strong, positive student
1089 perceptions and evidence of teaching effectiveness from student evaluations; updated course materials
1090 reflecting the current state of knowledge and/or learning outcome assessments; evidence of
1091 implementation of diverse pedagogical approaches into courses and mentoring; and evidence of highly
1092 effective trainee mentoring at the graduate and/or undergraduate level, including non-course related
1093 training or mentoring activities. Activities related to student success are also present.
1094

1095 **4 - Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to being highly effective based on the criteria for *Meets*
1096 *Expectations*, the faculty member may have taken on teaching assignments beyond their normal teaching
1097 load, advised a substantially large number of mentees based on departmental averages, developed new
1098 courses, incorporated new and/or innovative teaching pedagogies, had substantial involvement in
1099 professional development aimed at improving teaching efficacy, had mentoring of research projects that
1100 led to student accomplishments, or served a major, significant role on student committees or programs.
1101 In addition, multiple activities related to student success are present. In addition to the criteria for *Meets*
1102 *Expectations*, the faculty member presents evidence in support of three additional elements as detailed
1103 below.

1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151

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

Additional Teaching Elements:

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

iii. Service (1-5 scale)

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,

1152 volunteering to serve on *ad hoc* committees or service tasks, substantial participation and planning of
1153 Institute events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. This may also include membership
1154 on committees of professional organizations, membership on advisory boards, or public outreach.

1155
1156 **4 – Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the
1157 faculty member has a major effective role in both the Neuroscience Institute and in the College or
1158 University or in a professional organization, as described in the criteria for *Meets Expectations*. This
1159 may also include activities such as serving as the chair, vice chair, or other important position of a
1160 significant College or University committee or service in a leadership role (*e.g.*, chair or elected officer)
1161 in a professional organization or advisory board. In addition, multiple activities related to student
1162 success are present.

1163
1164 **5 - Exemplary:** In addition to meeting the criteria for *Exceeds Expectations*, the faculty member has a
1165 significant, leading effective role in more than one of the areas listed above. This may include activities
1166 such as serving as graduate or undergraduate director, Chair of the Senate, or other similar activities.
1167 Substantial activities related to student success are also present.