

April 22, 2016

Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, Third-year, and Cumulative Review for Tenure-track Faculty Members

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

Written April 20, 1992
Revised May 6, 1992
Revised March 1, 1993
Revised May 11, 1994
Revised March 2, 1995
Revised November 1, 1995
Revised January 12, 1998
Revised February 9, 1998
Revised May 8, 2000
Revised December 9, 2003
Revised May 9, 2004
Revised April 28, 2006
Revised January 19, 2012
Revised and Approved by faculty vote on December 14, 2012
Revised December 13, 2013
Revised May 11, 2015
Revised and Approved by faculty vote on April 22, 2016

Table of Contents

Preamble

Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process

Part 1

Third-year Review for Tenure-track Faculty Members

1.0 Third-year Review Procedures for Tenure-track Faculty Members

Part 2

Promotion for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty Members; Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty Members

1.0 Eligibility for Promotion for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty Members

1.01 Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion

1.02 Associate Professors Seeking Promotion

1.03 Promotion for Faculty Members with Secondary Appointments in the College of Education and Human Development

2.0 Eligibility for Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty Members

3.0 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

3.01 Criteria for Promotion

3.02 Criteria for Tenure

3.03 Research and Scholarly Activity

3.031 Publications

3.032 Presentations

3.033 Grants

3.034 Other Scholarly Activity and Professional Recognition

3.04 Teaching

3.05 Service

4.0 Tenure Review at the Time of Initial Appointment

5.0 Overview of the Review Process

5.01 External Review of Research and Scholarship Accomplishments of the Candidate

5.011 Rationale for External Review

5.012 Sources of External Reviewers

5.013 Criteria for External Reviewers

5.014 Communication with External Reviewers

5.015 Submission of Sample Publications, Vita, and Narrative Statement

5.016 Request for Reviewer's Participation

5.017 Distribution and Confidentiality of External Reviewers' Reports

5.02 Review by the Candidate's Department

5.03 Review by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT)

5.031 ACFPT Purpose

5.032 ACFPT Membership

5.033 ACFPT Procedures

5.04 Review by the Dean of the College

5.05 Review by the Provost

5.06 Rating Criteria for Evaluation of Candidates

5.07 Candidate's Withdrawal or Appeal

- 5.071 Candidate's Withdrawal
- 5.072 Candidate's Appeal

Part 3
Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

- 1.0 Eligibility for Cumulative Review
- 2.0 Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty (CCRTF)
 - 2.01 CCRTF Purpose
 - 2.02 CCRTF Membership
 - 2.03 CCRTF Procedures
 - 2.04 Criteria for Review

Part 4
Guidelines for Emeritus Status

- 1.0 Emeritus Faculty Appointments
 - 1.01 A current curriculum vitae
 - 1.02 Report of a vote of support by the department
 - 1.03 A letter of recommendation from the department chair to the dean
 - 1.04 A letter of recommendation from the dean to the provost

Part 5
Guidelines for Regents' and Distinguished University Professor Status

- 1.0 Regents' Professorships
- 2.0 Distinguished University Professorships

Appendices

Appendix A: Sample Letter to External Reviewers

Appendix B: Format for Dossiers Submitted for Promotion, Promotion and Tenure, or Tenure

- 1.0 Standard Format
 - 1.01 Section 1: The Candidate
 - 1.02 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity
 - 1.03 Section 3: Teaching
 - 1.04 Section 4: Service
- 2.0 General Rules for Preparing the Dossier

Appendix C: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier

- 1.0 Section 1: The Candidate
 - 1.01 Cover Sheet
 - 1.02 Current and Complete Vita
- 2.0 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity
 - 2.01 Narrative Statement
 - 2.02 Listing
 - 2.021 Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, Reviews, and Proceedings
 - 2.022 Presentations at Professional Meetings
 - 2.023 Awards and Grants
 - 2.024 Media Products
 - 2.025 Recognition by Scholarly and Professional Associations

Appendix C: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier (cont.)

2.03 Exhibits

3.0 Section 3: Teaching

3.01 Narrative Statement

3.02 Listing

3.021 Georgia State University Teaching Assignments

3.022 Courses Taught at Other Institutions

3.023 Courses Developed at Georgia State University

3.024 Graduate Student Committees

3.025 Other Information

3.026 Impact on Students

4.0 Section 4: Service

4.01 Narrative Statement

4.02 Listing

4.021 Service to the Profession

4.022 Service to the Community

4.023 Service to the University

Appendix D: Timeline for Third-year Review

Appendix E: Timeline for Promotion, Promotion and Tenure, or Tenure Review

Appendix F: Timeline for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

Appendix G: Timeline for Tenure Review at the Time of Initial Appointment

1.0 Review Procedures

2.0 External Review Letters

3.0 College-Level Review

4.0 University-Level Review

PREAMBLE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

The College of Education and Human Development is a metropolitan professional school with a particular commitment to excellence in preparing persons to work in a variety of urban educational and other settings and to advancing and disseminating knowledge. The mission of the College incorporates three components: research and scholarship, teaching, and service. Given the nature of a professional school, this mission is achieved by having faculty members who serve in diverse roles and who have unique responsibilities. Some faculty members are hired to serve in tenure-track positions, while others are hired to serve in non-tenure-track positions (e.g., clinical faculty members, lecturers, academic professionals). The evaluation of the faculty within the College recognizes the variety of roles and acknowledges that there are multiple paths to excellence. This document contains guidelines and procedures for promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure of tenure-track faculty members; guidelines and procedures for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty members are specified in a separate document.

The College of Education and Human Development exists within Georgia State University, a research university as designated by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Subsequently, there is an expectation, which permeates the hiring, evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes of tenure-track faculty members, that research and scholarly activities are essential. These research and scholarly activities are intended to enhance and expand the body of knowledge and to push forward the limits of that knowledge. These research and scholarly activities in no way are intended to replace the elements of teaching and service but are considered to be significantly more representative of expectations of tenure-track faculty members.

Promotions and tenure are integral components of a faculty member's professional growth and development at an academic institution. This growth and development begins when a faculty member is hired. At that time the faculty member's role and responsibilities are defined and expectations for performance delineated. Professional goals are set and plans for meeting those goals explored and established. To ensure growth and development, faculty members must be evaluated each year in a meaningful way to determine if responsibilities have been met and to measure progress toward professional goals.

Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member's accomplishments. It is a statement that the faculty member has met the established responsibilities of the current position and achieved professional goals reflective of a higher faculty rank. All faculty members are expected to evidence the professional growth commensurate with the criteria for promotion for faculty members.

The granting of tenure requires that the faculty member exhibits national and/or international contributions to the advancement and development of the faculty member's area of expertise as well as clear promise of continuing to contribute nationally and/or internationally to that advancement and development.

42 **Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process**

43
44 At Georgia State University, the quality of faculty members’ accomplishments in research and
45 scholarship, teaching, and service largely determines the quality of the institution as a whole. To ensure
46 that the institution and its faculty members achieve a high level of excellence, it is necessary to engage in
47 periodic evaluations of faculty members. As mandated by the policies of the Board of Regents, an
48 evaluation of each faculty member is conducted once a year by the faculty member’s supervisor. (This
49 evaluation process is addressed in a separate document on workload policy.) Additionally, faculty
50 members are evaluated for the purposes of promotion, promotion and tenure, tenure, or cumulative review
51 at appropriate intervals during their careers. This process begins with the third-year review for tenure-
52 track faculty members (see Part 1). Department chairs should advise all new faculty members, and in
53 particular, should inform new faculty members of all promotion and tenure requirements. To this end,
54 they should provide the new faculty members with copies of the appropriate department, college, and
55 university promotion and tenure policies and discuss the contents of these documents.

56
57 It is the responsibility of the candidate to know and follow the guidelines set forth in this document.
58 Furthermore, the candidate must present a professional record clearly and accurately and allow the
59 reviews to proceed according to the established procedures.
60

61 Similarly, it is the responsibility of all members of the College of Education’s Advisory Committee on
62 Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT) to know and follow these guidelines and all established
63 procedures. In addition, it is the responsibility of all members of department promotion and tenure
64 committees and all department chairs to know and follow these guidelines and all established procedures.
65 All deliberations in the promotion and tenure process are confidential.

66
67 Official timelines for all evaluation processes will be established by the Dean or his/her designee, with
68 approval of the Chair of Faculty Affairs. These timelines should be posted on the CEHD website. They
69 should follow the general guidelines in Appendices D, E, and F. Candidates, department promotion and
70 tenure committees, department chairs, the ACFPT, and the dean must follow these timelines. In cases
71 where University timelines differ from the College timelines included in this document, the University
72 guidelines take precedence and will be followed.

73
74 These guidelines and procedures are designed to assure fairness and due process throughout the review
75 process. Included in this document are appeal procedures to be followed in the event of disagreements
76 over promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure. There is also a separate CEHD Grievance Procedure
77 available to all faculty members. The renewal of each faculty member’s contract is subject to Board of
78 Regents and University policies and approval (see Georgia State University Faculty Handbook, Section
79 317.01).
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90

91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130

Part 1
Third-year Review for Tenure-track Faculty Members

1.0 Third-year Review Procedures for Tenure-track Faculty Members

A formal review of the progress toward promotion and tenure will be made during the third year so that all tenure-track faculty members have a clear idea of whether or not they are progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure. This review will be conducted by a department committee of at least three faculty members from the Professor or Associate Professor rank elected from among the tenured faculty members within the department, with one member elected as chair. This committee may be the same as the department promotion and tenure committee. The third-year review should address the faculty member’s progress in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

In accordance with the timeline in Appendix D, the chair of the department third-year review committee should meet with faculty members who will be reviewed to clarify procedures and items to be submitted for review. Such review should complement efforts to implement mentoring programs within each department. The third-year review is distinguished from the annual review in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments while still permitting time for changes in orientation and activity of the individual involved. Guidelines for the third-year review shall be specified in writing by each department.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to read these promotion and tenure guidelines carefully to be aware of expectations for promotion and tenure. The candidate needs to consider these expectations when preparing materials for the third-year review.

Faculty members may be hired with prior credit toward promotion and tenure. When a faculty member is hired with one or two years of probationary credit towards tenure and promotion there shall also be a mid-course pre-tenure review. A faculty member hired with three years of probationary credit may waive pre-tenure review with written approval of the department chair and dean. Faculty members with no credit will be evaluated in the spring of their third year in rank.

In accordance with the timeline in Appendix D, the report of the department third-year review committee will be forwarded to the department chair and dean for their review and comment. All letters and comments will be forwarded to the tenure-track faculty member in accordance with the timeline in Appendix D. The faculty member may provide a letter of response within 5 working days of receipt of all the letters and comments.

Each department must have a procedure that allows a candidate to request the department’s P&T committee to reconsider their recommendation prior to the recommendation being sent to the chair.

131 **Part 2**
132 **Promotion for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty Members; Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty**
133 **Members**

134
135 **1.0 Eligibility for Promotion for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty Members**
136

137 All candidates for promotion shall hold an earned doctoral degree or its equivalent as adjudged by faculty
138 members of the department and the Dean of the College and must be full-time members of the faculty of
139 the College of Education.
140

141 **1.01 Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion**

142 For Assistant Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the normal
143 minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to making application for consideration for
144 promotion. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an Assistant Professor may apply after
145 serving four (4) years. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of Assistant Professor is
146 seven (7) years.
147

148 **1.02 Associate Professors Seeking Promotion**

149 For Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor,¹ the normal minimum time
150 in rank is five (5) years prior to application although application for early promotion based on
151 exceptional accomplishment may be made during the fourth year in the rank of Associate
152 Professor with tenure.
153

154 For either Assistant Professors or Associate Professors seeking promotion, when moving from a non-
155 tenure-track to a tenure-track line, time in rank in a non-tenure-track position may not be used to meet
156 these requirements.
157

158 **1.03 Promotion for Faculty Members with Secondary Appointments in the College of**
159 **Education and Human Development**

160 A candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor who holds secondary
161 appointment in the College of Education and Human Development is not required to submit a
162 dossier to the College of Education. However, the candidate is required to submit notification of
163 intent to the department chair, the chair of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and
164 Tenure (ACFPT), and the dean to have the recommendation of the college of the faculty
165 member's primary appointment apply to the joint appointment in the College of Education.
166

167 **2.0 Eligibility for Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty Members**
168

169 All candidates for tenure shall hold an earned doctoral degree or its equivalent as adjudged by faculty
170 members of the department and the Dean of the College, must be full-time members of the faculty of the
171 College of Education, must hold the rank of Assistant Professor or higher, and must hold a tenure-track
172 line. Prior to application, the candidate seeking tenure must have served as a full-time faculty member in
173 a tenure-track line at Georgia State University or at another institution for a total of four (4) academic
174 years, with a minimum of one year in a tenure-track line at Georgia State University. Credit may be
175 granted for up to three years of previous service at another institution. The number of years to be credited
176 toward tenure is negotiated and documented at the time of hire. No credit may be granted for time served
177 in a non-tenure-track position. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of Assistant Professor
178 or above without the award of tenure is seven (7) years. Normally, a faculty member will apply for tenure
179 in the fifth year of service and be considered in the sixth year of service. In cases of exceptional

¹ Throughout this document, the terms Professor and full Professor refer to the rank of Professor.

180 achievement, a faculty member may apply for tenure in the fourth year of service and be considered for
181 tenure during the fifth year of service. A maximum of two (2) years suspension of the probationary
182 period may be granted due to a leave of absence based on birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability
183 or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member. Such interruption must be approved
184 by the president. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period, the maximum time that
185 may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven (7)
186 years.

187
188 Tenure or probationary credit toward tenure is lost upon resignation from an institution, or written
189 resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position, or written resignation from a
190 position for which probationary credit toward tenure has been given to take a position for which no
191 probationary credit is given.

192
193

194 **3.0 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

195

196 Because of the diversity of activities engaged in by faculty members, department promotion and tenure
197 committees, department chairs, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT), and
198 the Dean of the College will consider each set of materials individually using the following guidelines
199 based on the quality, scope, and impact of the candidate's research and scholarly activity, teaching, and
200 service.

201

202 The candidate will submit information for evaluation in three areas: research and scholarly activity,
203 teaching, and service. The three areas (research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service) are defined
204 in Part 2: Sections 3.03, 3.04, and 3.05 of this document.

205

206 **3.01 Criteria for Promotion**

207 Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member's accomplishments. It is a statement that
208 the faculty member has met the established responsibilities of the current position and achieved
209 professional goals reflective of a higher faculty rank. In each area of consideration (research and
210 scholarly activity, teaching, and service) candidates will be evaluated as having met or having not
211 met the standards for promotion and tenure.

212

213 Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires that a faculty member be recognized by
214 scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has contributed nationally and/or
215 internationally to the advancement and development of the faculty member's area of expertise.

216

217 At a minimum, an associate professor is expected to have developed a substantial body of work
218 that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers
219 within and outside of the University, and have a record of growth in research, scholarship, and
220 creative accomplishments that demonstrates a strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory
221 in terms of high quality and productive research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

222 Candidates for promotion to associate professor should be establishing a national reputation in
223 their field. They also must demonstrate high quality teaching and appropriate evidence of service.

224

225 Promotion to the rank of professor is also based on research, scholarship, and creative
226 accomplishment, teaching, and service activities. Both the quality and the level of achievements
227 required for a recommendation to the rank of professor must substantially surpass those required
228 for a recommendation to associate professor. A professor is expected to have established a
229 national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high
230 quality and productive research, scholarship, and creative activities. The faculty member must

231 demonstrate high quality teaching and provide significant service to the University and
232 professional communities.

233

234 **3.02 Criteria for Tenure**

235 Tenure takes a faculty member's past accomplishments into account and also considers the ability
236 to contribute to Georgia State University and to larger academic communities. In the College of
237 Education, the criteria upon which faculty members are to be considered for tenure include:
238 success in carrying out the faculty responsibilities of research and scholarly activity, teaching,
239 and service. The granting of tenure requires that the candidate exhibits national and/or
240 international contributions to the advancement and development of the faculty member's area of
241 expertise as well as clear promise of continuing to contribute nationally and/or internationally to
242 that advancement and development.

243

244 According to Board of Regents' policy, a person granted tenure by the Board of Regents of the
245 University System of Georgia is entitled to full-time employment for two out of three academic
246 semesters until retirement, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency.

247

248 **3.03 Research and Scholarly Activity**

249

250 In the College of Education, scholarly activity encompasses any activity that advances education
251 and human development by creating, extending, integrating, applying, or promoting knowledge
252 and/or modes of inquiry. The goal is to foster the production of high-quality scholarship,
253 acknowledging that the candidates' work must be judged holistically in the context of their field
254 or discipline. The quality of scholarship will be assessed on: (a) the national impact or effect of
255 the scholarship on the field or discipline, (b) the scope or extent of the scholarship, and (c) the
256 depth of the scholarship (d) a clear focus plan of research. Judgment will be based on the
257 candidate's evidence of scholarship, the candidate's narrative explanation and documentation of
258 the impact of the work, the professional judgment of external reviewers, and the
259 recommendations of department chairs, department promotion and tenure committees, the
260 ACFPT, and the dean.

261

262 A candidate's body of work includes work accomplished as a student or post doctorate fellow.
263 Candidates for promotion to associate professor should show a clear trend of independence from
264 prior mentors (e.g., fewer publications from mentors, more first authorships, clear defining focus
265 of research.)

266 Scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. Debates over the relative
267 merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical versus empirical work, scholarship of
268 discovery versus scholarship of integration, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary
269 versus secondary analyses are not germane to the promotion process. Each topic, method,
270 approach, and technique should be judged on whether it is appropriate to the stated goal and
271 whether it produces a valuable product.

272

273 Success in scholarly activity can be achieved in many ways and no one approach or technique is
274 inherently superior to another. Scholarly activity will be evaluated on the basis of its impact on
275 the candidate's identified area(s) of scholarship. The following discussion elaborates on some of
276 the complexities involved as candidates develop and present their dossiers, as well as how
277 committees, department chairs, and the dean evaluate the dossiers.

278

279 **3.031 Publications**

280 Candidates may choose mainly to write articles for refereed journals or to publish in
281 books whose publication process has comparable peer-review scrutiny for research and

282 scholarly activity. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles,
283 authored or edited books, electronic media, chapters in books) will be evaluated on the
284 whole body of work, as are those who specialize in one form of scholarly expression.
285 Peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship; however, it is recognized
286 that there are various levels of rigor in the peer-review process. It is the candidates'
287 responsibilities to provide evidence of the process and rigor of the reviews of their works,
288 such as journal acceptance rate, review policy process, and/or journal impact factor (if
289 available).

291 Formal and informal prestige hierarchies of scholarly journals exist within the fields of
292 education and human development; however, rigid adherence to any particular ranking is
293 ill advised. Valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that
294 challenges existing knowledge may or may not be published in the best-known journals.
295 Important contributions to scholarship also may appear in non-traditional forms of
296 refereed media such as CD-ROMs, Internet journals, and edited databases.

298 Books, book chapters, and monographs constitute valuable contributions to knowledge; it
299 is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence that such publications make
300 significant contributions to the scholarship of the field or discipline. Publications with a
301 prestigious press that conducts a rigorous review process indicate the quality of a book or
302 a book chapter in an edited volume. Publication of a scholarly book is more common in
303 some fields than others and authoring a book of high quality characteristically decreases
304 the number of other scholarly publications.

306 Both individual and collaborative scholarship is valued without automatically assigning
307 higher value to one over the other. Interdisciplinary inquiry is supported and often results
308 in publications with multiple authors or in scholarly outlets of multiple fields.
309 Furthermore, candidates who choose to collaborate may be able to publish a greater
310 number of items than those working alone. In different fields, order of authorship
311 conveys different information about relative contribution to the work; however, serving
312 as lead author on publications is an important recognition of the candidate's research
313 scope. It is incumbent upon candidates to explain their contributions to each work in the
314 listing that includes multiple authors.

316 Evaluations cannot be defined solely by the number of publications or other scholarly
317 activity. A smaller number of works of outstanding quality, or those requiring time-
318 consuming methodologies, may be evaluated as equal or superior to a greater number of
319 works. Candidates demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and
320 quantity of their publications and other scholarly activity. Further, the impact of the
321 candidate's work as judged by leading scholars in the field or related field (i.e., external
322 reviewers) is important in considering the quality and quantity of publications and other
323 scholarly activity.

325 **3.032 Presentations**

326 Presentations are another important avenue for dissemination of scholarship.
327 Presentations at meetings of national and international organizations reach a wider
328 audience and typically require more rigorous peer review than presentations at state and
329 regional meetings. Invited addresses, keynote presentations, and organization of
330 important symposia are indicators of a candidate's standing in the community of scholars.
331 In general, workshops will be considered as a contribution to service or instruction unless
332 they can be shown to make a significant contribution to the scholarship of the field.

333
334
335
336
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

3.033 Grants

Obtaining extramural grant support for one's research is a valued scholarly activity in some fields, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, offers significant evidence of scholarly reputation if the awarding of the grant is based on rigorous peer review. Evaluation of external grant funding records will be considered in light of available sources and processes within the candidate's field. It is recognized that writing proposals and implementing grants are time-consuming and demanding activities that may temporarily decrease other scholarly activity. It is incumbent upon candidates to document the impact of their grant support, particularly in terms of dissemination of project results.

3.034 Other Scholarly Activity and Professional Recognition

Leadership in professional organizations (e.g., officers, program chairs, committee chairs) and the editorial process of publication (e.g., editorships, editorial board memberships, reviews of manuscripts and conference proposals) are indicators of the scholarly reputation of the candidate. Honors, such as fellow status, invitations received for colloquium presentations or workshops at professional associations or other universities, reviews of published works, and awards from scholarly and professional associations that result from the candidate's research, also serve as indicators of the candidate's scholarly reputation.

3.04 Teaching

Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and typically involves teaching in the university classroom. Teaching includes advising and mentoring students. Teaching also may include the delivery of instructional activities in the profession, community, businesses, and schools (e.g., Professional Development Schools or partner schools), as well as the development of new courses, programs, instructional approaches, textbooks, and other curricular materials for both university and other students. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on student or other participant evaluations and additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness must be presented in the dossier. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to: peer evaluations, selected examinations and quizzes, students' passing rates on licensure/certification examinations, a teaching portfolio, new course and/or program development, use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, teaching awards received, and student accomplishments and acceptance of teaching products.

3.05 Service

Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on behalf of the University or the profession which do not entail systematic instruction (e.g., design and development of professional conferences), including work in Professional Development Schools or partner schools (see the Board of Regents' policy statement on faculty work in schools). Judgments of the quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contribution and on participation at national, regional, state and local levels.

384 **4.0 Tenure Review at the Time of Initial Appointment**

385

386 Based on the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' Policy:

387 In exceptional cases an institution president may approve an outstanding distinguished senior faculty
388 member for the award of tenure upon the faculty member's initial appointment; such action is otherwise
389 referred to as tenure upon appointment. Each such recommendation shall be granted only in cases in
390 which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an Associate or full Professor, was already
391 tenured at a prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution. If the person
392 is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the award of tenure
393 must be approved by the Chancellor. See Appendix G for procedures regarding tenure review at the time
394 of initial appointment.

395

396 **5.0 Overview of the Review Process**

397

398 **5.01 External Review of Research and Scholarship Accomplishments of the Candidate**

399

400 **5.011 Rationale for External Review**

401 External reviews of research and scholarship are necessary to gauge the relative standing
402 of the candidate's body of work in comparison to national and international peers who are
403 at the same point in their careers in the field or discipline. Such reviews are intended to
404 provide the institution with an assessment of the candidate's contributions based on the
405 reviewer's knowledge of the candidate's body of work. Five external reviewers will be
406 solicited for any candidate seeking promotion and tenure at the level of Assistant
407 Professor or promotion or tenure above the level of Assistant Professor. In exceptional
408 cases when five reviewers are not available, the dean may accept fewer but no less than
409 three external reviewers. In cases where the dean does accept fewer than five letters, the
410 dean must submit a memorandum detailing the steps taken to obtain sufficient reviewers
411 and identify the names contacted from all lists of external reviewers. These reviews
412 should address the candidate's contributions to the development and extension of
413 knowledge in the chosen field or discipline and the candidate's reputation at regional,
414 national, and international levels commensurate with status and rank. New letters from
415 external reviewers are required each time a candidate submits a dossier for promotion,
416 promotion and tenure, or tenure; external reviewers from the earlier review may be
417 selected.

418

419 **5.012 Sources of External Reviewers**

420 **Candidate's Suggested List**

421 In the academic year preceding a candidate's review and according to the timeline in
422 Appendix E, the candidate will submit to the dean and to the candidate's department chair
423 and department promotion and tenure committee a list of five names, addresses,
424 telephone numbers, professional affiliations, current positions and a one-paragraph
425 description for each potential external reviewer.

426

427 **Department Chair's Suggested List**

428 According to the timeline in Appendix E, the department chair in consultation with the
429 department promotion and tenure committee will submit to the dean a list of five
430 additional names, addresses, telephone numbers, professional affiliations, current
431 positions and a one-paragraph description for each potential external reviewer.

432

433 **Dean's Selection of External Reviewers**

434 The dean may contribute up to three additional nominations for external reviewers. The
435 dean will select five reviewers from the following lists: a) at least three reviewers from
436 the list provided by the department chair and department promotion and tenure
437 committee; b) at least one reviewer from the list provided by the candidate; c) at least one
438 from the list provided by the dean. The candidate will be given an opportunity to review
439 the final proposed list of external reviewers and to strike one potential reviewer; the dean
440 will select the replacement. The candidate, department chair, department promotion and
441 tenure committee, and dean are expected to provide additional names of external
442 reviewers if the chosen reviewers decline to participate. In exceptional cases when five
443 reviewers are not available, the dean may accept fewer but no less than three external
444 reviewers. In cases where the dean does accept fewer than five letters, the dean must
445 submit a memorandum detailing the steps taken to obtain sufficient reviewers and
446 identify the names contacted from all lists of external reviewers. In every case, more than
447 half of the list of external reviewers must be drawn from the department chair's suggested
448 list.

450 **5.013 Criteria for External Reviewers**

451 The external reviewers from academic institutions are to be affiliated with research
452 universities in which the emphasis on research and scholarship is of a rigor similar
453 to aspirational peer institutions for the candidate's discipline. The external reviewer
454 should be a recognized leader in the candidate's field or discipline and, when available,
455 be employed at an institution that is considered to be a peer or aspirant research
456 university. External reviewers must hold the rank of associate professor or professor for
457 candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor. External
458 reviewers must hold the rank of professor for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion
459 to the rank of professor.

461 The external reviewer cannot be a research collaborator (e.g., chair or member of
462 dissertation committee, coauthor on research and scholarly activity, co-investigator on a
463 grant) of the candidate.

465 The external reviewer cannot be on the faculty of Georgia State University as a regular
466 faculty member, adjunct faculty member, or part-time faculty member.

468 The external reviewer cannot be a relative of or have a significant other (non-
469 professional) relationship with the candidate.

471 The external reviewer cannot have an employee/employer relationship with the
472 candidate.

474 **5.014 Communication with External Reviewers**

475 Candidates may not actively recruit or contact potential external reviewers prior to or
476 during the review process. It is understood, however, that candidates are developing or
477 holding national reputations and are likely to have professional contact with potential
478 external reviewers.

480 **5.015 Submission of Sample Publications, Vita, and Narrative Statement**

481 According to the timeline in Appendix E, the candidate will submit to the dean a sample
482 of not more than five of the candidate's research and scholarly activities, a current and
483 complete vita, and a narrative statement. In the narrative, candidates explain the quality,
484 scope, and impact of their research and scholarly activities, as well as the connections

485 among them. The narrative will be up to 3 typed, double-spaced pages and may become
486 in part the research and scholarly activity narrative statement for the candidate's dossier.
487 Each external reviewer will be sent a solicitation letter, the sample of items, the vita, and
488 the narrative statement.

489
490 **5.016 Request for Reviewer's Participation**

491 Preceding each candidate's review and according to the timeline in Appendix E, the dean
492 will solicit reviews of the candidate's work (through a standardized letter, suggestion
493 included in Appendix A) and subsequently will receive the written reviews from the
494 reviewers. It should be made clear to all parties that external reviewers will assess the
495 research and scholarly activity of the candidate. No honoraria will be paid to external
496 reviewers. The Dean of the College, however, will send a letter of appreciation to all
497 external reviewers.

498
499 **5.017 Distribution and Confidentiality of External Reviewers' Reports**
500 **Distribution of the Reports**

501 In accordance with the timeline in Appendix E, the dean will forward copies of the
502 external reviews to the department chair, the department promotion and tenure
503 committee, and to the ACFPT.

504
505 **Access to External Reviewers' Letters**

506 External reviewers' letters will be accessible only to the dean, department chair,
507 department promotion and tenure committee members, and members of the ACFPT,
508 within the parameters of the Georgia Open Records Law. Reviewers will be informed of
509 the existence of the Open Records Law of Georgia (see Appendix A).

510
511 **5.02 Review by the Candidate's Department**

512 The department promotion and tenure committee will review and evaluate the candidate's dossier, the
513 letters from external reviewers, and any other materials relevant to the candidate's dossier... The
514 committee will forward a recommendation to the candidate and to the candidate's department chair
515 according to the timeline in Appendix E.

516
517 In departments with three or more full Professors, only those full Professors will vote on
518 candidates for promotion to full Professor. In departments with fewer than three full Professors,
519 the dean, in consultation with the department chair, will augment faculty committees with
520 members at the Professor rank from other department.

521
522 Each department must have a procedure that allows a candidate to request the department's P&T
523 committee to reconsider their recommendation prior to the recommendation being sent to the
524 chair.

525
526 **5.03 Review by the Candidate's Department Chair**

527 The department chair will review and evaluate the candidate's dossier, the letters from external
528 reviewers, the recommendation from the department promotion and tenure committee and any
529 other materials relevant to the candidate's dossier. The department chair will forward a
530 recommendation to the candidate and to the ACFPT according to the timeline in Appendix E.

536 **5.04 Review by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT)**
537

538 **5.041 ACFPT Purpose**

539 The ACFPT is a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College
540 of Education and Human Development. Its purpose is to recommend to the dean through
541 the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education and Human Development
542 those faculty members the committee agrees have met or not met the criteria for
543 promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure.
544

545 **5.042 ACFPT Membership**

546 The ACFPT shall consist of six members, at least three of whom must be a full Professor.
547 Only the full Professors shall be the voting members for candidates seeking promotion to
548 full Professor. Each department of the College of Education and Human Development
549 shall elect from among its faculty one representative (1) who has been a full-time faculty
550 member of the College of Education and Human Development for three academic years,
551 (2) who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and (3) who has been
552 awarded tenure. Faculty members so elected shall serve a term of two years. A faculty
553 member may not serve two consecutive full terms on the ACFPT. Faculty members who
554 are candidates for promotion may not serve on the ACFPT. Any committee member who
555 is a relative of the candidate or has a relationship that constitutes a conflict of interest
556 with the candidate must not participate in any committee work regarding that candidate.
557 Members of the ACFPT may not vote on candidates at the department level.
558

559 A schedule for each department's election has been established so that half the members
560 of the committee will be elected each year; that schedule includes when a department will
561 need to elect a full Professor. Departments should hold elections for representatives
562 during the fall semester. The department chair will notify the dean and the chair of the
563 Faculty Affairs Committee of the results of the election according to the timeline in
564 Appendix E. The term of office will be January 1 - December 31. Should a vacancy occur
565 before a person has completed a full term, the affected department will fill that vacancy
566 by holding a special election. No committee action is official unless a quorum is present;
567 a quorum consists of two-thirds of the full committee membership.
568

569 **5.043 ACFPT Procedures**

570 The dean will notify faculty members of their eligibility for promotion, promotion and
571 tenure, or tenure. It is the clear and unequivocal responsibility of candidates to notify
572 their chair, the dean, and the chair of the ACFPT of the intent to submit their credentials
573 for consideration according to the timeline in Appendix E.
574

575 ACFPT will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs
576 Committee according to the timeline in Appendix E. The committee will have three
577 orders of business: the election of a chair, the review of this document, and the planning
578 of informational sessions for faculty seeking promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure.
579 These informational sessions are to be held according to the timeline in Appendix E.
580

581 The committee, or its designate, will review any submitted dossiers for proper format
582 according to the timeline in Appendix E. As a courtesy the committee will return its
583 suggestions according to the timeline in Appendix E.
584

585 Based on the timeline in Appendix E, ACFPT members will meet to form themselves
586 into teams for the purpose of reading the dossiers, reading the external reviewers' letters,
587 reading the recommendations from the department chairs and department promotion and

588 tenure committees and reading any responses from candidates. The committee will
589 establish its meetings in the fall as necessary to accomplish its duties.

590
591 At an appropriate time the committee will meet to hear the findings of the teams in
592 preparation for identifying any areas requiring additional information about a candidate.
593 The committee will write a letter of inquiry to any candidates for whom the committee
594 needs any additional information or clarification in order to prepare a well-informed letter
595 of recommendation.

596
597 After the responses from any candidates for whom additional information or clarification
598 is needed, the committee will meet for the purpose of considering the candidates.
599 Committee members, by simple majority vote, will determine whether or not the
600 candidate has met or not met the standards for promotion or tenure in each of three areas..
601 The full Professors shall be the sole voting members for candidates seeking promotion to
602 full Professor. A separate vote will be taken on the candidate's application for tenure. The
603 ACFPT will forward a recommendation to the candidate and to the dean according to the
604 timeline in Appendix E. The letter will contain the results of the vote(s) for the
605 candidate, the majority report, and an optional minority report. The minority report is
606 optional. All members of the ACFPT will sign the letter acknowledging their
607 participation in the review. **All communication between committee members is
608 confidential. Members of the committee will not communicate with the
609 candidate except through the committee's letters of inquiry and
610 recommendation, except in cases where the candidate asks the committee for
611 clarification of the letter of inquiry. In this case, the chair of ACFPT is
612 responsible for answering the candidates' questions, and should be the only
613 one to directly communicate with candidates.**

614
615 The ACFPT may choose to have a final meeting in order to make recommendations to
616 the College Faculty Affairs Committee on the entire process. This may involve
617 recommendations regarding revisions of these guidelines.

618 619 **5.05 Review by the Dean of the College**

620 In addition to the recommendation of the ACFPT, the other independent sources of
621 recommendation to the dean are (a) the chair of the candidate's department, (b) the promotion and
622 tenure committee within the candidate's department, and (c) the external reviewers. Based upon
623 these sources of recommendation and an independent review of the candidate's dossier, the dean
624 forwards a recommendation to the provost according to the timeline in Appendix E. The
625 candidate's curriculum vitae and narrative statement; copies of the letters from the department
626 promotion and tenure committee, department chair, and the ACFPT; and copies of the external
627 review letters will accompany the dean's recommendation to the Provost.

628 629 **5.06 Written Notification to Candidate**

630
631 At each of the stages of review, a candidate must receive a written notice of the outcome of the
632 deliberations and a copy of any evaluation(s) that are made of the candidate's credentials
633 including any possible minority reports. Reports from department and college committees, as well
634 as minority reports may remove the signature page or section that identifies committee members
635 by name. A candidate has the right to respond in writing to any or all of these evaluations, and
636 copies of the candidate's response(s) will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels
637

638 **5.07 Review by the Provost**

639 The Provost will make an independent review of the candidate's promotion and/or tenure
640 materials. During this review, the Provost will consult with the Advisory Panel to the Provost on
641 Promotion and Tenure. For more information about the membership and function of the Advisory
642 Panel to the Provost on Promotion and Tenure, please refer to Section F in *GSU Promotion and*
643 *Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors*. Informed by the Advisory Panel's
644 recommendation and all submitted materials related to a candidate, the Provost will make a
645 recommendation to the President of the University.

646
647 The President of the University in accordance with the policies of the University System of
648 Georgia Board of Regents makes the final decision regarding promotion and/or tenure.

649
650 **5.08 Rating Criteria for Evaluation of Candidates**

651 Candidates will be evaluated as having met or having not met the standards for tenure and
652 promotion in each area of consideration (research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service).
653 For more detail regarding this evaluation, please refer to section 3.0 in this document.

654
655 **5.09 Candidate's Withdrawal**

656
657 If a candidate elects to withdraw from the review process at any time in the review
658 process the candidate will immediately inform in writing the department chair, the chair
659 of the ACFPT, and the Dean of the College. At that time all review processes related to
660 that candidate will be terminated. New letters from external reviewers are required each
661 time a candidate submits for promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure; external
662 reviewers from the earlier review may be selected."
663

664 **5.010 Candidate's Appeal**

665 ***A. Appeals to the Provost***

666 Appeals of negative recommendations by college deans may be made to the provost. In
667 reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the
668 appeal from the candidate, the college dean, the departmental chair, the departmental or
669 college promotion and tenure committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or
670 outside the University. The provost shall provide the candidate and the dean with a
671 written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or
672 rejected, by the date specified in the calendar.

673 ***B. Appeals to the President***

674 A candidate may appeal the provost's negative recommendations or decision regarding
675 his/her appeal to the president. The appeal to the president shall conform to the principles
676 and processes stated above for appeals to the provost.

677 The president shall provide the candidate a written decision including a statement of the bases
678 upon which the candidate's appeal is supported or rejected by the date specified in the calendar.

679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686

687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737

Part 3
Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

1.0 Eligibility for Cumulative Review

This review should begin five years after the most recent promotion or tenure and continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further promotion or impending candidacy for promotion within a year.

2.0 Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty (CCRTF)

2.01 CCRTF Purpose

The CCRTF is a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education. Its purpose is to conduct a rigorous formative review of tenured faculty members. Such review provides an opportunity to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provides feedback to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth to help the departments fulfill their missions. The cumulative review is distinguished from an annual review in that the cumulative review assesses achievements and goals over a longer period (e.g., multi-year projects and research direction) and may facilitate longer-term growth and development. This committee serves as one of several levels of review. The CCRTF review will be reviewed and commented on by the department chair, the dean, and the provost. All letters and comments will be forwarded to the tenured faculty member in accordance with the timeline in Appendix F. The faculty member may provide a letter of response within 5 working days of receipt of all the letters and comments.

2.02 CCRTF Membership

The CCRTF shall consist of six members. Each department of the College of Education and Human Development shall elect one representative from among its faculty (1) who has been a full-time faculty member of the College of Education and Human Development for three academic years, (2) who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and (3) who has been awarded tenure. Faculty members so elected shall serve a term of two years. A schedule for each department's election has been established so that half the members of the committee will be elected each year. Departments should hold elections for representatives during the fall semester. The department chair will notify the dean and the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the results of the election according to the timeline in Appendix F.

The term of office will be January 1 - December 31. Should a vacancy occur before a person has completed a full term, the affected department will fill that vacancy by holding a special election. A faculty member may not serve two consecutive full terms on the CCRTF. Faculty members who are candidates for cumulative review may not serve on the CCRTF. Any committee member who is a relative of or has a significant other relationship with an applicant for cumulative review must withdraw from the committee. No committee action is official unless a quorum is present; a quorum consists of two-thirds of the full committee membership.

2.03 CCRTF Procedures

The dean will notify faculty members who will receive a cumulative review according to the timeline in Appendix F.

The CCRTF will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee according to the timeline in Appendix F. The committee will have three orders of business: (1) the election of a chair, (2) the review and familiarization of the guidelines and supporting documents essential to the process, and (3) the declaration of informational sessions for the

738 purpose of explaining the guidelines and acknowledging any nuances to the process which might
739 be appropriate. These informational sessions are held according to the timeline in Appendix F.

740
741 In accordance with the timeline in Appendix F, the committee will meet to review the information
742 submitted by the faculty being reviewed. If deemed necessary, the committee will make the
743 candidate aware of any additional information or clarification needed.

744
745 **2.04 Criteria for Review**

746 This cumulative review should address accomplishments in: research and scholarly activity,
747 teaching, and service. In accordance with the timeline in Appendix F, the faculty member being
748 reviewed will submit a narrative of that individual's quality and scope of goals and
749 accomplishments in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. The review will be
750 based on available information such as annual reports, evaluations of teaching, curriculum vitae,
751 and publications. An individual being reviewed should not be expected to prepare additional
752 materials solely for the purpose of the cumulative review.

753

754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778

Part 4
Guidelines for Emeritus Status

1.0 Emeritus Faculty Appointments

In compliance with the Board of Regents' policy, the president may recommend for approval by the Board of Regents the title of "emeritus" for any retired and tenured Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor, or Board-approved non-tenure-track faculty member of equivalent rank, who, at the time of retirement, had ten years or more of honorable and distinguished service in the University System. In making recommendations for emeritus appointments, departments should be specific with respect to the emeritus title (e.g., Associate Professor emeritus, Professor emeritus or department chair emeritus).

Candidates for emeritus faculty status may be nominated by faculty members in their own departments or may nominate themselves to be considered. The nominations should be brought before the department faculty for a vote. A simple majority vote of the department faculty is necessary to recommend emeritus status. If the faculty members recommend the candidate for emeritus status, a report of the recommendation goes to the department chair, and then the dean. The dean forwards a recommendation to the provost with the following provided:

- 1.01 A current curriculum vitae**
- 1.02 Report of a vote of support by the department**
- 1.03 A letter of recommendation from the department chair to the dean**
- 1.04 A letter of recommendation from the dean to the provost**

779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793

Part 5
Guidelines for Regents' and/or Distinguished University Professor Status

1.0 Regents' Professorships

Please refer to university policy,
<http://faculty.gsu.edu/regents-professorships/>

2.0 Distinguished University Professorships

Please refer to university policy,
<http://faculty.gsu.edu/distinguished-university-professorships-2/>

794 **Appendices**

795
796 **Appendix A: Sample Letter to External Reviewers**

797
798 Dear xxxxx:

799
800 I am writing to ask for your professional assistance in the review of a colleague, Dr. XXXXX, who is
801 being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. We appreciate your
802 willingness to assist us with the evaluation by offering your opinion as an accomplished scholar in the
803 discipline. We are interested in an appraisal of the research and scholarly activities and, where applicable,
804 service to the profession of Dr. XXXXX. A sample of materials provided by the candidate is enclosed,
805 along with a current curriculum vitae and a narrative written by Dr. XXXXX.

806
807 In your evaluation, we ask that you address the overall quality of the candidate's scholarship and as
808 appropriate, the impact of this scholarship on the field or discipline. We seek your evaluation of the
809 candidate's research and scholarly achievements and your assessment of the relative position of the
810 candidate in her or his field or discipline. We also request an evaluation of how the candidate's
811 accomplishments compare to outstanding scholars in the same field at a similar stage in their careers. In
812 addition to submission of an evaluation of the candidate, we ask that you provide a copy of your
813 curriculum vitae.

814
815 The evaluation you provide will be made available only to appropriate administrators and to Georgia
816 State University faculty members responsible for advising the academic administrators on the promotion
817 and tenure of the candidate. You should be aware, however, that the requirements of the Georgia Open
818 Records Law might result in your review becoming public and available to the candidate.

819
820
821 Sincerely yours,

822
823
824
825 Dean, College of Education and Human Development
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833

834 **Appendix B: Format for Dossiers Submitted for Promotion, Promotion and Tenure, or Tenure**

835

836 **1.0 Standard Format**

837

838 To assist the reviews, candidates shall submit information in a standard format as described in this
839 section. All information is to be typed on standard size pages (8 1/2 x 11) with standard margins, and
840 assembled in sections as described below, and submitted in electronic (e.g. .pdf) files only. The dossier
841 shall contain a separate electronic file for each section as shown in 1.01-1.04. In addition, the dossier will
842 include electronic files for each candidate's external review letters, provided by the Dean's office.

843

844 When it is not feasible to submit artifacts electronically, the candidate can petition his/her Department
845 Promotion & Tenure Committee for exceptions to electronic submissions.

846

847 Each candidate's electronic dossier and external review letters will be held on a secured drive in the
848 Dean's office. Access to each candidate's dossier and external review letters will be restricted to: his/her
849 department chair, his/her department's Promotion & Tenure Committee members, ACFPT members, the
850 Dean, and approved Dean's office staff Access by the chair and departmental committee members will be
851 withdrawn once the FAC chair has received their recommendation letters. Access by ACFPT members
852 will be withdrawn once the FAC Chair has received their recommendation letters.

853

854 **1.01 Section 1: The Candidate**

855 This section should include a) cover sheet and b) current and complete vita. Candidates with
856 probationary credit toward prior service at another institution must supply documentation from
857 the dean outlining the number of years awarded upon initial appointment at Georgia State
858 University.

859

860 **1.02 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity**

861 This section should include a) Narrative Statement, b) Listing, and c) Exhibits.

862

863 **1.03 Section 3: Teaching**

864 This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing.

865

866 **1.04 Section 4: Service**

867 This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing.

868

869 **2.0 General Rules for Preparing the Dossier**

870

871 **2.01** The dossier should be a complete summary of a candidate's professional activity whether or
872 not a particular type of activity is specifically mentioned in these guidelines.

873

874 **2.02** Detailed information regarding any activity or product should be listed in one section only;
875 however, an activity or product may be cited in the narrative statement for two or more sections
876 when appropriate.

877

878 **2.03** Explanations of unusual academic roles and/or assignments, such as program coordination
879 by an Assistant Professor, should be included when appropriate.

880

881 **2.04** Those seeking promotion to the rank of Professor should mark current activities with an
882 asterisk (*) at the left of each entry. Current activities are defined as work done since the
883 candidate last successfully applied for promotion at any university.

884

885 **Appendix C: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier**

886

887 **1.0 Section 1: The Candidate**

888

889 **1.01 Cover Sheet**

890 The cover page of the dossier should include the following:

891

1.011 Name of candidate

892

1.012 Present rank of candidate

893

1.013 Department of candidate

894

1.014 Effective date of appointment to Georgia State University

895

1.015 Effective date of last promotion

896

1.016 Signature of candidate

897

1.017 Date dossier is submitted to the committee

898

899 **1.02 Current and Complete Vita**

900 The vita must include institutions of higher education attended (including date attended, degrees
901 and/or certificates awarded, and areas of specialization) and professional employment history.

902 The lists are to be presented in reverse chronological order. It must also include the same
903 information presented in Section 2.02 of this Appendix.

904

905 **2.0 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity**

906

907 This section is concerned with information about scholarly activity directed toward the development and
908 extension of knowledge, which is typically demonstrated by publications and presentations designated for
909 professional and public audiences. Research and scholarly activity includes journal articles, books and
910 texts, reports of quantitative and qualitative research, theoretical discussion and debate, and the
911 development of solutions to significant problems of theory and practice, and creative works and
912 performances.

913

914 **2.01 Narrative Statement**

915 In this narrative, candidates explain the quality, scope, and impact of their research and scholarly
916 activity and the connections among them. It is incumbent upon candidates to address how their
917 research and scholarly activity has advanced their field or discipline. Candidates should describe
918 the nature and quality of their work with reference to the appropriate points in Section 2.02 of the
919 dossier. The narrative will be up to 5 typed, double-spaced pages and may be the same in part as
920 the narrative submitted to external reviewers.

921

922 **2.02 Listing**

923 Scholarly activity is to be listed within categories in the order shown below. Categories for which
924 candidates have no entries may be omitted. Entries are to be listed in reverse chronological order.
925 In addition to the information requested below, each entry is to include whether the publication is
926 refereed or non-refereed and its intended audience (e.g., international, national, regional, state).
927 Authors and editors are to be listed in the order shown on the published documents. It is
928 incumbent upon candidates to explain their contribution to each work in the listing that includes
929 multiple authors. Documentation of accepted but not yet published and submitted scholarly
930 activity (e.g., letters of acceptance, proof of submission) should be provided in Appendix A.

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
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985

2.021 Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, Reviews, and Proceedings

2.0211 Published Articles

Candidates should provide a list of articles that are published or accepted for publication. This list should include for each article: author(s), title, journal, volume, date (or projected date) of publication.

2.0212 Chapters in Books

Candidates should provide a list of chapters that have been published in edited books and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each chapter: author(s), title of the chapter, title of book, the book’s editor(s), publisher, and the date (or projected date) of publication. Only chapters that are completed and scheduled for publication on a definite date should be included.

2.0213 Books and Monographs

Candidates should provide a list of books or monographs published or accepted for publication. This list should include: author(s), title, publisher, and date (or projected date) of publication. For works accepted but not yet published, clear documentation should be given of whether the item is a completed book manuscript in press and scheduled for publication at a definite date, or a book project for which a contract has been awarded for a manuscript to be submitted to the publisher in the future and the projected date of completion.

2.0214 Book Reviews

Candidates should provide a list of book reviews published or accepted for publication, including: author(s) and title of the book reviewed, place of appearance, and date (or projected date) of publication.

2.0215 Published Abstracts or Proceedings

Candidates should include author(s), title, name of professional organization or conference, date of publication, and number of published pages. A presentation that has a published abstract or is included in published proceedings should only appear once in the listings.

2.0216 Submitted Scholarly Writings

Candidates should include author(s), title, type of publication, publisher or journal to which submitted, month/year submitted, and number of typed, double-spaced manuscript pages. Only submitted work should be listed.

2.0217 Other

Candidates should list any other type of publication (e.g., ERIC documents). Include the author(s), title, publisher, date (or projected date) of publication.

2.022 Presentations at Professional Meetings

Candidates should provide a list of presentations at professional meetings. This list should include the title of the presentation, author(s), the type of presentation (e.g., paper, poster, invited paper or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion), and the name, location, and date of the meeting. Works that have been accepted but not yet presented may be listed.

986 **2.023 Awards and Grants**
987 Candidates should provide a list of all research grants and contracts received and all
988 scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and personal development awards that supported
989 the candidate's scholarly activity. This list should include the title of each project
990 supported, the awarding agency, the amount and period of the award, and the precise role
991 of the investigator and any other co-investigators on the project. When the candidate is
992 not the PI, a letter from the PI describing the candidate's role in the project should be
993 included. Candidates also should provide copies of official letters of award for funded
994 projects. Separate headings should be created, when appropriate, for: Funded external
995 awards; Funded internal awards; and Submitted and/or unfunded external awards.
996 Listings of submitted grants and awards should include the date of submission and the
997 funding agency. Listings of unfunded external awards the candidate chooses to submit
998 must include the date(s) of submission and documentation of the evaluation received.
999

1000 **2.024 Media Products**
1001 Candidates should provide a list of titles, dates of publication or completion, and the
1002 following additional information as appropriate for each product: (a) developer(s) in
1003 order of relative contribution or by specific role, (e.g., writer, producer); (b) descriptive
1004 information (product medium or media; viewing or listening time; amount and kind of
1005 supplementary material; specific content if not expressed in title; purpose and intended
1006 audience; and (c) product distributor.
1007

1008 **2.025 Recognition by Scholarly and Professional Associations**
1009 Leadership in professional organizations (e.g., officers, program chairs, committee
1010 chairs) and the editorial process of publication (e.g., editorships, editorial board
1011 memberships, reviews of manuscripts and conference proposals) are indicators of the
1012 scholarly reputation of the candidate. Honors, such as fellow status, invitations received
1013 for colloquium presentations or workshops at professional associations or other
1014 universities, reviews of published works, and awards from scholarly and professional
1015 associations that result from the candidate's research also serve as indicators of the
1016 candidate's scholarly reputation. Candidates should provide the type of recognition,
1017 organization, and dates.
1018

1019 **2.03 Exhibits**
1020 Appendix A of the dossier should include all documentation requested to support listings as well
1021 as the sample of five of the candidate's research and scholarly activities submitted for the external
1022 reviewers. Candidates should select scholarly activities that represent the impact, scope, and
1023 depth of their work.
1024

1025 **3.0 Section 3: Teaching**

1026
1027 The purpose of this section of the dossier is to provide information regarding the candidate's teaching
1028 effectiveness. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge
1029 and typically involves teaching in the university classroom. Teaching includes advising and mentoring
1030 students. Teaching also may include the delivery of instructional activities in the profession, community,
1031 businesses, and schools, including work in Professional Development Schools or partner schools (see the
1032 Board of Regents' policy statement on faculty work in schools), as well as the development of new
1033 courses, programs, instructional approaches, textbooks, and other curricular materials for both university
1034 and other students.
1035

Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on such indicators as: a) peer and/or student reports and recognition of teaching and/or mentorship through awards; b) presentations and publications with student coauthors; c) chairing and serving on doctoral committees and specialist and master's theses/projects; and d) critical review and acceptance of teaching products.

3.01 Narrative Statement

Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional teaching. The narrative will be up to 5 typed, double-spaced pages.

3.02 Listing

Information regarding teaching is to be listed in the order of the categories below. Course listings are to include departmental course designation (e.g., EPY 9000) and complete course title in addition to other information as indicated at each category heading below.

3.021 Georgia State University Teaching Assignments: should include number of times taught since appointment or last successful application for promotion; average enrollment.

3.022 Courses Taught at Other Institutions: should include name of institution(s); date(s); number of times taught since appointment or last successful application for promotion.

3.023 Courses Developed at Georgia State University: specify role in development; date of college approval or year of first Bulletin listing.

3.024 Graduate Student Committees: include number by degree level; role title, date, and author of dissertations, theses, and projects, indicate which in progress or directed to completion.

3.025 Other Information

3.0251 Products developed for teaching: include type of product; brief description; course(s) for which product is useful; date of development. List textbooks or textbook series written or edited, publisher, date of publication; these may not be also listed under Research and Scholarly Activity.

3.0252 Honors and Awards for Teaching: include date; source; type of competition, if applicable; further details as appropriate.

3.0253 Peer evaluation of teaching reports if available.

3.026 Impact on Students

3.0261 Evidence of student achievement, such as presentations at conferences and publications.

3.0262 Summary of student evaluations. For each course taught at Georgia State University, include the full College of Education and Human Development computerized evaluation form. If printed it must be in landscape form.

4.0 Section 4: Service

The purpose of this section of the dossier is to provide information regarding the candidate's professional service activities. Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on behalf of the University or the profession which do not entail systematic instruction (e.g., design and development of professional conferences), including work in Professional Development Schools or partner schools (see the Board of Regents' policy statement on faculty work in schools). Judgments of the quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contribution and on participation at the national, regional, state, and local levels.

1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103

4.01 Narrative Statement

Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional service activities that contribute to the candidate's value in the University, in the community, and in professional affiliations. The narrative will be up to 3 typed, double-spaced pages.

4.02 Listing

Service activities include the following: meetings and conference sessions chaired, attended, or organized; programs and materials developed; workshops conducted or attended; consultancies; committees chaired or served; work in Professional Development Schools and partner schools, and so forth. Concise but complete details should be provided. Any activity presented more than once with little or no substantive change (e.g., a speech or workshop) should be indicated in one entry, which shows place and date of each presentation. Information regarding service activities is to be presented using the following categories:

4.021 Service to the Profession

4.022 Service to the Community

4.023 Service to the University

1104 Official timelines will be decided on an annual basis based on the university timelines and approved by
 1105 the CEHD Dean and chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Once decided, they will be posted on the
 1106 website and the following appendices may be changed without an official vote of the faculty. Therefore,
 1107 these timelines should be considered general guidelines.

1108 **Appendix D: Timeline for Third-year Review**
 1109
 1110

DATES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	TASK
October 1	Dean	Dean notifies non-tenured tenure-track faculty who are to receive third-year review.
No later than January 31	Department review committee	Department review committee has information session(s) for non-tenured tenure-track faculty who are to receive third-year review.
First Monday in March	Non-tenured tenure-track faculty	Last date for non-tenured tenure-track faculty to submit materials to department review committee.
Second Monday in April	Department review committee	Results of the third-year review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty submitted by department review committee to the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member, to the department chair, and to the dean.
May 1	Department chair	Comments concerning third-year review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty submitted by department chair to the dean and respective faculty.
June 2	Dean	Comments concerning third-year review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty submitted by the dean to the Provost/Academic Vice President and respective faculty.
Upon receipt from the provost	Dean	Dean forwards to the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member any comments from the provost.

1111

1112
1113

Appendix E: Timeline for Promotion, Promotion and Tenure, or Tenure Review

DATES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	TASK
During Fall semester	Departments	Departments elect representatives to ACFPT.
First Monday in November	Department chairs	The department chairs notify the dean and the chair of FAC of the result of the above.
No later than January 31	Chair of FAC	The chair of FAC convenes ACFPT. The purpose of the initial meeting is to elect a chair of ACFPT, review the P&T document, and establish date(s) for the informational session(s) for faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure.
February 7	ACFPT	The dates for the informational session(s) submitted by ACFPT to the dean.
February 14	Dean	The dean notifies faculty of their eligibility for consideration for promotion and/or tenure and of the date(s) of the informational session(s).
Between February 22 and March 22	ACFPT	ACFPT holds informational session(s) for faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure. The meeting shall be open to all interested faculty members in the college.
April 1	Faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure	Candidate notifies in writing the department chair, the dean, and the chair of ACFPT of the intent to be considered for promotion and/or tenure.
April 10	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure	Candidate submits to the dean, the department chair, and the department promotion/tenure committee a list of five nominations for external reviewers.
April 15	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure Department chair	Candidate submits to the dean a sample of publications, a current and complete vita, and the narrative to be forwarded to external reviewers. Department chair in consultation with the department promotion and tenure committee submits to the dean a list of five additional names of potential reviewers.

1114
1115

DATES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	TASK
April 25	Dean	Dean sends list of potential external reviewers to candidate for opportunity to remove one reviewer.
May 1	Dean	Dean sends materials to external reviewers.
June 30	Dean	Dean receives outside letters regarding candidates for promotion and/or tenure and if necessary solicits additional reviews.
August 1	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure	Last day for candidates for promotion and/or tenure to submit dossier for optional format review.
August 11	ACFPT	ACFPT returns feedback concerning dossier format to candidate.
August 19	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure	Last day for candidate to submit dossier for formal consideration.
No later than August 19	Dean	Dean forwards external reviewers' letters to chair of ACFPT, department chairs, and department promotion and tenure committees.
September 13	Department promotion and tenure committee	Recommendations with rationale due to respective candidates from department promotion and tenure committee.
Sept 15	Request for Reconsideration	Last day for candidate to send to dept P&T committee a request for reconsideration
September 18	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure	Last day for candidates to submit to department chair response in writing to the any or all of the evaluations from the department promotion and tenure committee.
September 18	Department promotion and tenure committee	Recommendations with rationale due to department chair from department promotion and tenure committee.
October 10	Department chair	Recommendations with rationale due to respective candidates from department chair.

DATES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	TASK
October 15	Department chair	Last day for candidates to submit to ACFPT response in writing to the any or all of the evaluations from the department chair.
October 15	Department chair	Recommendations with rationale due to ACFPT from department chair.
Between October 15 and November 22	ACFPT	Dossier review teams are formed. Teams read dossiers and external reviews of the assigned candidates. Teams present their findings to ACFPT. ACFPT discusses and identifies the need for clarification for any candidate and contacts any such candidate by letter with a request for additional information and clarification; candidates will have five working days to respond. ACFPT meets to consider and evaluate candidates.
November 15	Chair of ACFPT	ACFPT chair submits sealed report of promotion and/or tenure recommendations with rationale to the dean and respective candidates.
Nov 22	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure	Last opportunity for candidate to submit a response to the dean
December 16	Dean	Dean's recommendations due to Provost/Academic Vice President and respective candidates.

1116
1117
1118

1119
1120

Appendix F: Timeline for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

DATES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	TASK
During Fall Semester	Departments	Departments elect representatives to the CCRTF.
October 1	Dean	Dean notifies faculty who are to receive five-year cumulative review.
December 1 or earlier	Department chairs	The Department chair notifies the dean and the chair of FAC of the elections described above.
Early in January	Chair of FAC	Chair of FAC will convene CCRTF. The purpose of the initial meeting will be to elect a chair of CCRTF and to establish a date for the information session(s) for those tenured faculty, who are to receive five-year cumulative review.
No later than January 31	CCRTF	CCRTF holds information session(s).
First Monday in March	Faculty undergoing five-year cumulative review	Last date for tenured faculty receiving five-year cumulative review to submit materials to CCRTF.
April 15	CCRTF	Results of five-year cumulative review of tenured faculty submitted by CCRTF to the tenured faculty, to the department chair, and to the dean.
May 1	Department chairs	Comments concerning five-year cumulative review of tenured faculty submitted by department chair to the dean and respective faculty.
June 2	Dean	Comments concerning five-year review of tenured faculty submitted by dean to the Provost/Academic Vice President and respective faculty.
June 2	Dean	Dean forwards to tenured faculty any comments from the provost.

1121
1122
1123
1124

1125 **Appendix D: Timeline for Tenure Review at the Time of Initial Appointment**

1126

1127 **1.0 Review Procedures**

1128

1129 In recruiting a candidate for a senior position, a department chair must request the dean's permission prior
1130 to the formulation of an offer to conduct a tenure review at the time of initial appointment. If the dean
1131 concurs that the candidate is eligible for such a review, the review is not initiated until other aspects of an
1132 offer to the candidate have been formulated and agreed to by the dean.

1133

1134 **2.0 External Review Letters**

1135

1136 The procedures contained in the Criteria for Tenure section 5.00 are to be followed as closely as possible.
1137 Thus, external review letters are required as part of the candidate's dossier, which will be reviewed within
1138 the department and at the College level under the same procedures (with different time deadlines) as
1139 specified in these guidelines.

1140

1141 **3.0 College-Level Review**

1142

1143 If the recommendations of the faculty review committee of the department, the department chair, the
1144 ACFPT, and the dean are all positive, the dean will recommend to the provost and president that tenure be
1145 granted at the time of initial appointment.

1146

1147 **4.0 University-Level Review**

1148

1149 Under special circumstances, the president may agree to make a University-level recommendation with
1150 respect to a tenure review at time of initial appointment. University-level assurances are used very
1151 sparingly for achieving long range and continuing institutional goals.

1152

1153