

1 **Guidelines for Promotion of Clinical Faculty Members**

2
3
4
5
6
7 **COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**
8 **GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**
9 **ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

10
11
12
13
14
15 **Version 1.0 Approved Faculty Affairs Committee, October 2, 2014**

16 **Version 1.1 Amended by College of Education and Human Development faculty October 21,**
17 **2014**

18 **Version 1.2 Approved by Faculty Affairs Committee, December 2, 2014**

19 **Version 1.3 Approved by Faculty Affairs Committee, April 2, 2015**

20 **Version 1.4 Approved by Faculty Affairs Committee, April 2017**

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Version 1.4 April 21, 2017

Table of Contents

52	
53	
54	I. PREAMBLE
55	
56	II. Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process
57	
58	III. Part 1 Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee
59	
60	IV. Part 2 Structured Reviews for Clinical Faculty Members
61	4.1 Structured Third-Year Review for Clinical Faculty
62	4.2 Structured Five-Year Review for Clinical Faculty
63	
64	V. Part 3 Promotion for Clinical Faculty Members
65	5.1 Eligibility for Promotion for Clinical Faculty Members
66	5.1.1 Clinical Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion
67	5.1.2 Clinical Associate Professors Seeking Promotion
68	5.1.3 Promotion for Faculty Members with Secondary Appointments in the College of
69	Education and Human Development
70	5.2 Criteria for Promotion
71	5.2.1 Teaching
72	5.2.2 Service
73	5.2.3 Research
74	5.3 Overview of the Review Process
75	5.3.1 Review of Teaching
76	5.3.2 Peer Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness
77	5.4 Review by the Candidate's Department
78	5.5 Review by the Advisory Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion (ACCFP)
79	5.5.1 ACCFP Purpose
80	5.5.2 ACCFP Membership
81	5.5.3 ACCFP Procedures
82	5.6 Review by the Dean of the College
83	5.7 Written Notification to Candidate
84	5.8 Candidate's Withdrawal or Appeal
85	5.8.1 Candidate's Withdrawal
86	5.8.2 Candidate's Appeal
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
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153

Appendices

- I. Appendix A: Format for Dossiers Submitted for Promotion
 - 1 Standard Format
 - 1.1 Section 1: The Candidate
 - 1.2 Section 2: Teaching
 - 1.3 Section 3: Service
 - 1.4 Section 4: Research
 - 2 General Rules for Preparing the Dossier
- II. Appendix B: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier
 - 1 Section 1: The Candidate
 - 1.1 Cover Sheet
 - 1.2 Current and Complete Vita
 - 1.3 Department Chair's Letter for Addressing Workload
 - 2 Section 2: Teaching
 - 2.1 Narrative Statement
 - 2.2 Listing
 - 2.2.1 Georgia State University Teaching Assignments
 - 2.2.2 Courses Taught at Other Institutions
 - 2.2.3 Courses Developed at Georgia State University
 - 2.2.4 Graduate Student Committees
 - 2.2.5 Other Information
 - 2.2.6 Impact on Students
 - 3 Section 3: Service
 - 3.1 Narrative Statement
 - 3.2 Listing
 - 3.2.1 Service to the Profession
 - 3.2.2 Service to the Community
 - 3.2.3 Service to the University
 - 3.2.4 Service to the Department
 - 4 Section 4: Research
 - 4.1 Narrative Statement
 - 4.2 Listing
 - 5 Exhibits

154 **I. PREAMBLE**
155

156 The College of Education and Human Development is a metropolitan professional school with a
157 commitment to excellence in preparing people to work in a variety of urban educational and service
158 delivery positions and to advancing and disseminating knowledge. The mission of the College
159 incorporates three components: research and scholarship, teaching, and service. Given the nature of a
160 professional school, this mission is achieved by having faculty members who serve in diverse roles and
161 who have unique responsibilities. Some faculty members are hired to serve in tenure-track positions,
162 while others are hired to serve in non-tenure-track positions (e.g., clinical faculty members). The
163 evaluation of the faculty within the College recognizes the variety of roles and acknowledges that there
164 are multiple paths to excellence. This document contains guidelines and procedures for promotion of
165 clinical faculty. Throughout this document, the word *department* is used to refer to departments and
166 divisions within the College.

167
168 Promotions are integral components of a faculty member's professional growth and development at an
169 academic institution. This growth and development begins when a faculty member is hired. At that time
170 the faculty member's role and responsibilities are defined and expectations for performance delineated.
171 Professional goals are set and plans for meeting those goals are explored and established. To ensure
172 growth and development, faculty members must be evaluated each year in a meaningful way to determine
173 if responsibilities have been met and to measure progress toward professional goals.

174
175 Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member's accomplishments. It is a statement that the faculty
176 member has met the established responsibilities of the current position and achieved professional goals
177 reflective of a higher faculty rank. All faculty members are expected to evidence the professional growth
178 commensurate with the criteria for promotion of faculty members.
179
180

181 **II. Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process**
182

183 As mandated by the policies of the Board of Regents, an evaluation of each faculty member is conducted
184 once a year by the faculty member’s supervisor. (This evaluation process is addressed in a separate
185 document on workload policy.) Additionally, clinical (non-tenure-track) faculty members who possess a
186 terminal degree in their field are evaluated for the purposes of promotion at appropriate intervals during
187 their careers. The Structured Third-Year Review is a formal review of progress towards promotion. This
188 review will be made no later than three years after the initial appointment, so that all clinical faculty
189 members have a clear idea of whether or not they are progressing toward successfully achieving
190 promotion. The Structured Five-Year Review begins five years after initial appointment and then every
191 five years thereafter unless interrupted by a further promotion or impending candidacy for promotion
192 within a year. The Structured Five Year Review provides opportunities to assess faculty development
193 goals and achievements and provide feedback to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and
194 professional growth to help the departments fulfill their missions.
195

196 For Clinical Instructors seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, the minimum time
197 in rank is one year. For Clinical Assistant Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate
198 Professor, the normal minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to making application for consideration
199 for promotion. For Clinical Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, the
200 minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to application. In cases of exceptional accomplishment
201 application for early promotion may be made.
202

203 Department chairs should advise all faculty members, and in particular, should inform new faculty
204 members of all promotion requirements. To this end, they should provide the faculty members with
205 copies of the appropriate department, college, and university promotion policies and discuss the contents
206 of these documents. It is the responsibility of the candidate to know and follow the guidelines set forth in
207 these documents. Furthermore, the candidate must present a clear and accurate professional record and
208 allow the reviews to proceed according to the established procedures.
209

210 Similarly, it is the responsibility of all members of the Advisory Committee on Clinical Faculty
211 Promotion (ACCFP) to know and follow these guidelines and all established procedures. In addition, it is
212 the responsibility of all members of department promotion committees and all department chairs to know
213 and follow these guidelines and all established procedures. All deliberations in the promotion process are
214 confidential.
215

216 The Provost sets the dates for communication of promotion decisions coming from the college. The
217 timelines for all evaluation processes will be adjusted by the college to complete review in advance of
218 these dates each year. (See University NTT Manual Lines 546-552) General guidelines for the timing of
219 the process appear in Appendices D, E, and F. Candidates, department promotion committees, department
220 chairs, the ACCFP, and the Dean must follow these timelines. In cases where University timelines differ
221 from the College timelines included in this document, the University guidelines take precedence and will
222 be followed.
223

224 These guidelines and procedures are designed to assure fairness and due process throughout the review
225 process. The renewal of each faculty member’s contract is subject to Board of Regents and University
226 policies and approval. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for
227 consideration for the award of tenure (BOR Policy Manual Section 8.3.8).
228

229 **III. Part 1: Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee**
230

231 Each department is responsible for establishing guidelines and creating a Department Clinical
232 Faculty Review Committee. The committee will serve as the department committee that reviews
233 clinical non-tenure track faculty during their structured reviews and for promotion. This department
234 committee shall consist of at least three faculty members. Where possible, members of the
235 department committee must include Clinical Faculty of the rank to which the candidate aspires and
236 may include tenure track faculty. As far as possible, clinical faculty members on the committee shall
237 be from a clinical position that is similar to that of the candidate(s) in terms of emphasis on teaching,
238 research and service. The appropriate rank of faculty who can serve on the department level
239 promotion committee would include faculty at ranks above the current rank of the faculty being
240 considered for promotion. If there are no clinical faculty of appropriate rank to serve as members of
241 the department level promotion committee, appropriate clinical faculty from related departments
242 within the college shall be considered.
243

244 **IV. Part 2: Structured Reviews for Clinical Faculty Members**

245 Procedures for the Structured Third Year Review and the Structured Five-Year Review shall be specified
246 in writing by each department. *The Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track*
247 *Faculty* provides the following description for structured reviews for Clinical Faculty Members:
248

249 *Structured Reviews are intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an*
250 *annual review. Structured Reviews contribute to the determination of whether the faculty members are*
251 *performing at the level necessary for reappointment, whether faculty members who are seeking*
252 *promotion are progressing towards promotion, and to identify opportunities that will enable faculty*
253 *members to reach their full potential in terms of contribution to the University. All NTT faculty whose*
254 *initial appointment at GSU is at an entry level will have a review no later than three years after the initial*
255 *appointment (Structured Third Year Review), and a review no later than five years after the initial*
256 *appointment (Structured Five Year Review). Thereafter, subsequent structured reviews will take place*
257 *every five years, unless a faculty member is promoted sooner. If a NTT faculty member is promoted,*
258 *subsequent structured reviews will occur every five years after the most recent promotion. (Section V,*
259 *lines 373-384).*
260

261 **4.1 Structured Third Year Review for Clinical Faculty Members**
262

263 All Clinical Faculty members are required to participate in a formal review of their progress toward
264 promotion. This review will be made no later than three years after the initial appointment, so that all
265 clinical faculty members have a clear idea of whether or not they are progressing toward successfully
266 achieving promotion. Following the initial third review structured reviews should occur only at five year
267 intervals. Teaching is expected to comprise the majority of the clinical faculty member's effort as defined
268 by the CEHD Workload Policy. In consultation with their department chairs, Clinical Faculty members
269 are expected to identify at least one area of additional focus (i.e., service or research) on which to base
270 their review.
271

272 In accordance with the deadline issued by the provost for notification of the outcomes of college review
273 and following the guidelines as set forth by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the chair of the Department
274 Clinical Faculty Review Committee should meet with faculty members who will be reviewed to clarify
275 procedures and items to be submitted for review. Such review should complement efforts to implement
276 mentoring programs within each department. The Structured Third Year Review is distinguished from the
277 annual review in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments while still permitting
278 time for changes in orientation and activity of the individual involved. Faculty members may be hired
279 with prior credit toward promotion subject to approval by the dean and the provost.

280 It is the responsibility of the faculty member to read these promotion guidelines carefully to be aware of
281 expectations for promotion. The candidate needs to consider these expectations when preparing materials
282 for the Structured Review.

283
284 In accordance with the deadline issued by the provost for notification of the outcomes of college review
285 and following the guidelines as set forth by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the report of the Department
286 Clinical Faculty Review Committee will be forwarded to the department chair for review and comment.
287 Department chairs will forward the report of the department committee and their letters and comments to
288 the Dean. All letters and comments will be forwarded to the clinical faculty member in accordance with
289 the guidelines set forth by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The faculty member may provide a letter of
290 response within 3 business days of receipt of all the letters and comments.

291 292 **4.2 Structured Five-Year Review for Clinical Faculty Members**

293 294 **Purpose of Structured Five-Year Review of Clinical Faculty**

295
296 After the initial third review structured reviews occur at five year intervals. Each department is
297 responsible for conducting ongoing formative reviews of clinical faculty members. Such reviews provide
298 opportunities to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provide feedback to faculty in
299 ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth to help the departments fulfill their missions.
300 The Structured Five Year Review will be reviewed and commented on by the department chair, the Dean,
301 and the Provost.

302 303 **Eligibility for Structured Five-Year Review**

304 This review should begin five years after initial appointment and then every five years thereafter unless
305 interrupted by a further promotion or impending candidacy for promotion within a year. The Structured
306 Five Year Review is not required to coincide with promotion decisions. In the case that promotion occurs
307 during the five year cycle, the next review will occur five years after the most recent promotion. These
308 structured reviews will take place at the departmental level.

309
310 The chair of the Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee should meet with faculty members who
311 will be reviewed to clarify procedures and items to be submitted for review. The Structured Five Year
312 Review is distinguished from the annual review because it is expected to provide clinical faculty with a
313 long-term perspective on accomplishments and career development.

314
315 It is the responsibility of the faculty member to read these promotion guidelines carefully to be aware of
316 expectations for promotion. The candidate needs to consider these expectations when preparing materials
317 for the Structured Review.

318
319 In accordance with the timeline issued annually by the provost and the guidelines as set forth by the
320 Faculty Affairs Committee, the report of the Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee will be
321 forwarded to the department chair for review and comment. Department chairs will forward the report of
322 the committee and their letters and comments to the Dean.

323 324 **Criteria for Structured Five-Year Review**

325
326 This structured review should address accomplishments in the primary areas of assigned workload
327 (teaching, service, and/or research). The faculty member being reviewed will submit a narrative of that
328 individual's quality and scope of goals and accomplishments in assigned areas of workload (teaching,
329 service, and/or research). The review will be based on available information such as annual reports,

330 student course evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching, and curriculum vitae. An individual being
331 reviewed should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of this review.
332

333 **V. Part 3: Promotion for Clinical Faculty Members**

334 **5.1 Eligibility for Promotion for Clinical Faculty Members**

335 All candidates for promotion shall hold an earned doctoral degree and must be full-time members of the
336 faculty of the College of Education and Human Development. In the fall of the academic year, the dean's
337 office will notify clinical faculty of their eligibility for promotion. It is the clear and unequivocal
338 responsibility of candidates to notify their chair and the Dean of the intent to submit their credentials for
339 consideration as specified in the COE timeline for promotion of Clinical Faculty Members. In recruiting
340 candidates for senior positions, department chairs must request the Dean's permission prior to the
341 formulation of an offer to conduct a promotion review at the time of initial appointment.
342
343

344 **5.1.1 Clinical Instructors Seeking Promotion**

345 Clinical Instructors may seek promotion to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor when they
346 meet the qualifications of that rank (e.g., earn a doctoral degree or its equivalent). Clinical
347 instructors must be in rank at least one year.
348

349 **5.1.2 Clinical Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion**

350 For Clinical Assistant Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor,
351 the typical minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to making application for consideration
352 for promotion. In cases of exceptional accomplishment, a faculty member can ask to apply for
353 early promotion. A maximum of three years' credit towards the Georgia State University service
354 period may be allowed based on previous service by the candidate at another institution or within
355 Georgia State University (e.g., visiting/temporary Assistant Professor). Such credit for prior
356 service must be approved in writing by the department chair, dean, and provost at the time of
357 initial appointment.
358

359 **5.1.3 Clinical Associate Professors Seeking Promotion**

360 For Clinical Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, the typical
361 minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to application although application for early
362 promotion based on exceptional accomplishment may be made. A maximum of three years' credit
363 towards the Georgia State University service period may be allowed based on previous service by
364 the candidate at another institution or within Georgia State University (e.g., visiting/temporary
365 Associate Professor). Such credit for prior service must be approved in writing by the department
366 chair, dean, and provost at the time of initial appointment.
367

368 **5.2 Criteria for Promotion**

369 Because of the diversity of activities engaged in by Clinical Faculty members, department promotion
370 committees, department chairs, the Advisory Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion (ACCFP), and the
371 Dean of the College will consider each set of materials individually using the following guidelines based
372 on the quality, scope, and impact of the candidate's teaching, service, and research.
373

374 Teaching is typically the primary responsibility for Clinical Faculty and candidates may submit
375 information for evaluation in three areas depending on their role and responsibility in the college:
376 teaching, service, and research. These categories subsume the Board of Regents' indices for promotion.
377 The criterion of professional growth and development is met when a candidate achieves promotion. The
378 three areas (teaching, service, and research) are defined in Part 3: Sections 5.2.1, 5.2.2, and 5.2.3.
379
380

381 Clinical Faculty members at the Instructor, Assistant or Associate rank may be eligible for promotion.
382 Clinical Faculty are not required to work toward promotion and may apply for promotion at any time after
383 the minimum number of years in rank are met.

384
385 Clinical Faculty negotiate with their department chair each year at the time of annual evaluation as to
386 their workload requirements. The promotion criteria should reflect the workload distribution of the
387 individual candidates for promotion. The level of accomplishments required in each area of responsibility
388 (teaching, research and service) should reflect the emphasis the workload distribution of the candidate in
389 each of these three areas. In general, the quality and level of achievements required for promotion to a
390 higher rank in the position must substantially surpass those required for promotion to the previous rank.

391
392 Clinical Faculty are required in addition to their teaching duties to engage in professional service, **or** to
393 conduct an active line of research as defined in College of Education and Human Development
394 documents on workload and on promotion. Under these conditions, Clinical Faculty who choose to work
395 toward promotion have the opportunity, over time, to become accomplished in multiple areas of service
396 and/or research in addition to their primary responsibility of teaching.

397
398 Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member's accomplishments. It is a statement that the faculty
399 member has met the established responsibilities of the current position and achieved professional goals
400 reflective of a higher faculty rank. Each area of consideration (teaching, and either service or research)
401 will be evaluated. The area under consideration for promotion in addition to teaching will be identified in
402 a letter from the candidate's department chair that is included in the dossier for promotion. This letter
403 reflects the annual workload assignments and more detail regarding this letter is provided in Appendix C,
404 Section 3.1.3. A basic rating scale consisting of "Met" or "Not Met" is used to determine whether or not
405 the candidate has achieved the threshold of accomplishment.

406
407 Promotion to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor or Clinical Associate Professor requires that a
408 faculty member demonstrate a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as
409 excellent. For promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor the candidate must demonstrate a sustained
410 level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as excellent with continued growth in
411 the time period since the last promotion. That evaluation is based on the recognition that a faculty
412 member's contribution is of such high quality and importance that the faculty member has achieved a
413 high impact in the individual's area of teaching.

414
415 The *Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non Tenure Track Faculty* provides the following
416 detail for evaluation of criteria for promotion in the secondary areas of service or research:

417
418 *If a candidate's workload includes service (but is not the candidate's primary responsibility), then for*
419 *promotion to an intermediate rank or to the highest rank, the candidate must provide high quality service*
420 *to the department, college and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community. (Section*
421 *IV, lines 363-366)*

422
423 *If a candidate's workload includes research (but is not the candidate's primary responsibility), then for*
424 *promotion to an intermediate rank or to the highest rank, the candidate must demonstrate high quality*
425 *research. (Section IV, lines 347-349)*

426 427 **5.2.1 Teaching**

428 Teaching is typically the primary responsibility for Clinical Faculty. It represents professional
429 activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and involves teaching in the university
430 setting. The *Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non Tenure Track Faculty* further
431 defines teaching as being related to one or more of the following:

- 432 • *teaching courses related to professional practice;*
- 433 • *providing practical instruction and application of practical knowledge;*
- 434 • *supervising and teaching in a clinical or practice setting;*
- 435 • *teaching and/or supervising applied clinical courses;*
- 436 • *providing academic instruction in skills relevant to the practice of a specific discipline*
- 437 • *training and supervising students to help them acquire clinical skills for the profession;*
- 438 • *coordinating and supervising clinical practica, student field experiences and internship;*
- 439 • *teaching and advising students in professional academic programs;*
- 440 • *providing services or out-of-class educational opportunities for students.* (Section III,
441 lines 132-140)

442
443 Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of innovative practice, teaching effectiveness,
444 and positive learning outcomes. Any evidence of teaching effectiveness submitted by the
445 candidate should be reasonably attributable to the contributions made by the candidate. See
446 Review of Teaching (Section 5.3.1) in this document for more information on evidence of
447 teaching effectiveness.

448 **5.2.2 Service**

449 Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of
450 University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on behalf of
451 the University or the profession which do not entail systematic instruction (e.g., design and
452 development of professional conferences), including work in Professional Development Schools
453 or partner schools (see the Board of Regents' policy statement on faculty work in schools).
454 Service also includes administrative positions (e.g., program coordinator). Judgments of the
455 quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contributions and on
456 participation at international, national, regional, state, and/or local levels. For candidates choosing
457 service as their secondary responsibility and seeking promotion to the highest level of Clinical
458 Professor, they are expected to have held leadership positions in their service activities during the
459 period of review.

460 **5.2.3 Research**

461 In the College of Education and Human Development, research encompasses any activity that
462 advances education and human development by creating, extending, integrating, applying, or
463 promoting knowledge and/or modes of inquiry. Research is expected to focus on candidates'
464 professional expertise, which would include pedagogical research, scholarship of teaching and
465 learning, research related to practice, and/or disciplinary scholarly research. Candidates are
466 referred to section 3.3 in this document for definitions of acceptable research.

467 **5.3 Overview of Review Process**

470 **5.3.1 Review of Teaching**

471 Teaching is the primary area for consideration in the promotion of Clinical Faculty in the College
472 of Education and Human Development. Candidates must present evidence of teaching
473 effectiveness and innovative practice. This must include student evaluations of instruction and
474 peer evaluation(s) of their teaching effectiveness. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness may
475 include, but are not limited to: selected examinations and quizzes, students' passing rates on
476 licensure/certification examinations, teaching portfolio, new course and/or program development,
477 effective use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, teaching awards
478 received, and student accomplishments.

480
481

5.3.2 Peer Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

Peer evaluations of teaching consist of systematic and impartially monitored peer observations of teaching ability and effectiveness. Peer evaluations of teaching should address the candidates' commitment to the development and extension of knowledge in their chosen fields as evidenced by development of course related materials and delivery methods. Likewise, the evaluations should address candidate's effectiveness in the classroom or learning environment as demonstrated through instructional methods, maintenance of learning environment that encourages student contributions, and evaluations procedures that support program, college, and course objectives.

A candidate anticipating application for promotion as a clinical faculty member is encouraged to have regular annual peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The candidate will nominate potential peer evaluators to be reviewed and approved by department chair. The evaluations are expected to take place over an academic term (spring, fall, or summer semester) with no more than one evaluator reviewing a particular course in a given semester. A candidate may nominate any faculty member who has a rank higher than the candidate's current rank. The candidate is required to provide the reviewer with copies of syllabi, readings, and any other pertinent course materials. After reviewing those course materials, the reviewer will contact the candidate to arrange times for teaching observations. It is expected that the reviewer make multiple observations of the candidate's course. Following the evaluation period, the internal reviewer will complete a review letter and supply copies to the candidate to be included in the promotion dossier.

5.4 Review by the Candidate's Department

Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee Review

The committee will review the candidate's dossier and related materials. The committee will write a letter of inquiry to any candidates for whom the committee needs any additional information or clarification in order to prepare a well-informed letter of recommendation. After the responses from any candidates for whom additional information or clarification is needed, the committee will meet for the purpose of considering the candidates and prepare a letter of recommendation. This letter, along with the candidate's dossier, related materials, and dissenting letters/minority reports will be forwarded to the department chair as specified in the CEHD timeline for promotion of Clinical Faculty Members

Department Chair Review

The department chair will review and evaluate the candidate's dossier, related materials, and the recommendation letter from the departmental committee. The department chair will write a letter of inquiry to any candidates for whom additional information or clarification is needed to prepare a well-informed letter of recommendation. After the responses from any candidates for whom additional information or clarification is needed, the department chair will prepare a recommendation letter and forward it along with the departmental committee's letter to the chair of the ACCFP as specified in the COE timeline for promotion of Clinical Faculty Members. The department chair will also forward the candidate's dossier and related materials for review by the ACCFP.

5.5 Review by the Advisory Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion (ACCFP)

5.5.1 ACCFP Purpose

The ACCFP is a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education and Human Development. Its purpose is to recommend to the Dean those faculty members the committee agrees have met or not met the criteria for promotion.

533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583

5.5.2 ACCFP Membership

Where possible, the ACCFP shall consist of one clinical associate or clinical full professor elected from each department. If a department does not have an eligible clinical faculty member, it can elect a tenured faculty member from their department. Except for the first year of the formation of the committee, faculty members so elected shall serve a term of two years. A faculty member may not serve two consecutive full terms on the ACCFP. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion may not serve on the ACCFP. Any committee member who is a relative of the candidate or has a relationship that constitutes a conflict of interest with the candidate must not participate in any committee work regarding that candidate. Members of the ACCFP may not vote on candidates at the department level.

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 spring semester. The department chair will notify the Dean and the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the results of the election as specified in the CEHD timeline for promotion of Clinical Faculty Members. The term of office, typically, will be two years beginning in the fall of the academic year. Should a vacancy occur before a person has completed a full term, the affected department will fill that vacancy by holding a special election. No committee action is official unless a quorum is present; a quorum consists of two-thirds of the full committee membership.

5.5.3 ACCFP Procedures

ACCFP will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee as specified in the CEHD timeline for promotion of Clinical Faculty Members. The committee will have three orders of business: the election of a chair, the review of this document, and the planning of informational sessions for faculty seeking promotion. These informational sessions are to be held according to the timeline.

Based on the CEHD timeline for Promotion of Clinical Faculty Members, ACCFP members will meet to form themselves into teams for the purpose of reading the dossiers and reading the recommendations from the department chairs and department clinical faculty review committees. The committee will establish its meetings as necessary to accomplish its duties.

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

All communication between committee members is confidential. Members of the committee should not communicate with the candidate except through the committee's letters of inquiry and recommendation, except in cases where the candidate asks the committee for clarification of the letter of inquiry. The chair of ACCFP is responsible for answering the candidates' questions.

After the responses from any candidates for whom additional information or clarification is needed, the committee will meet for the purpose of considering the candidates. Members will rate candidates in each performance area. Committee members, by simple

584 majority vote, will determine whether or not the candidate should be awarded promotion
585 in rank. Clinical Full Professors shall be the sole voting members for candidates seeking
586 promotion to Clinical Full Professor. If Clinical Full Professors are not available tenured
587 professors of the rank of full should substitute. The committee informs the candidates of
588 the committee's decision by letter. This letter includes a rating of "Met" or "Not Met" for
589 each category along with the rationale for that particular rating. Letters of
590 recommendation and minority reports will be forwarded to the dean according to the
591 COE timeline for Promotion of Clinical Faculty Members.

592
593 The ACCFP may choose to have a final meeting in order to make recommendations to
594 the College Faculty Affairs Committee for improving the promotion process. This may
595 involve recommendations regarding revisions of these guidelines.
596

597 **5.6 Review by the Dean of the College**

598 In addition to the recommendation of the ACCFP, two other sources of recommendation to the
599 Dean are (a) the chair of the candidate's department and (b) the promotion committee within the
600 candidate's department. Based upon these three sources of recommendation and the dean's
601 independent review of the candidate's dossier, the Dean forwards a recommendation to the
602 Provost. The Dean's recommendation may be accompanied by recommendations from the
603 department chair, the department's promotion committee, and the ACCFP. Subsequently, the
604 Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs forwards his or her recommendation to the
605 President of the University, who in accordance with the policies of the University System of
606 Georgia Board of Regents makes the final decision.
607

608 **5.7 Written Notification to Candidate**

609 Candidates for promotion will receive written notice of the deliberation outcomes from
610 departmental committee, department chair, and college committee according to the guidelines
611 provided in the *Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty*. It
612 states:

613 *At each of the above stages of review, the department chair or the dean must provide the*
614 *candidate a written notice of the outcome of the deliberations and a copy of the reports*
615 *by the department committee, department chairperson and, if applicable, the college*
616 *committee. Minority reports, if they exist, should also be included. The reports, including*
617 *minority reports, may remove the signature page or section which identifies committee*
618 *members by name. The date by which the reports have to be provided to the candidate*
619 *shall be specified in the college NTT promotion manual calendar. A candidate has the*
620 *right to respond in writing to any or all of these reports, and copies of the candidate's*
621 *response(s) will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels. The candidate's*
622 *written response has to be submitted to the dean (with a copy to department chair) within*
623 *three business days of receiving the reports. (p. 15, lns 476-485)*
624

625 **5.8 Candidate's Withdrawal or Appeal**

626 **5.8.1 Candidate's Withdrawal**

627 Candidates may withdraw their application for promotion at any time. If a candidate
628 elects to withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the due date for
629 submission of dossiers to the ACCFP, the candidate will immediately inform in writing
630 the department chair, the chair of the ACCFP, and the Dean of the College. At that time
631 all review processes related to that candidate will be terminated.
632
633

634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663

5.8.2 Candidate's Appeal
Candidates may appeal recommendations as outlined in the *Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty* (p.17, lns. 524-543):

Appeals to the Provost
A candidate may appeal to the provost a negative recommendation by the dean. Upon receipt of the dean’s negative recommendation, the candidate shall have at least ten business days to appeal the negative recommendation to the provost. The grounds for appeal shall only be those that involve errors of due process. These would include procedural errors such as failure to receive notification at each stage of review. Errors of due process would also include substantive errors such as arbitrariness, capriciousness, and discrimination, as well as bias and other forms of nonprofessional judgment on the part of any person or group involved in the promotion review. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the dean, the department chair, the department committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or outside the University. By the date specified in the NTT promotional manual calendar, the provost shall provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected.

Appeals to the President
A candidate may appeal to the president a negative recommendation by the provost or a decision by the provost rejecting the candidate’s appeal to the provost. The appeal to the president shall conform to the principles and processes stated above for appeals to the provost. By the date specified in the promotion manual calendar, the president shall provide the provost, the appropriate dean and the candidate a written decision including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate's appeal is supported or rejected.

664 **Appendices**

665 **I. Appendix A: Format for Dossiers Submitted for Promotion**

667
668 **1 Standard Format**

669
670 To assist the reviewers, candidates shall submit information in a standard format as described in this
671 section. All information is to be formatted to standard size pages (8 1/2 x 11) with standard margins, and
672 assembled in sections as described below, and submitted in electronic (e.g. .pdf) files only. The candidate
673 needs to only include those sections that have been part of the candidate’s workload. The dossier shall
674 contain a separate electronic file (and only one) for each section as shown in Appendix B, if.1.1-2.1.4. .
675

676 When it is not feasible to submit artifacts electronically, the candidate can petition his/her Department
677 Clinical Faculty Member’s Review Committee for exceptions to electronic submissions.
678

679 Each candidate’s electronic dossier will be held on a secured drive in the Dean’s office. Access to each
680 candidate’s dossier will be restricted to: his/her department chair, his/her Department’ Clinical Faculty
681 Review Committee members, ACCFP members, the Dean, and approved Dean’s office staff.
682

683 **1.1 Section 1: The Candidate**

684 This section should include a) cover sheet, b) current and complete vita, and c) workload letter or
685 documentation from chair for the last five years of service. Candidates with probationary credit
686 toward prior service at another institution must supply documentation from the dean outlining the
687 number of years awarded upon initial appointment at Georgia State University. The candidate
688 should include only the following sections that are included in their workload.
689

690 **1.2 Section 2: Teaching**

691 This section should include a) Narrative Statement; b) Listing as defined in section 3.2; and c)
692 peer reviews of teaching.
693

694 **1.3 Section 3: Service**

695 This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing as defined in section 3.3.
696

697 **1.4 Section 4: Research**

698 This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing as defined in section 3.4.
699

700 **1.5 Section 5: Exhibits**

701 Documentation that supports the candidate’s listings.
702

703 **2 General Rules for Preparing the Dossier**

704
705 **2.1** The dossier should be a complete summary of a candidate's professional activity whether or
706 not a particular type of activity is specifically mentioned in these guidelines.
707

708 **2.2** Detailed information regarding any activity or product should be listed in one section only;
709 however, an activity or product may be cited in the narrative statement for two or more sections
710 when appropriate.
711

712 **2.3** Explanations of unusual academic roles and/or assignments, such as program coordination by
713 a Clinical Assistant Professor, should be included when appropriate.
714

715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765

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

766 **II. Appendix B: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier**

767
768 **1. Section 1: The Candidate**

769
770 **1.1 Cover Sheet**

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

- 772 a) **Name of candidate**
- 773 b) **Present rank of candidate**
- 774 c) **Department of candidate**
- 775 d) **Effective date of appointment to Georgia State University**
- 776 e) **Effective date of last promotion**
- 777 f) **Signature of candidate**
- 778 g) **Date dossier is submitted to the committee**

779
780 **1.2 Current and Complete Vita**

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

783 The lists are to be presented in reverse chronological order starting with the most recent. It must
784 also include the same information presented in Section 3.2.2 of this Appendix.

785
786 **1.3 Department Chair's Letter Addressing Workload**

787 The purpose of this letter is to identify the distribution of assigned workload for the Clinical
788 Faculty member seeking promotion and it will create the rubric for evaluating the candidate for
789 promotion. The letter will address workload assignment for the time period since last promotion
790 and address any changes or modifications in workload assignment during that period. This letter
791 will clearly identify the percentage of time assigned to the candidate in the areas of service or
792 research in addition to the primary assignment of teaching. This letter will be signed by both the
793 Department Chair and the candidate and will accompany the candidate's dossier throughout the
794 process. The candidate should include only the following sections that are part of their workload.

795
796 **2. Section 2: Teaching**

797
798 The purpose of this section of the dossier is to provide information regarding the candidate's teaching
799 effectiveness. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge
800 and typically involves teaching at the university level. Teaching includes advising and mentoring
801 students. Teaching also may include the delivery of instructional activities in the profession, community,
802 businesses, and schools (e.g., Professional Development Schools or partner schools), as well as the
803 development of new courses, programs, instructional approaches, textbooks, and other curricular
804 materials for both university and other students. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based
805 on student or other participant evaluations, peer evaluation(s), and critical review and acceptance of
806 teaching products.

807
808 **2.1 Narrative Statement**

809 Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional teaching. The narrative
810 will not exceed 3 typed, double-spaced pages.

811
812 **2.2 Listing**

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

816 **2.2.1 Georgia State University Teaching Assignments:** should include number of times
817 taught since appointment or last successful application for promotion; average
818 enrollment.

819 **2.2.2 Courses Taught at Other Institutions:** should include name of institution(s);
820 date(s); number of times taught since appointment or last successful application for
821 promotion.

822 **2.2.3 Courses Developed at Georgia State University:** specify role in development;
823 date of college approval or year of first Bulletin listing.

824 **2.2.4 Graduate Student Committees:** include number by degree level; role, title, date,
825 and author of dissertations, theses, and projects, indicate which are in progress or were
826 directed to completion.

827 **2.2.5 Other Information**

828 a) Products developed for teaching: include type of product; brief description;
829 course(s) for which product is useful; date of development.

830 List textbooks or textbook series written or edited, publisher, date of publication;
831 these should not be also listed under Research.

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

834 c) Peer evaluations of teaching

835 **2.2.6 Impact on Students**

836 a) Evidence of student achievement, such as presentations at conferences and
837 publications.

838 b) Summary of student evaluations. For each course taught at Georgia State
839 University, include the full College of Education and Human Development
840 computerized evaluation form.

841
842 **3. Section 3: Service**

843
844 The purpose of this section of the dossier is to provide information regarding the candidate's professional
845 service activities. Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and
846 maintenance of University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on
847 behalf of the University or the profession which do not entail systematic instruction (e.g., design and
848 development of professional conferences), including work in Professional Development Schools or
849 partner schools (see the Board of Regents' policy statement on faculty work in schools). Judgments of the
850 quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contribution and on participation at
851 the international, national, regional, state, and/or local levels.

852
853 **3.1 Narrative Statement**

854 Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional service activities that
855 contribute to the candidate's value in the University, in the community, and in professional
856 affiliations. The narrative will not exceed 3 typed, double-spaced pages.

857
858 **3.2 Listing**

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

- 867 **3.2.1 Service to the Profession**
- 868 **3.2.2 Service to the Community**
- 869 **3.2.3 Service to the University**
- 870 **3.2.4 Service to the Department**

871

872 **4. Section 4: Research**

873

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

880

881 **4.1 Narrative Statement**

882 In this narrative, candidates explain the quality, scope, and impact of their research and scholarly
883 activity and the connections among them. It is incumbent upon candidates to address how their
884 research and scholarly activity has advanced their field or discipline. Candidates should describe
885 the nature and quality of their work with reference to the appropriate points in Section 2.02 of the
886 dossier. The narrative will not exceed 3 typed, double-spaced pages.

887

888 **4.2 Listing**

889 Scholarly activity is to be listed within categories in the order shown below. Categories for which
890 candidates have no entries may be omitted. Entries are to be listed in reverse chronological order.
891 In addition to the information requested below, each entry is to include whether the publication is
892 refereed or non-refereed and its intended audience (e.g., international, national, regional, state).
893 Authors and editors are to be listed in the order shown on the published documents. It is
894 incumbent upon candidates to explain their contribution to each work in the listing that includes
895 multiple authors. Documentation of accepted but not yet published and submitted scholarly
896 activity (e.g., letters of acceptance, proof of submission) should be provided in Appendix A. For
897 more information regarding listing of scholarly activity, candidates may refer to section 2.02 in
898 the College of Education and Human Development's *Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, Third-*
899 *year, and Cumulative Review for Tenure-track Faculty Members.*

900

901 **5. Section 5: Exhibits**

902 Documentation that supports the candidate's listings.