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I. PREAMBLE

The College of Education and Human Development is a metropolitan professional school with a commitment to excellence in preparing people to work in a variety of urban educational and service delivery positions 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). 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 of clinical faculty. Throughout this document, the word department is used to refer to departments and divisions within the College.

Promotions are integral components of a faculty member's professional growth and development at an academic institution. This growth and development begin 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 are 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 of faculty members.

II. Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process

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

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

Department chairs should advise all faculty members, and in particular, should inform new faculty members of all promotion requirements. To this end, they should provide the faculty members with copies of the appropriate department, college, and university promotion policies and discuss the contents of these documents. It is the responsibility of the candidate to know and follow the guidelines set forth in these documents. Furthermore, the candidate must present a clear and accurate professional record and allow the reviews to proceed according to the established procedures.
Similarly, it is the responsibility of all members of the Advisory Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion (ACCFP) to know and follow these guidelines and all established procedures. In addition, it is the responsibility of all members of department promotion committees and all department chairs to know and follow these guidelines and all established procedures. All deliberations in the promotion process are confidential.

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

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

III. Part 1: Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee

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

IV. Part 2: Structured Reviews for Clinical Faculty Members

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

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

4.1 Structured Third Year Review for Clinical Faculty Members

All Clinical Faculty members are required to participate in a formal review of their progress toward promotion. This review will be made no later than three years after the initial appointment, so that all
clinical faculty members have a clear idea of whether or not they are progressing toward successfully
achieving promotion. Annual peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness are expected to be included in the third-
year review. Following the initial third year review, structured reviews should occur only at five year
intervals. This structured review should address accomplishments in the primary areas of assigned workload
(office, research, teaching, or special circumstances as outlined in the CEHD Workload Policy).
In consultation with their department chairs, Clinical Faculty members are expected to identify at least one
area of additional focus (i.e., service or research) on which to base their review.

In accordance with the deadline issued by the provost for notification of the outcomes of college review
and following the guidelines as set forth by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the chair of the Department
Clinical Faculty 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 Structured 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. Faculty members may be hired
with prior credit toward promotion subject to approval by the dean and the provost.

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

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

4.2 Structured Five-Year Review for Clinical Faculty Members

Purpose of Structured Five-Year Review of Clinical Faculty

Following the initial third year review, the next structured review will occur after two additional years, i.e., the
fifth-year review, then all future structured reviews should occur at five-year intervals. Each department is
responsible for conducting ongoing formative reviews of clinical faculty members. Such reviews provide
opportunities to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provide feedback to faculty in
ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth to help the departments fulfill their missions.
The Structured Five-Year Review will be reviewed and commented on by the department chair, the Dean,
and the Provost.

Eligibility for Structured Five-Year Review

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

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

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

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

Criteria for Structured Five-Year Review

This structured review should address accomplishments in the primary areas of assigned workload (teaching, service, research, or special circumstances as outlined in the CEHD Workload Policy). The faculty member being reviewed will submit a narrative of that individual’s quality and scope of goals and accomplishments in assigned areas of workload (teaching, service, and/or research). The review will be based on available information such as annual reports, student course evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching, and curriculum vitae. An individual being reviewed should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of this review.

V. Part 3: Promotion for Clinical Faculty Members

5.1 Eligibility for Promotion for Clinical Faculty Members

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

5.1.1 Clinical Instructors Seeking Promotion

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

5.1.2 Clinical Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion

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

5.1.3 Clinical Associate Professors Seeking Promotion

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

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

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

Typically, clinical faculty would submit information for evaluation in two areas. In some cases, candidates would submit information that qualifies for special circumstances under the Workload Policy. Clinical Faculty members at the Instructor, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor rank may be eligible for promotion. Clinical Faculty are not required to work toward promotion and may apply for promotion at any time after the minimum number of years in rank are met.

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

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

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. Each area of consideration (teaching, and either service or research) will be evaluated. The area under consideration for promotion in addition to teaching will be identified in a letter from the candidate’s department chair that is included in the dossier for promotion. This letter reflects the annual workload assignments and more detail regarding this letter is provided in Appendix C, Section 3.1.3. A basic rating scale consisting of “Met” or “Not Met” is used to determine whether or not the candidate has achieved the threshold of accomplishment.

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

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

*If a candidate’s workload includes service (but is not the candidate’s primary responsibility), then for promotion to an intermediate rank or to the highest rank, the candidate must provide high quality service to the department, college and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community.* (Section IV, lines 363-366)
If a candidate’s workload includes research (but is not the candidate’s primary responsibility), then for promotion to an intermediate rank or to the highest rank, the candidate must demonstrate high quality research. (Section IV, lines 347-349)

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

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

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

### 5.2.2 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). Service also includes administrative positions (e.g., program coordinator). Judgments of the quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contributions and on participation at international, national, regional, state, and/or local levels. For candidates choosing service as their secondary responsibility and seeking promotion to the highest level of Clinical Professor, they are expected to have held national/international level of leadership positions in their service activities during the period of review.

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

### 5.3 Overview of Review Process

#### 5.3.1 Review of Teaching
Teaching is typically the primary area for consideration in the promotion of Clinical Faculty in the College of Education and Human Development. If the candidate’s workload reflects the majority of effort involves teaching, candidates must present evidence of teaching effectiveness and innovative practice. This must include student evaluations of instruction and peer evaluation(s) of their teaching
effectiveness. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to: selected examinations and quizzes, students’ passing rates on licensure/certification examinations, teaching portfolio, new course and/or program development, effective use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, teaching awards received, and student accomplishments.

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 expected to have regular annual peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The candidate will nominate potential peer evaluators to be reviewed and approved by the department chair. 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 a time for the peer observation. Following the observation, the internal reviewer will complete a review letter and supply copies to the candidate to be included in the promotion dossier. Additional observations may be requested by either the candidate or observer if deemed valuable or desired.

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.

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. From 2022-2023 or until determined by the CEHD Faculty Affairs Committee/faculty vote earlier, this successive term limitation will be suspended until such time as sufficient promoted clinical faculty members are available to serve. 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 majority vote, will determine whether or not the candidate should be awarded promotion in rank. Clinical Full Professors shall be the sole voting members for candidates seeking promotion to Clinical Full Professor. If Clinical Full Professors are not available tenured
professors of the rank of full should substitute. The committee informs the candidates of the committee’s decision by letter. This letter includes a rating of “Met” or “Not Met” for each category along with the rationale for that particular rating. Letters of recommendation and minority reports will be forwarded to the dean according to the COE timeline for Promotion of Clinical Faculty Members.

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

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

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

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

5.8 Candidate’s Withdrawal or Appeal

5.8.1 Candidate’s Withdrawal
Candidates may withdraw their application for promotion at any time. If a candidate elects to withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the due date for submission of dossiers to the ACCFP, the candidate will immediately inform in writing the department chair, the chair of the ACCFP, and the Dean of the College. At that time all review processes related to that candidate will be terminated.

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, Ins. 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.
Appendices

I. Appendix A: Format for Dossiers Submitted for Promotion

1 Standard Format

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

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

Each candidate’s electronic dossier will be held on a secured drive in the Dean’s office. Access to each candidate’s dossier will be restricted to: his/her department chair, his/her Department Clinical Faculty Member’s Review Committee for exceptions to electronic submissions.

1.1 Section 1: The Candidate
This section should include a) cover sheet, b) current and complete vita, and c) workload letter or documentation from chair for the last five years of service. Candidates with probationary credit toward prior service at another institution must supply documentation from the dean outlining the number of years awarded upon initial appointment at Georgia State University. The candidate should include only the following sections that are included in their workload.

1.2 Section 2: Teaching
This section should include a) Narrative Statement, b) Listing as defined in section 3.2, c) peer reviews of teaching, and d) see summary of student evaluations form (Appendix C).

1.3 Section 3: Service
This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing as defined in section 3.3.

1.4 Section 4: Research
This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing as defined in section 3.4.

1.5 Section 5: Exhibits
Documentation that supports the candidate’s listings.

2 General Rules for Preparing the Dossier

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

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

2.3 Explanations of unusual academic roles and/or assignments, such as program coordination by a Clinical Assistant Professor, should be included when appropriate.
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.
II. Appendix B: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier

1. Section 1: The Candidate

1.1 Cover Sheet
The cover page of the dossier should include the following:
   a) Name of candidate
   b) Present rank of candidate
   c) Department of candidate
   d) Effective date of appointment to Georgia State University
   e) Effective date of last promotion
   f) Signature of candidate
   g) Date dossier is submitted to the committee

1.2 Current and Complete Vita
The vita must include institutions of higher education attended (including date attended, degrees and/or certificates awarded, and areas of specialization) and professional employment history. The lists are to be presented in reverse chronological order starting with the most recent. It must also include the same information presented in Section 3.2.2 of this Appendix.

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

2. Section 2: Teaching
The purpose of this section of the dossier is to provide information regarding the candidate's teaching effectiveness. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and typically involves teaching at the university level. 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, peer evaluation(s), and critical review and acceptance of teaching products.

2.1 Narrative Statement
Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional teaching. The narrative will not exceed 5 typed, double-spaced pages.

2.2 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.
2.2.1 Georgia State University Teaching Assignments: should include number of times taught since appointment or last successful application for promotion; average enrollment.

2.2.2 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.

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

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

2.2.5 Other Information

a) 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 should not also be listed under Research.

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

c) Peer evaluations of teaching

2.2.6 Impact on Students

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

b) Summary of student evaluations form (Appendix C). For each course taught at Georgia State University, include the full College of Education and Human Development evaluation form.

3. Section 3: 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 international, national, regional, state, and/or local levels.

3.1 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 not exceed 5 typed, double-spaced pages.

3.2 Listing

Service activities include the following: program administration; 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:
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

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

4.1 Narrative Statement
In this narrative, candidates explain the quality, scope, and impact of their research and scholarly activity and the connections among them. It is incumbent upon candidates to address how their research and scholarly activity has advanced their field or discipline. Candidates should describe the nature and quality of their work with reference to the appropriate points in Section 2.02 of the dossier. The narrative will not exceed 4 typed, double-spaced pages.

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

5. Section 5: Exhibits
Documention that supports the candidate’s listings.
### Appendix C: Student Evaluation Summary Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSU Student Evaluation Items</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Summer 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Summer 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Follow plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assignments related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explained grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Well-prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goals/objectives met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Readings valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluations related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interesting/wherwhile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Concepts used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Instructor effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yearly Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW EVAL</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Summer 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Summer 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Summer 2018</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goals set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Follow plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assignments related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explained grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Well-prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Goals/objectives met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Readings valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Evaluations related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interesting/wherwhile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Concepts used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Instructor effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yearly Mean**