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

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

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

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

At Georgia State University, the quality of faculty members’ accomplishments in research and scholarship, teaching, and service largely determines the quality of the institution as a whole. To ensure that the institution and its faculty members achieve a high level of excellence, it is necessary to engage in periodic evaluations of faculty members. 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, faculty members are evaluated for the purposes of promotion, promotion and tenure, tenure, or cumulative review at appropriate intervals during their careers. This process begins with the third-year review for tenure-track faculty members (see Part 1). Department chairs should advise all new faculty members, and in particular, should inform new faculty members of all promotion and tenure requirements. To this end, they should provide the new faculty members with copies of the appropriate department, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and discuss the contents of these documents.

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

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

Official timelines for all evaluation processes will be established by the Dean or his/her designee, with approval of the Chair of Faculty Affairs. These timelines should be posted on the CEHD website. They should follow the general guidelines in Appendices D, E, and F. Candidates, department promotion and tenure committees, department chairs, the ACFPT, 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. Included in this document are appeal procedures to be followed in the event of disagreements over promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure. There is also a separate CEHD Grievance Procedure available to all faculty members. The renewal of each faculty member’s contract is subject to Board of Regents and University policies and approval (see Georgia State University Faculty Handbook, Section 317.01).
Part 1

Third-year Review for Tenure-track Faculty Members

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

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

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

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

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

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

Each department must have a procedure that allows a candidate to request the department’s P&T committee to reconsider their recommendation prior to the recommendation being sent to the chair.
Part 2

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

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

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

1.01 Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion

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

1.02 Associate Professors Seeking Promotion

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

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

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

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

2.0 Eligibility for Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty Members

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

---

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

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

3.0 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Because of the diversity of activities engaged in by faculty members, department promotion and tenure committees, department chairs, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT), 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 research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

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

3.01 Criteria for Promotion

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. In each area of consideration (research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service) candidates will be evaluated as having met or having not met the standards for promotion and tenure.

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

At a minimum, an associate professor is expected to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers within and outside of the University, and have a record of growth in research, scholarship, and creative accomplishments that demonstrates a strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory in terms of high quality and productive research, scholarship, and/or creative activities. Candidates for promotion to associate professor should be establishing a national reputation in their field. They also must demonstrate high quality teaching and appropriate evidence of service.

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

3.02 Criteria for Tenure

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

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

3.03 Research and Scholarly Activity

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

A candidate’s body of work includes work accomplished as a student or post doctorate fellow. Candidates for promotion to associate professor should show a clear trend of independence from prior mentors (e.g., fewer publications from mentors, more first authorships, clear defining focus of research.) Scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. Debates over the relative merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical versus empirical work, scholarship of discovery versus scholarship of integration, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses are not germane to the promotion process. Each topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged on whether it is appropriate to the stated goal and whether it produces a valuable product.

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

3.031 Publications

Candidates may choose mainly to write articles for refereed journals or to publish in books whose publication process has comparable peer-review scrutiny for research and
Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, electronic media, chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work, as are those who specialize in one form of scholarly expression. Peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship; however, it is recognized that there are various levels of rigor in the peer-review process. It is the candidates’ responsibilities to provide evidence of the process and rigor of the reviews of their works, such as journal acceptance rate, review policy process, and/or journal impact factor (if available).

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

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

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

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

### 3.032 Presentations

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

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

3.034 Other Scholarly Activity and Professional Recognition

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

3.04 Teaching

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

3.05 Service

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

Based on the University System of Georgia Board of Regents’ Policy:

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

5.0 Overview of the Review Process

5.01 External Review of Research and Scholarship Accomplishments of the Candidate

5.011 Rationale for External Review

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

5.012 Sources of External Reviewers

Candidate's Suggested List

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

Department Chair's Suggested List

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.015 Submission of Sample Publications, Vita, and Narrative Statement
According to the timeline in Appendix E, the candidate will submit to the dean a sample of not more than five of the candidate's research and scholarly activities, a current and complete vita, and a narrative statement. In the narrative, candidates explain the quality, scope, and impact of their research and scholarly activities, as well as the connections
among them. The narrative will be up to 3 typed, double-spaced pages and may become in part the research and scholarly activity narrative statement for the candidate’s dossier. Each external reviewer will be sent a solicitation letter, the sample of items, the vita, and the narrative statement.

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

5.017 Distribution and Confidentiality of External Reviewers’ Reports
Distribution of the Reports
In accordance with the timeline in Appendix E, the dean will forward copies of the external reviews to the department chair, the department promotion and tenure committee, and to the ACFPT.

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

5.02 Review by the Candidate’s Department
The department promotion and tenure committee will review and evaluate the candidate’s dossier, the letters from external reviewers, and any other materials relevant to the candidate’s dossier. The committee will forward a recommendation to the candidate and to the candidate’s department chair according to the timeline in Appendix E.

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

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

5.03 Review by the Candidate’s Department Chair
The department chair will review and evaluate the candidate’s dossier, the letters from external reviewers, the recommendation from the department promotion and tenure committee and any other materials relevant to the candidate’s dossier. The department chair will forward a recommendation to the candidate and to the ACFPT according to the timeline in Appendix E.
5.04 Review by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT)

5.041 ACFPT Purpose
The ACFPT 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 through the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education and Human Development those faculty members the committee agrees have met or not met the criteria for promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure.

5.042 ACFPT Membership
The ACFPT shall consist of six members, at least three of whom must be a full Professor. Only the full Professors shall be the voting members for candidates seeking promotion to full Professor. Each department of the College of Education and Human Development shall elect from among its faculty one representative (1) who has been a full-time faculty member of the College of Education and Human Development for three academic years, (2) who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and (3) who has been awarded tenure. Faculty members so elected shall serve a term of two years. A faculty member may not serve two consecutive full terms on the ACFPT. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion may not serve on the ACFPT. 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 ACFPT 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; that schedule includes when a department will need to elect a full Professor. Departments should hold elections for representatives during the fall semester. The department chair will notify the dean and the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the results of the election according to the timeline in Appendix E. The term of office will be January 1 - December 31. Should a vacancy occur before a person has completed a full term, the affected department will fill that vacancy by holding a special election. No committee action is official unless a quorum is present; a quorum consists of two-thirds of the full committee membership.

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

ACFPT will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee according to the timeline in Appendix E. 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, promotion and tenure, or tenure. These informational sessions are to be held according to the timeline in Appendix E.

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

Based on the timeline in Appendix E, ACFPT members will meet to form themselves into teams for the purpose of reading the dossiers, reading the external reviewers’ letters, reading the recommendations from the department chairs and department promotion and
tenure committees and reading any responses from candidates. The committee will establish its meetings in the fall as necessary to accomplish its duties.

At an appropriate time 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.

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. Committee members, by simple majority vote, will determine whether or not the candidate has met or not met the standards for promotion or tenure in each of three areas.

Committee members, by simple majority vote, will determine whether or not the candidate has met or not met the standards for promotion or tenure in each of three areas. The full Professors shall be the sole voting members for candidates seeking promotion to full Professor. A separate vote will be taken on the candidate’s application for tenure. The ACFPT will forward a recommendation to the candidate and to the dean according to the timeline in Appendix E. The letter will contain the results of the vote(s) for the candidate, the majority report, and an optional minority report. The minority report is optional. All members of the ACFPT will sign the letter acknowledging their participation in the review. All communication between committee members is confidential. Members of the committee will 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. In this case, the chair of ACFPT is responsible for answering the candidates’ questions, and should be the only one to directly communicate with candidates.

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

5.05 Review by the Dean of the College

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

5.06 Written Notification to Candidate

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

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

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

5.08 Rating Criteria for Evaluation of Candidates

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

5.09 Candidate's Withdrawal

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

5.010 Candidate's Appeal

A. Appeals to the Provost

Appeals of negative recommendations by college deans may be made to the provost. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the college dean, the departmental chair, the departmental or college promotion and tenure committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or outside the University. 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, by the date specified in the calendar.

B. Appeals to the President

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

The president shall provide the candidate a written decision including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate's appeal is supported or rejected by the date specified in the calendar.
Part 3
Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

1.0 Eligibility for Cumulative Review

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

2.0 Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty (CCRTF)

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

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

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

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

The CCRTF will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee according to the timeline in Appendix F. The committee will have three orders of business: (1) the election of a chair, (2) the review and familiarization of the guidelines and supporting documents essential to the process, and (3) the declaration of informational sessions for the
purpose of explaining the guidelines and acknowledging any nuances to the process which might be appropriate. These informational sessions are held according to the timeline in Appendix F.

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

**2.04 Criteria for Review**

This cumulative review should address accomplishments in: research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. In accordance with the timeline in Appendix F, the faculty member being reviewed will submit a narrative of that individual’s quality and scope of goals and accomplishments in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. The review will be based on available information such as annual reports, evaluations of teaching, curriculum vitae, and publications. An individual being reviewed should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the cumulative review.
Part 4
Guidelines for Emeritus Status

1.0 Emeritus Faculty Appointments

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

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

1.01 A current curriculum vitae
1.02 Report of a vote of support by the department
1.03 A letter of recommendation from the department chair to the dean
1.04 A letter of recommendation from the dean to the provost
Part 5
Guidelines for Regents’ and/or Distinguished University Professor Status

1.0 Regents’ Professorships

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

2.0 Distinguished University Professorships

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

Appendix A: Sample Letter to External Reviewers

Dear Dr. _____:

I am writing to ask if you would agree as an external reviewer for a colleague, Dr. ______, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of ______ in the Department of ______ in the College of Education & Human Development at Georgia State University.

You have been suggested as a reference who is in a position to assess Dr. _____'s research/scholarship/creative contributions and reputation, and I would greatly appreciate your help with this evaluation process.

We are specifically interested in the following:

• The length and nature of your relationship with Dr. _____;
• The quality and significance of the candidate's scholarship/creative contributions;
• The candidate's professional reputation and standing in the field at the national and/or international level;
• How Dr. _____ compares to others in the field at approximately the same stages in their careers; and
• Whether Dr. _____ would be promoted to the rank of _____ at your institution.

If you agree to assist in this evaluative process, a sample of materials provided by the candidate will be emailed to you along with their current curriculum vitae and narrative.

Please be assured that your letter will be made available only to Georgia State University personnel participating in the review process. You should know, however, that external reviewer letters may be subject to release under the Georgia Open Records Act.

In addition to submission of an evaluation of the candidate, we ask that you provide a copy of your curriculum vitae along with the evaluation and return both by _____.

We would sincerely appreciate your time and effort in helping us with this very important decision.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Alberto, Ph.D.
Dean and Regents' Professor
College of Education & Human Development
Georgia State University
Appendix B: Format for Dossiers Submitted for Promotion, Promotion and Tenure, or Tenure

1.0 Standard Format

To assist the reviews, candidates shall submit information in a standard format as described in this section. All information is to be typed on 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 dossier shall contain a separate electronic file for each section as shown in 1.01-1.04. In addition, the dossier will include electronic files for each candidate’s external review letters, provided by the Dean’s office.

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

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

1.01 Section 1: The Candidate
This section should include a) cover sheet and b) current and complete vita. 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.

1.02 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity
This section should include a) Narrative Statement, b) Listing, and c) Exhibits.

1.03 Section 3: Teaching
This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing.

1.04 Section 4: Service
This section should include a) Narrative Statement and b) Listing.

2.0 General Rules for Preparing the Dossier

2.01 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.

2.02 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.

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

2.04 Those seeking promotion to the rank of 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.
Appendix C: Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Dossier

1.0 Section 1: The Candidate

1.01 Cover Sheet
The cover page of the dossier should include the following:

1.011 Name of candidate
1.012 Present rank of candidate
1.013 Department of candidate
1.014 Effective date of appointment to Georgia State University
1.015 Effective date of last promotion
1.016 Signature of candidate
1.017 Date dossier is submitted to the committee

1.02 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. It must also include the same information presented in Section 2.02 of this Appendix.

2.0 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity

This section is concerned with information about 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.

2.01 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 be up to 5 typed, double-spaced pages and may be the same in part as the narrative submitted to external reviewers.

2.02 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.
2.021 Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, Reviews, and 
Proceedings

2.0211 Published Articles
Candidates should provide a list of articles that are published or accepted for 
publication. This list should include for each article: author(s), title, journal, 
volume, date (or projected date) of publication.

2.0212 Chapters in Books
Candidates should provide a list of chapters that have been published in edited 
books and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each 
chapter: author(s), title of the chapter, title of book, the book’s editor(s), 
publisher, and the date (or projected date) of publication. Only chapters that are 
completed and scheduled for publication on a definite date should be included.

2.0213 Books and Monographs
Candidates should provide a list of books or monographs published or accepted 
for publication. This list should include: author(s), title, publisher, and date (or 
projected date) of publication. For works accepted but not yet published, clear 
documentation should be given of whether the item is a completed book 
manuscript in press and scheduled for publication at a definite date, or a book 
project for which a contract has been awarded for a manuscript to be submitted to 
the publisher in the future and the projected date of completion.

2.0214 Book Reviews
Candidates should provide a list of book reviews published or accepted for 
publication, including: author(s) and title of the book reviewed, place of 
appearance, and date (or projected date) of publication.

2.0215 Published Abstracts or Proceedings
Candidates should include author(s), title, name of professional organization or 
conference, date of publication, and number of published pages. A presentation 
that has a published abstract or is included in published proceedings should only 
appear once in the listings.

2.0216 Submitted Scholarly Writings
Candidates should include author(s), title, type of publication, publisher or 
journal to which submitted, month/year submitted, and number of typed, double-
spaced manuscript pages. Only submitted work should be listed.

2.0217 Other
Candidates should list any other type of publication (e.g., ERIC documents). 
Include the author(s), title, publisher, date (or projected date) of publication.

2.022 Presentations at Professional Meetings
Candidates should provide a list of presentations at professional meetings. This list 
should include the title of the presentation, author(s), the type of presentation (e.g., paper, 
poster, invited paper or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion), and 
the name, location, and date of the meeting. Works that have been accepted but not yet 
presented may be listed.
2.023 Awards and Grants
Candidates should provide a list of all research grants and contracts received and all scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and personal development awards that supported the candidate’s scholarly activity. This list should include the title of each project supported, the awarding agency, the amount and period of the award, and the precise role of the investigator and any other co-investigators on the project. When the candidate is not the PI, a letter from the PI describing the candidate’s role in the project should be included. Candidates also should provide copies of official letters of award for funded projects. Separate headings should be created, when appropriate, for: Funded external awards; Funded internal awards; and Submitted and/or unfunded external awards. Listings of submitted grants and awards should include the date of submission and the funding agency. Listings of unfunded external awards the candidate chooses to submit must include the date(s) of submission and documentation of the evaluation received.

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

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

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

3.0 Section 3: 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 in the university classroom. Teaching includes advising and mentoring students. Teaching also may include the delivery of instructional activities in the profession, community, businesses, and schools, including work in Professional Development Schools or partner schools (see the Board of Regents’ policy statement on faculty work in 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 such indicators as: a) peer and/or student reports and recognition of teaching and/or mentorship through awards; b) presentations and publications with student coauthors; c) chairing and serving on doctoral committees and specialist and master’s theses/projects; and d) critical review and acceptance of teaching products.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.0253 Peer evaluation of teaching reports if available.

3.026 Impact on Students
3.0261 Evidence of student achievement, such as presentations at conferences and publications.

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

4.0 Section 4: Service
The purpose of this section of the dossier is to provide information regarding the candidate’s professional service activities. Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on behalf of the University or the profession which do not entail systematic instruction (e.g., design and development of professional conferences), including work in Professional Development Schools or partner schools (see the Board of Regents’ policy statement on faculty work in schools). Judgments of the quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contribution and on participation at the national, regional, state, and local levels.
4.01 Narrative Statement
Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional service activities that contribute to the candidate's value in the University, in the community, and in professional affiliations. The narrative will be up to 3 typed, double-spaced pages.

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

- 4.021 Service to the Profession
- 4.022 Service to the Community
- 4.023 Service to the University
Official timelines will be decided on an annual basis based on the university timelines and approved by the CEHD Dean and chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Once decided, they will be posted on the website and the following appendices may be changed without an official vote of the faculty. Therefore, these timelines should be considered general guidelines.

Appendix D: Timeline for Third-year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean notifies non-tenured tenure-track faculty who are to receive third-year review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than December 15</td>
<td>Department review committee</td>
<td>Department review committee has information session(s) for non-tenured tenure-track faculty who are to receive third-year review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Non-tenured tenure-track faculty</td>
<td>Last date for non-tenured tenure-track faculty to submit materials to department review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Department review committee</td>
<td>Results of the third-year review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty submitted by department review committee to the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member, to the department chair, and to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Comments concerning third-year review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty submitted by department chair to the dean and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Comments concerning third-year review of non-tenured tenure-track faculty submitted by the dean to the Provost/Academic Vice President and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon receipt from the provost</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards to the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member any comments from the provost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by the Dean and Chair of CEHD Faculty Affairs Committee - September 14, 2017
### Appendix E: Timeline for Promotion, Promotion and Tenure, or Tenure Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Fall semester</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Departments elect representatives to ACFPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday in November</td>
<td>Department chairs</td>
<td>The department chairs notify the dean and the chair of FAC of the result of the above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than January 31</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>The chair of FAC convenes ACFPT. The purpose of the initial meeting is to elect a chair of ACFPT, review the P&amp;T document, and establish date(s) for the informational session(s) for faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>The dates for the informational session(s) submitted by ACFPT to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>The dean notifies faculty of their eligibility for consideration for promotion and/or tenure and of the date(s) of the informational session(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between February 22 and March 22</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT holds informational session(s) for faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure. The meeting shall be open to all interested faculty members in the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Candidate notifies in writing the department chair, the dean, and the chair of ACFPT of the intent to be considered for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Candidate submits to the dean, the department chair, and the department promotion/tenure committee a list of five nominations for external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Candidate submits to the dean a sample of publications, a current and complete vita, and the narrative to be forwarded to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Department chair in consultation with the department promotion and tenure committee submits to the dean a list of five additional names of potential reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATES</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</td>
<td>TASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean sends list of potential external reviewers to candidate for opportunity to remove one reviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean sends materials to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean receives outside letters regarding candidates for promotion and/or tenure and if necessary solicits additional reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last day for candidates for promotion and/or tenure to submit dossier for optional format review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT returns feedback concerning dossier format to candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last day for candidate to submit dossier for formal consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than August 19</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards external reviewers’ letters to chair of ACFPT, department chairs, and department promotion and tenure committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13</td>
<td>Department promotion and tenure committee</td>
<td>Recommendations with rationale due to respective candidates from department promotion and tenure committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>Request for Reconsideration</td>
<td>Last day for candidate to send to dept P&amp;T committee a request for reconsideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last day for candidates to submit to department chair response in writing to the any or all of the evaluations from the department promotion and tenure committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Department promotion and tenure committee</td>
<td>Recommendations with rationale due to department chair from department promotion and tenure committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Recommendations with rationale due to respective candidates from department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATES</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</td>
<td>TASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Last day for candidates to submit to ACFPT response in writing to the any or all of the evaluations from the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Recommendations with rationale due to ACFPT from department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between October 15 and November 15</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>Dossier review teams are formed. Teams read dossiers and external reviews of the assigned candidates. Teams present their findings to ACFPT. ACFPT discusses and identifies the need for clarification for any candidate and contacts any such candidate by letter with a request for additional information and clarification; candidates will have five working days to respond. ACFPT meets to consider and evaluate candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Chair of ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT chair submits sealed report of promotion and/or tenure recommendations with rationale to the dean and respective candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last opportunity for candidate to submit a response to the dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean's recommendations due to Provost/Academic Vice President and respective candidates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F: Timeline for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the month of September</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Departments elect representatives to the CCRTF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean notifies faculty who are to receive five-year cumulative review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Department chairs</td>
<td>The Department chair notifies the dean and the chair of FAC of the elections described above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By November 15</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>Chair of FAC will convene CCRTF. The purpose of the initial meeting will be to elect a chair of CCRTF and to establish a date for the information session(s) for those tenured faculty, who are to receive five-year cumulative review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than January 31</td>
<td>CCRTF</td>
<td>CCRTF holds information session(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Faculty undergoing five-year cumulative review</td>
<td>Last date for tenured faculty receiving five-year cumulative review to submit materials to CCRTF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>CCRTF</td>
<td>Results of five-year cumulative review of tenured faculty submitted by CCRTF to the tenured faculty, to the department chair, and to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Department chairs</td>
<td>Comments concerning five-year cumulative review of tenured faculty submitted by department chair to the dean and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Comments concerning five-year review of tenured faculty submitted by dean to the Provost/Academic Vice President and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon receipt from the provost</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards to tenured faculty any comments from the provost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Timeline for Tenure Review at the Time of Initial Appointment

1.0 Review Procedures

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

2.0 External Review Letters

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

3.0 College-Level Review

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

4.0 University-Level Review

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