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INTRODUCTION

It is the policy of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies (AYSPS) to base promotion decisions on impartial and informed evaluations of the qualifications of all candidates. Excellence in teaching, research, and service (AYSPS categories are titled: instruction, scholarship, and service) shall be the standard against which these qualifications will be evaluated; however, it is recognized that each non-tenure track (NTT) faculty member’s responsibilities in each of these activities will be discipline-specific and related to one’s job description. The college is committed to providing an environment in which all members of the non-tenured faculty have the opportunity and resources needed to achieve the qualifications necessary for promotion to higher rank as well as to foster ongoing professional development.

This document is intended to provide the AYSPS non tenure-track faculty with essential information about the promotion criteria, standards, and review processes of the College, including the responsibilities of candidates for promotion, the AYSPS academic units, the College Committee on NTT Promotion, and the Dean of the College. For purposes of this document, an AYSPS “academic unit” includes the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, Department of Economics, Department of Public Management and Policy, and the School of Social Work.

The policies and procedures contained in this document are supplementary to the bylaws and policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Georgia State University Statutes and Bylaws, the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and provisions contained in the Georgia State University Faculty Handbook. The GSU documents are available on the university’s website. The provisions of those documents that control college and departmental policy and procedure are incorporated herein by reference. Any perceived conflict between AYSPS and GSU or BOR policy will be resolved by compliance with the higher level policy.

A candidate for promotion is bound by the College’s promotion manual and, if there is one, the respective unit’s promotion manual in effect on January 1 of the calendar year in which the unit and college reviews of the candidate occur. [Please note: Each academic unit has the option to prepare a manual for the promotion of NTT faculty consistent with the University and College manuals. In the absence of such a unit manual, the college NTT promotion manual will apply. (GSU Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty)]

Candidates dossiers are considered on their own merits according to the guidelines in effect at the time of their declarations of candidacy. The College does not operate under any “quota system” for the number of promotions recommended, nor does it compare current candidates with candidates in previous years. Recommendations will be made in light of the standards in effect at the time of declaration of candidacy.

All deliberations in the promotion process are to be conducted in a spirit of confidentiality.
POLICIES ON PROMOTION

I. GENERAL POLICIES

Every NTT faculty member has a responsibility to be aware of the contents of this manual, including current deadlines contained in Appendix A. The exact dates may change depending on the promotion calendar set forth by the Office of the Provost and this calendar will be communicated to AYS faculty in advance of each year’s promotion cycle.

A faculty member seeking promotion must declare his/her candidacy in writing to the chair of his/her unit in order to be considered for promotion in the following academic year.

Candidates for promotion have the right to withdraw from further consideration at any time prior to the deadline for submitting recommendations to the Provost.

Records of all unit deliberations shall be kept on file in the academic unit. These records remain confidential.

All materials delivered to the College Committee on NTT Promotion are treated confidentially. Access to these materials is limited to the members of the Committee, the administrative secretary to the Committee and administrative officials at the College and the University charged with the responsibility for reviewing candidates for promotion.

The Office of the Dean shall retain in its files all materials submitted by the units, the unit chair/director, and the College Committee on NTT Promotion. All materials submitted by the candidate shall be returned to the candidate at the appropriate time.

I. LIST OF NTT FACULTY POSITIONS AND RANKS

The following NTT faculty positions in use in the AYSPS are eligible for promotion:

1. Clinical Faculty
   Ranks: Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor

2. Research Faculty
   Ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor

3. Lecturer
II. DESCRIPTION OF NTT DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

(GSU Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty):

These descriptions provide a general context for each of the NTT positions. Each NTT faculty member shall have a job description that outlines more specific workload expectations (within the parameters as outlined below) as unique to his/her position and role in the academic unit.

1. Clinical Faculty

Teaching:
The primary responsibility of Clinical Faculty is teaching, 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 practices, student field experiences and internships;
- Teaching and advising students in professional academic programs;
- Providing services or out-of-class educational opportunities for students.

Research:
As part of their workload, Clinical faculty may be expected to engage in research activities. If the workload requires research, it is expected that Clinical Faculty will engage in research involving their professional expertise, which would include pedagogical research, scholarship of teaching and learning, research related to practice, and/or disciplinary scholarly research.

Service:
As part of their workload, Clinical Faculty may be expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include advising and serving the academic needs of the
students, serving on committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the unit, College and/or University level. Service also may involve activities related to the professional and practice community.

2. Research Faculty

The primary responsibility of Research Faculty is to conduct research.

The purpose of Research Faculty appointments, based on available external funding, is to increase the research, scholarly, and creative efforts of the University. Research Faculty will work either in close collaboration with other faculty and/or will carry out independent research that builds upon an explicit area of focus for the University. Research Faculty salaries are primarily from research grants or other sources of external funds (non-general state funds). Research Faculty hold a terminal degree in their discipline, have demonstrated evidence of independent research careers (non-independent investigators should be appointed at the post-doctoral level), and concentrate primarily on research. Appointments of members of the Research Faculty are renewable on an annual basis upon satisfactory review and available external funding.

Teaching:
As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in teaching.

Service:
As part of their workload, Research Faculty may be expected to engage in service activities. Among such service would be providing academic advisement to students.

3. Lecturer

Teaching:
The primary responsibility of Lecturers is teaching.

Service:
As part of their workload, Lecturers may be expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the department, college and/or University level.

Research:
Lecturers are not required to engage in research activities. Nonetheless, Lecturers are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in their discipline.

4. Academic Professional
As per Board of Regents requirements, a title from the academic professional track “may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.8.3).

The designation Academic Professional would apply to a variety of academic assignments that call for academic background similar to that of a faculty member with professional rank, but which are distinctly different from professorial positions (BOR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.8.3).

The Academic Professional position requires an appropriate terminal degree, or in rare and extraordinary circumstances, qualification on the basis of demonstrably successful related experience, which exception is expressly approved by the institution president (BOR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.8.3). The appropriate terminal degree is considered an earned doctoral degree.

Service:
The primary responsibility of an Academic Professional is service, which includes activities such as:

- Managing instructional laboratories;
- Assuming academic program management roles not suited for expectations applied to tenure-track faculty members, operating instructional technology support programs;
- Being responsible for general academic advising;
- Assuming professional student counseling center responsibilities, providing specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs;
- Working with tenure-track faculty members in course and curriculum development and in the laboratory.

Teaching:
As part of their workload, Academic Professionals may be expected to engage in teaching activities.

Research:
As part of their workload, Academic Professionals may be expected to engage in research activities.

III. ELIGIBILITY (TIME-IN-RANK) POLICIES

1. Educational Requirements
An earned doctoral degree is required for NTT faculty seeking promotion to the rank of clinical assistant or clinical/research associate or full professor, except in cases of “degree equivalents” as stated in the Regents’ policies and University statutes, and as made explicit and applicable for each unit in AYSPS. Promotion to Senior Academic Professional for individuals hired as Academic Professionals after 2012 requires an earned doctoral degree.

2. Promotion Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Promotion To:</th>
<th>Must Serve:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5 years as Clinical Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical / Research Associate Professor</td>
<td>5 years as a Clinical/Research Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical / Research Professor</td>
<td>5 years as a Clinical/Research Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>5 years as a Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>5 years as a Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Academic Professional</td>
<td>5 years as an Academic Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Early Promotion

Consideration for early promotion should occur only in cases in which a clear indication of exceptional merit exists. Consistent with time-in-rank requirements, candidates should be encouraged to take ample time to demonstrate fully their merits and accomplishments.

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 faculty). Such credit for prior service shall
be approved in writing by the Provost (GSU Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, Section IV., p.10).

**PROMOTION PROCESS**

**Introduction**

The promotion process in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies begins with the Dean’s Office and the unit head notifying all candidates of their eligibility for promotion. The unit’s promotion committee will evaluate the credentials of those faculty members who are eligible for promotion. The qualifications of each eligible faculty member being considered must be evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth in the College’s *Non-Tenure Track Promotion Manual* (and the unit’s manual if one exists).

The procedure and the criteria to be used for evaluating a candidate are those described in the College’s *Non-Tenure Track Promotion Manual* that is in effect on January 1 of the calendar year in which the academic unit and college reviews of the candidate occur.

Whether non-tenure track faculty members primarily have teaching or research responsibilities in the AYSPS, their faculty rank resides in one of the School’s academic units. While clinical NTT faculty hold their principal and often sole appointment in an academic unit, research NTT faculty typically have their principal appointments in one of the College’s research centers, with a secondary appointment as members of one of the academic units: Criminal Justice and Criminology, Economics, PMAP, or Social Work.

As such, clinical NTT faculty must hold an academic appointment, while holding a faculty appointment is optional for research associates working in centers, contingent on their interest and the concurrence of the specific unit. In both cases, the faculties of the academic units must approve initial appointments of NTT faculty rank, and they should have a similar role in reviewing applications for promotion of NTT faculty to higher ranks. (In the case of research NTT faculty, any such promotion pertains only to their faculty rank, not to their research center status.)
NTT faculty who wish to apply for promotion will submit applications and supporting materials, which will be reviewed in turn by the academic unit promotion committee, the unit chair/director, the College’s promotion committee, and the Dean by the due dates found in Appendix A.

The supporting materials submitted by NTT faculty seeking promotion will be tailored to the particular responsibilities and rank of the NTT faculty member seeking promotion. In addition, in cases in which a research NTT faculty member has principal responsibilities in research centers, the supporting materials will include a letter from his or her center director which documents the candidate’s performance in the center and his or her contributions to and standing in their professional field.

I. ACADEMIC UNIT-LEVEL REVIEW

1. Academic Unit Promotion Manuals

Academic units may adopt a promotion manual to clarify or make more specific the policy and procedures contained in the College’s Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Manual. In the absence of such an academic unit manual, the College’s manual is assumed to apply. The academic unit promotion manuals are subject to approval by the Dean upon recommendation from the College Committee on NTT Promotion. Formal and significant faculty participation must be part of the development and revision of the academic unit manual, but the precise way in which this participation is achieved is the responsibility of the academic unit. The academic unit manuals must be consistent with the College’s Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Manual, GSU Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and with all policies of the University and the Board of Regents. Any revisions of the academic unit manual are subject to approval by the Dean upon recommendation from the College Committee on NTT Promotion.

2. Academic Unit Promotion Committees

Each academic unit will have a promotion committee that reviews and evaluates the credentials of all faculty members being considered for NTT promotion. This committee consists of a minimum of four faculty members. All members must be at a higher rank than the candidate for promotion, and NTT faculty must have representation to the extent possible. If there are no NTT faculty at ranks above the candidate’s current rank, appropriate NTT faculty from related AYS units shall be considered. The unit head will appoint the committee members and chair.

3. Evaluation of Candidates
A candidate for promotion must prepare a dossier that is appropriate to one’s position and rank according to the College’s guidelines (refer to section: Directions to Candidate for Submitting Materials for Promotion). It is submitted to the academic unit head, who then forwards the dossier to the chair of the unit-level committee.

**Academic Unit NTT Promotion Committee**

The academic unit committee reviews and evaluates the candidate’s dossier within the timeframe specified in the calendar (Appendix A). After reaching its decision, the chair of the unit committee prepares a recommendation letter with detailed justification addressed to the unit head. This letter reflects the opinion of the majority of the committee. The statement from the unit committee must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation and justification. Committee members who do not agree with the recommendation of the unit committee must so indicate in writing. They may do so either with a joint statement signed by all dissenting committee members, or with individual statements. Any member of the committee may provide a separate statement indicating differences of opinion in the justification, in the recommendations, and in the reasons for these recommendations. When sent to the candidate, the committee reports, including minority reports, may have the signature page or section that identifies committee members by name removed.

The chair of the unit promotion committee inserts the committee’s recommendation letter and any minority reports in the candidate’s dossier and forwards it to the unit head. At the same time, a copy of the recommendation letter and minority reports, if any, are sent to the candidate. The candidate has three (3) business days upon receipt of the committee’s letter to respond in writing to the unit head.

**Academic Unit Head [Chair/Director]**

The unit head reviews and evaluates the candidate’s dossier within the timeframe specified in the calendar (see Appendix A). He/she prepares a written statement, addressed to the chair of the College Committee on NTT Promotion, indicating a recommendation that states areas of agreement and/or disagreement with the unit committee’s recommendation and provides specific rationale and justification.

The unit head sends a copy of his/her recommendation letter to the candidate, and, at the same time, to the College Committee on NTT Promotion. The College committee receives the unit head’s recommendation letter, the unit committee’s letter, and any minority reports as part of the candidate’s complete dossier.

The candidate has three (3) business days upon receipt of the unit head’s letter to respond in writing to the chair of the College committee.
II. COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEW

The unit head is responsible for providing the College Committee on NTT Promotion with:

(A) The dossier submitted by the candidate;
(B) The unit-level committee’s recommendation letter, dissenting letters (if any) from committee member(s), and the unit head’s recommendation letter; and
(C) Any written responses from the candidate to these evaluations.

1. College Committee on NTT Promotion

The College Committee on Promotion & Tenure (P&T Committee) is charged by the Bylaws of the College with making recommendations to the Dean regarding the promotion of all candidates. The College Committee on NTT Promotion will be a subcommittee of the P&T Committee, and is charged with reviewing and evaluating the dossier and other related materials, including recommendations from the academic unit-level committee and unit head, of NTT faculty members being considered for promotion. The chair of this committee will report its NTT promotion recommendations to the Dean and cc the Dean’s office administrative support who will process the information.

The College Committee on NTT Promotion consists of representation from each of the College’s academic units. All members must be at a higher rank than the candidate for promotion, and NTT faculty must be represented. If there are no NTT faculty at ranks above the candidate’s current rank, appropriate NTT faculty from related units outside the college shall be considered. Tenure-track faculty serving on this committee shall be from the College’s P&T Committee. No NTT or TT faculty member may serve at more than one level of review.

2. Evaluation of Candidates

College Committee on NTT Promotion

The College Committee on NTT Promotion reviews the candidate’s dossier and other related materials, accompanying letters from previous reviews, and candidate’s written response, if any, within the timeframe specified in the calendar (see Appendix A). The College committee is charged with evaluating whether, according to the published criteria and standards of the academic unit and College and the candidate’s job description, the recommendations for or against promotion are justified in light of the evaluations presented by the unit and the unit head. Specifically, it seeks to ascertain whether or not
sufficient evidence has been presented regarding the quality of the candidate. If the College committee has reason to believe that one or both of the unit recommendations have not been adequately substantiated, it may seek additional information from the unit. If there are inconsistencies among the unit statements, it assesses the extent, if any, to which these inconsistencies militate against a recommendation for promotion.

If, as a result of its deliberations, the College Committee concludes that a positive recommendation for promotion is warranted by the evaluation provided by the unit committee and the unit head, it will so recommend and also provide a summary of this record and evaluations as part of its report to the Dean. If the College Committee concludes that a positive recommendation is not justified by the record and the evaluations, it will recommend against promotion and also provide a summary of the record and evaluations in its report to the Dean. The report of the College Committee must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation and justification. Committee members who do not agree with the recommendation or justification, must so indicate in writing. Dissenting members of the committee may provide a single joint statement. Alternatively, any member of the committee may provide a separate statement indicating differences of opinion in the justification, in the recommendations, and in the reasons for these recommendations.

The Dean will inform the unit head and the candidate in writing of the recommendation received from the College Committee within five (5) business days upon receipt of the committee’s letter. When sent to the candidate, the committee reports, including dissent letters, may have the signature page or section that identifies committee members by name removed.

The candidate has the right to respond in writing to the College Committee’s evaluation, and a copy of the candidate’s response will be included in the dossier reviewed at all higher levels. The candidate will have three (3) business days upon receipt of the College Committee recommendation in which to respond.

**AYSPS Dean**

The Dean reviews and evaluates the recommendations from the College Committee, the unit committee, the unit head, and any responses from the candidate.

The Dean will forward his/her recommendation letter and the candidate’s dossier and other related materials to the Provost within the timeframe specified in the calendar (see Appendix A). This recommendation is accompanied by:

(A) Copies of the evaluations from the unit committee, the unit head, including any minority reports from the committee;
(B) A copy of the report and recommendation provided by the College’s Committee on NTT Promotion together with any minority reports;

(C) Any written responses from the candidate to prior evaluations; and

(D) Any other documentation requested by the Office of the Provost.

The Dean will notify the candidate in writing by the date specified in the calendar (Appendix A). A candidate, who is not recommended by the Dean, may appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost. The candidate shall have ten (10) business days upon receipt of the Dean’s written decision to submit a written appeal. The grounds for appeal shall only be those that involve errors of due process (see *GSU Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty*, section VII. Appeals).

**Candidate Withdrawal from Promotion Consideration**

A candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application for promotion. A candidate who wishes to withdraw from further consideration may do so by informing the Dean in writing with a copy sent to the unit head. Regardless of the candidate’s decision to withdraw after receipt of the college committee’s letter or the Dean’s letter, the candidate has five (5) business days from the receipt of the respective letter in which to submit a letter withdrawing from further consideration.

**III. UNIVERSITY-LEVEL REVIEW**

The Provost’s review and President’s review of the candidate are outlined in the *GSU Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty* (Section VI. Promotion Process).
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION
THE ANDREW YOUNG SCHOOL OF POLICY STUDIES

I. EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

An earned doctoral degree is required for NTT faculty seeking promotion to the rank of clinical assistant or clinical/research associate or full professor, except in cases of “degree equivalents” as stated in the Regents’ policies and University statutes, and as made explicit and applicable for each unit in AYSPS. Promotion to Senior Academic Professional for individuals hired after 2012 requires an earned doctoral degree.

II. PROMOTION RATINGS CATEGORIES

The NTT faculty member will be evaluated as high quality, excellent, and sustained excellence & continued growth in the three performance areas of instruction, scholarship, and service as applicable. The ratings of high quality, excellence, and sustained excellence & continued growth are taken from the GSU Promotion Manual for NTT Faculty (teaching: lines 320-329; research: lines 342-349; service: lines 356-366).

Promotion is granted on the basis of a NTT faculty member’s accomplishments evaluated according to the criteria for promotion as outlined below. The candidate’s job description, and any modification of it over time, must be used as context for alignment with the performance expectations and rating categories (e.g., research faculty with teaching assignments).

The minimum ratings required for promotion at each rank are outlined below.
A. CLINICAL AND RESEARCH FACULTY

Promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor

In order to be promoted to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, a Clinical Instructor must be judged *excellent* in instruction and *high quality* in scholarship (if applicable) and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promotion to Associate Professor

In order to be promoted to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, a Clinical Assistant Professor must be judged *excellent* in instruction and *high quality* for scholarship (if applicable) and service.

In order to be promoted to the rank of Research Associate Professor, a Research Assistant Professor must be judged *excellent* in scholarship and *high quality* for instruction (if applicable) and service. NTT research assistant professors work in research centers in the School and are expected to contribute to the service work of their academic unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Associate Professor</th>
<th>Research Associate Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction:</strong></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship:</strong></td>
<td>High quality, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service:</strong></td>
<td>High quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Promotion to Professor**

In order to be promoted to the rank of Clinical Professor, a Clinical Associate Professor must be judged as showing *sustained excellence & continued growth* in instruction and at least *high quality* in both scholarship and service.

In order to be promoted to the rank of Research Professor, a Research Associate Professor must be judged as showing *sustained excellence & continued growth* in scholarship and *high quality* in instruction (if applicable) and service. In order to be promoted to full professor, a NTT research faculty member should be engaged to some extent in the full range of professorial responsibilities in an academic unit.

The rating of *sustained excellence & continued growth* is defined as competence and effectiveness in the respective assessment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Professor</th>
<th>Research Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction:</td>
<td>Sustained Excellence &amp; Continued Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship:</td>
<td>High quality, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
<td>High quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. LECTURER**

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Senior Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL

Promotion to Senior Academic Professional

The rating of sustained excellence & continued growth is defined as competence and effectiveness in service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senior Academic Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction:</td>
<td>High quality, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship:</td>
<td>High quality, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
<td>Sustained Excellence &amp; Continued Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. TERMS OF EVALUATION

The evaluations should take into account the range of and emphasis on instruction and teaching activities, scholarship, and service, which will differ for each candidate depending on: (1) the NTT position of clinical faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and academic professionals; (2) the mission and needs of the academic unit; (3) the NTT faculty job description, expectations, and responsibilities and workload distribution; and (4) principal (or sole) appointment in one of the College’s research centers or in one of the four academic units.

An evaluation of sustained excellence & continued growth in the area of instruction means that the faculty member demonstrates an ability to communicate and work effectively with students, to provide them with the current concepts, information, theories, and explanations required for mastery of the field in which the faculty member teaches, and, were the opportunity exists, to guide them successfully in individual projects. An evaluation of excellent in the area of instruction means that the faculty member has gone beyond basic competency in providing students with the basic materials of the subject matter taught. Rather, the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to effectively organize and present material in such a way that student learning is significantly enhanced. An evaluation of high quality in the area of instruction means that the faculty member is successful in providing students with the basic materials of the subject matter taught.

Assessing instruction should consider the following criteria:

1. Quality of course content: evaluated through review of syllabi, examinations, assignments, handouts, and other curriculum materials
2. Teaching effectiveness: demonstrated ability to communicate and work effectively with students;
3. Mentoring of students (e.g., independent studies, research projects/presentations, theses, dissertations) and student accomplishments

4. Development and application of curriculum materials and/or innovation in teaching methodologies

5. Development and execution of new course preparations

6. Participation in course/curriculum modification and evaluation

7. Facilitates experiential learning opportunities for students and/or provides mentoring to students in community-based internships

8. Provides leadership in the development of new courses, programs, instructional materials, and teaching methodologies

9. Applies expertise from professional practice in the classroom

10. Serves as guest speaker in other classes

11. Engages in course evaluations and student outcome measures

12. Additional Criteria: An academic unit/center may consider developing additional criteria as appropriate in evaluating the candidate’s performance

An evaluation of sustained excellence & continued growth in the area of scholarship means that the faculty member has established a national or international reputation as a leader in his/her field of study and has contributed to issues relevant to the College as defined by the respective academic unit and/or center. The faculty member is seen as someone who has made, and who continues to make, substantial and significant contributions to the literature, and as one whose work has had a marked impact on the work of others. The faculty member has advanced the understanding of an issue or the solution to an issue. An evaluation of excellent in the area of scholarship means that the faculty member has produced a body of work that is recognized as important to the discipline. An evaluation of high quality in the area of scholarship means that the faculty member has made important contributions to the literature.

Assessing scholarship should include the following criteria:

1. Publications: journals, books, monographs, essays, reviews, reports
2. Popular publications: articles, essays, op-ed pieces
3. Grants applied for and/or funded; professional development grants/awards
4. Service on editorial boards; manuscript reviewer for scholarly journals/publishers
5. Disseminates professional expertise through presentations at professional and/or academic conferences
6. Evaluates research findings for application in practice
7. Additional Criteria: An academic unit/center may consider developing additional criteria as appropriate in evaluating the candidate’s performance
An evaluation of *high quality* in the area of service means that a faculty member has made valuable service contributions to the academic unit and/or center, the College, University, and the discipline. Service activities beyond the University, in professional or academic associations and, if applicable, the practice community are expected of clinical and research faculty. Service for lecturers is dependent on the mission as defined by the academic unit, but it is generally at the unit or college level. Assessing the performance of *high quality* service should consider the following criteria:

1. Contributes to professional and/or academic associations through committee membership and/or leadership positions
2. Serves on unit, center, College, and/or University committees
3. Fulfills administrative appointments and assignments within the unit, center, College, and/or University
4. Contributes to the mission and needs of the unit and/or center through community engagement
5. Provides academic advisement to the students
6. Public speaking on behalf of the unit and/or center
7. Additional Criteria: An academic unit/center may consider developing additional criteria as appropriate in evaluating the candidate’s performance

For academic professionals, an evaluation of *sustained excellence & continued growth* in the area of service relates to the department’s mission and the specific service responsibilities of the candidate. Assessing the performance of *sustained excellence & continued growth* service of academic professionals should consider the following criteria:

1. Job Knowledge: Knowledge, skills and abilities as they relate to performing job requirements
2. Productivity: Amount of work successfully accomplished while maintaining standards and meeting deadlines
3. Accuracy and Quality: Professionalism and thoroughness of the work produced
4. Adaptability: Ability to master new duties and show flexibility in meeting the changing demands of the work environment
5. Organizational Skills: Ability to effectively and efficiently plan and carry out work priorities
6. Communication Skills: Ability to communicate in a clear manner, listen attentively, and respond appropriately to multiple audiences (e.g., faculty, students, peers, community members)
7. Initiative: Shows resourcefulness and creativity in addressing issues, gaps, challenges in carrying out work responsibilities
8. Professional Relationships: Develops and maintains effective working relationships with co-workers, supervisor, faculty, staff, students, community members, and others in carrying out job responsibilities
9. **Supervisory Skills**: Ability to effectively delegate and monitor work and follow-up with others; provide appropriate feedback and support to supervisees.

10. **Committee Service**: Active member and/or chair of unit and/or College committees.

11. **Community Service**: Participates in professional and/or academic associations.

12. **Community Engagement**: Contributes to the mission and needs of the academic unit, center, College, and/or University.

13. **Additional Criteria**: An academic unit/center may consider developing additional criteria as appropriate in evaluating the candidate’s performance.
DIRECTIONS TO CANDIDATE FOR SUBMITTING MATERIALS FOR PROMOTION

I. INSTRUCTIONS AND COMMENTS ON SUBMISSION OF DOSSIER

Each candidate must submit a dossier with documentation that describes his/her activities. The dossier should be able to make the case by itself (i.e., without formal or informal oral discussion, or presentations) with respect to the candidate’s qualifications. An electronic copy of the dossier is required to facilitate timely review by the various parties included in the review process. The unit head or appropriate administrator should provide a statement of the workload distribution and the duties and responsibilities pertaining to the candidate to be included in the dossier (GSU Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, p. 14).

Candidates for promotion whose last promotion was at Georgia State University must not submit work performed prior to the submission of the dossier for their last promotion.

Candidates must refer to the NTT promotion calendar found in Appendix A for timeline and submission deadlines for each step. Candidates submit a complete dossier to the appropriate unit head by the date specified on the calendar. Materials can be added to the dossier until the unit promotion committee makes its recommendation to the unit head. The additional materials will be provided to the unit head, who will notify all members of the unit promotion committee that additional materials have been added to the dossier. Once the unit committee has made its recommendation, no material, except written replies to reports of subsequent evaluations of the dossier, may be added to the dossier. The dossier is considered closed as of this date, and all parties involved in the review of the candidate’s credentials will have access to exactly the same information in the dossier.

Once a dossier is submitted to the College Committee on NTT Promotion, it can be viewed only by committee members, the administrative secretary of the committee, and administrative officials at the College and the University charged with the responsibility for reviewing candidates for promotion. This policy is strictly enforced; candidates should not submit the only copies of materials if they might be needed before the committee returns the dossier in the spring semester.

Candidates must follow the directions for categorizing supporting evidence submitted on instruction, scholarship, and service. The categories given for the division of materials in these areas should not be regarded as limiting or exclusive, and candidates may make additions.
II. INSTRUCTIONS FOR ELECTRONIC FORM OF DOSSIER

Information on the structure of the electronic file You will either turn in your file on a jump drive or as an electronic folder. Your opening screen must be your Table of Contents and CV with your name marking the file (CV Smith). Each file should be labeled with last name and nature of the documents (i.e. Smith, CV or Smith Table of Contents). Additional items should be separated into folders so like items can be easily identified and found. If electronic files are not clear and concise or items are in disarray, submission will be returned to the candidate to correct it.

The following is one suggestion for compiling your file. (It will not hold in all cases, but it can serve as a guideline or suggestion). The opening screen can also contain your combined statement and up to three separate folders depending on the requirements of your position. The three folders would be Teaching, Research, and Service. Inside each of these folders you can place two files. One would be your statement for this section and the other would be supporting documentation. The supporting documentation should be in one long PDF, and in the order indicated above. Screen shots found at the end of the document.

The dossier may be returned for revision if the materials in the dossier are not submitted in the standard format.

III. FORMAT FOR DOSSIER

1. The dossier begins with a cover sheet that includes the candidate’s name, present rank, academic unit, date of appointment at Georgia State University (full or part-time status indicated) and rank awarded, number of credits for years of prior service, dates for leaves of absence (with the purposes of the leaves indicated), and dates and places of previous promotions. The following format should be used (lines not applicable should be omitted):

   Name
   Highest Degree
   Present Rank
   Academic Unit
   Research Center Affiliation
   Date of GSU Appointment and Rank Awarded
   (A copy of the letter stating the award should be attached.)
   Leaves of Absence
   (Description and Purposes)
Dates and Places of Previous Promotions and Ranks Awarded

Proposed Rank

2. Unit head’s memorandum of recommendations and analysis to the Dean.

3. Statement of recommendation from the unit committee on promotion.

4. Candidate written responses to the statements of recommendation.

5. Index tabs with the following labels (underscored words), followed by the materials.

6. Table of Contents (note: the items listed above will be received and prepared by the academic unit head subsequent to the candidate preparing and submitting credentials to the academic unit for review, thus the table of contents will only include the items listed below as submitted by the candidate).

7. Workload Statement. A statement of the candidate’s workload distribution and job responsibilities and duties from the unit head. If the job responsibilities have changed over time (e.g., adding teaching responsibilities), it needs to be stated.

8. Resume in the order specified in Appendix B.

9. Three concise statements (not to exceed 1.5 pages each) of candidate’s teaching philosophy and evidence of teaching performance, area of research and evidence of research/scholarly productivity (where applicable) including external assessment of the candidate’s work in the form of citations or book reviews, and description of service activities. Each section in each of three areas (where applicable) should be clearly separated from the others by dividers.

10. Lists of Accomplishments and Supporting Evidence for Instruction, Scholarship, and Service, as follows:

A. In order to determine whether or not candidates meet the criteria given in the College’s Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Manual (and unit manuals, if applicable), the committees will review the credentials of NTT candidates in the applicable areas of instruction, scholarship, and service. This review will consider only the material and documentation present in a candidate’s dossier (as well as any information received from the unit head and the unit promotion committee). In each of the main areas, the College’s Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Manual identifies major
categories or subsections into which the activities of most candidates can
be logically divided; however, some candidates may not have activities to
report in all of the categories. The documentation should be placed
immediately after the list of accomplishments for a specific category and
in the same order used in the list.

B. Explicit instructions are given in the following sections for the
arrangement of the lists of accomplishments and the supporting
documentation. Most of the materials submitted by a candidate can be
placed in one of the categories listed later in the College’s NTT Promotion
Manual for instruction, scholarship, or service. Materials inappropriate for
listed categories must be placed in a separate category at the end of the
area. The dossier may be returned if it is not clear or in disarray.

IV. CATEGORIES FOR INSTRUCTION

As stated in the section on criteria, Georgia State University requires the services of
teacher-scholars who are now contributing significantly in the area of instruction and for
whom there exists ample evidence that this activity will continue in the future.
Information provided by candidates to document their contributions in the areas of
instruction must be divided into the sections listed below:

1. **Courses Taught:** The candidate must provide a copy of the most recent syllabus
used for each course taught since he/she was hired or last promoted. Only one
syllabus for each different course is required. The candidate must provide a list of
courses taught indicating the quarter or semester, the title and course number, and
the number of students in the course.

2. **Perception of Students:** Summary of the student questionnaires must be
provided for courses taught. Written comments may be included.

3. **Course Development:** Provide evidence of significant development of new or
revised courses, programs, and/or instructional methods.

4. **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction:** These should be listed in
tabular form.

5. **Independent Studies, Honors Theses, Theses, and Dissertations:** for each item
include the name of student, title of project, date completed, and candidate’s role.
6. **Published Materials:** Textbooks and published articles related to the candidate’s teaching (candidate as author). A copy of each must be provided.

7. **Other Materials** that bear on the evaluation of instruction. Candidates are encouraged to include in their dossier as many as possible of the materials identified by them as relevant to the assessment of instruction. It is important to note that a candidate must not solicit letters of support from students, faculty colleagues, or friends and include those letters in the dossier.

V. **CATEGORIES FOR SCHOLARSHIP**

Normally, all candidates’ accomplishments in this area can be listed logically in one of the categories given below. If this is not the case for some items, the candidate may create new categories and list the accomplishments under the new headings.

For multiple-authored works and collaborative projects, the candidate and (when possible) the unit should assess and explain in detail the degree of the candidate’s contribution to the work.

1. **Participation in Professional Associations:**

   A list of memberships in professional associations and participation at professional meetings should be provided. Items in this category should be arranged as follows:

   A. Memberships in Professional Associations.
      List current memberships.

   B. Presentations at Professional Meetings and Conferences
      Title and date of presentation, name and location of meeting. A one or two sentence description of the presentation.

   C. Offices Held in Professional Associations.
      Title, dates of term, and methods of selection.

2. **Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews:**

   A. Published Articles and Those Accepted for Publication.
Title of article, journal, volume, date (or projected date of publication),
names of the authors as they appear in print, and a one or two sentence
description of the publication, including an assessment of its contributions
to the discipline. Clear indication should be given of whether the article
has been published or only accepted for publication, and whether the
journal is refereed. The department’s evaluations of these articles should
include assessments of the relative prestige of the journals within the
candidate’s fields of interest; it is not expected that publications will
necessarily be in journals directly related to the candidate’s departmental
orientation.

B. Published Books and Monographs and Those Accepted for Publication.
Title, publisher, and date of publication or projected publication, and a one
or two sentence description of the work, including an assessment of its
contribution to the discipline. For works only accepted for publication,
clear indication should be given of whether an item is a book manuscript
in press and scheduled for publication at a more or less definite date, or a
book project for which a contract has been awarded and a manuscript is to
be submitted to the publisher in the future.

C. Reports, Essays, Book Chapters.
Title, where published, and date of publication or projected publication,
and a one or two sentence description of the work, including an
assessment of its contribution to the discipline.

D. Book Reviews.
Title, author, place of appearance, and date of publication or projected
publication.

E. Papers Under Review and In-process.
For each paper under review, state where it has been and is being
considered, and provide referee reports, if any.

**DOCUMENTATION**

Provide copies of items listed in paragraphs A, B, C, and E above.

3. **Awards and Grants:** List scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, professional
development grants, grants funded by local agencies, and grants from national
agencies. Indicate the amount of the award, the schedule of funding, the period of
the award, and the precise role of the investigator and any other co-principal or
co-investigator in the research or creative activities funded.
4. **Significant Professional Services:** List memberships on editorial boards, activities as referee for scholarly journals, activities as referee for granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, and services as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations. The list should include dates of service.

5. **Recognition by National, Scholarly, and Professional Associations:** List and include titles of honors, awards, fellowships, and internships.

6. **General Recognition Within One’s Field:** List requests for colloquium presentations or workshops, reviews of publications, and citations and references to the candidate’s work by others.

7. **Specialized Professional Activities Appropriate to the Discipline:** Included here are materials for which descriptions are not presented in any of the other categories above.

---

**VI. CATEGORIES FOR SERVICE**

The College Committee on Promotion considers only service activities related to candidates’ areas of professional competence. Service open to any responsible citizen must not be included. Extra remuneration for academic or public service should not preclude its inclusion. However, such service will be considered primarily on the basis of its direct benefits to Georgia State University. Letters of recommendation from a candidate’s department should discuss this category. In areas where a candidate believes substantial contributions have been made (as may be indicated in the candidate’s statement on service), it is appropriate for the department to solicit information about the effectiveness or importance of the candidate’s service and to speak to this effectiveness and importance in its letters. Given the mission of the Andrew Young School, collegiality and cooperation among faculty and researchers of several disciplines and research centers are emphasized. The College’s focus on applying research and theory to practice through the interaction of academic departments and research centers, service contributions that enhance these values are especially encouraged. Examples include senior co-authorships with junior faculty; attracting funding that helps support other faculty and graduate students not under the candidate’s own direction; helping other faculty with professional contracts; reviewing and assisting with manuscripts of other faculty members; being regularly available to colleagues and students outside of regular office hours and class times; frequent attendance at guest speaker seminars and other School events; participation in candidate job interviews and presentations across the School; providing intellectual leadership in research, instruction or service that benefits other faculty, students and other constituents; and assisting PTIs and GTAs with course development and instructional activities, such as mentoring and giving guest lectures.
1. **Assistance and Availability to Colleagues:** List consultation about educational problems, reviews of manuscripts, collaboration on research projects, assistance with projects, and contributions to programs in other concentrations, areas, or colleges. The candidate should indicate ways in which he/she regularly make himself/herself accessible to his/her colleagues.

2. **Contributions to Unit:** List memberships on unit committees, development of programs, and activities. List only contributions not already included in instruction or scholarship.

3. **Contributions to Research Centers:** List formal associations and appointments in research centers, and projects, programs, reports, committees, grant submissions, and presentations in which the candidate has have participated under the aegis of these centers.

4. **Committee Responsibilities at the College, University or System Level:** List committees and periods of service.

5. **Support of Local, State, National or International Organizations:** List consultant-ships, memberships on advisory boards, and offices held, and include dates of service.

6. **Significant Community Participation:** List lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, and short courses, and include dates.

7. **Meritorious Public Service:** List assistance to governmental agencies and development of community, state, or national resources and include dates.

---

**STRUCTURED REVIEWS**

Structured reviews contribute to the determination of whether the faculty member is performing at the level necessary for reappointment, whether the faculty member who is seeking promotion is progressing towards promotion, and to identify opportunities that will enable the faculty member to reach one’s full potential in terms of contribution to one’s unit, the School, and the University. [*GSU NTT Promotion Manual*]

An appointment to a NTT faculty position is for a one-year period. All NTT faculty should be reviewed on an annual basis, in accordance with the Georgia State University Faculty Handbook and Board of Regents policies.
All NTT faculty whose initial appointment at GSU is at an *entry level* or *above the entry* level will have a structured three year review no later than three years after the initial appointment, and a structured five year review no later than five years after the initial appointment. 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. [GSU NTT Promotion Manual]

The year in which the NTT comes up for promotion does not have to coincide with the structured review period.

### I. THIRD YEAR REVIEW

#### 1. DATE OF THIRD YEAR REVIEW

The review will occur during the Spring Semester of what would be the faculty member’s third full year. See Appendix C for the third year review calendar.

#### 2. THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE

Each academic unit will have a structured review committee that evaluates the credentials of all NTT faculty members undergoing review. This committee consists of a minimum of three faculty members. All members must be at a higher rank than the candidate under review, and NTT faculty must have representation. If there are no NTT faculty at ranks above the candidate’s current rank, appropriate NTT faculty from related AYS units shall be considered. The review committee members, appointed by the unit head, will select its chair.

#### 3. MATERIALS TO BE REVIEWED

The third year review committee will review the faculty member’s instruction, scholarship, and service activities. The faculty member will supply the appropriate documentation for the committee to make such a review, including:

- Resume;
- Copies of published and unpublished research;
- Teaching evaluations;
Additionally, a faculty member should provide a concise summary of accomplishments, expectations, and three-year goals not to exceed two pages in length.

Unit heads or administrators should provide a statement of the candidate’s workload.

4. THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

A written report will be prepared by the review committee and presented to the unit head, with a copy to the faculty member. The report will contain an evaluation of the faculty members progress toward promotion or reappointment in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service in alignment with the NTT faculty member’s tasks and job responsibilities; a recommendation regarding retention of the faculty member, and; observations and thoughts regarding what changes, if any, the committee believes the faculty member seeking promotion needs to address. The committee must have clear evidence that the faculty member seeking promotion is not making reasonable progress toward promotion before recommending dismissal.

The unit head may call a meeting of the unit’s review committee to discuss the report.

The unit head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the report of the committee.

The unit head will prepare a separate memorandum. Both the written report from the review committee, the memorandum from the unit head, the resume, and the two page statement will be sent to the Dean. In turn, the Dean will prepare a memorandum and will forward the memorandum, along with letter from the review committee, the memorandum from the unit head, the resume, and the two page statement to the Provost.

The Provost reviews all College’s Third Year Review documents. After the Provost has added comments, all letters, memoranda, and comments will be sent to the faculty member with copies to the other parties involved in the review. If the review is negative, the Provost will consult with the Dean, and the Dean will notify the candidate of the negative review.

The full report, including all letters, memoranda, and comments, and faculty member’s response, if any, will become part of the faculty member’s file. Written notification will be provided to the candidate at each stage of the review.
II. FIVE YEAR REVIEW

1. DATE OF THE FIVE YEAR REVIEW

The five year review will be conducted during the Spring Semester of the fifth year after the most recent promotion and continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a leave of absence (paid or unpaid), further promotion, impending candidacy for promotion within a year, or a letter of retirement/resignation that is effective prior to the end of the five year interval. For lecturers appointed at the entry level, the first structured five year review is also the review for promotion to senior lecturer (GSU NTT Promotion Manual). See Appendix D for the five year review calendar.

2. FIVE YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE

Each academic unit will have a review committee that evaluates the credentials of all NTT faculty members undergoing a five year review. This committee consists of a minimum of three faculty members. All members must be at a higher rank than the candidate under review, and NTT faculty must have representation. If there are no NTT faculty at ranks above the candidate’s current rank, appropriate NTT faculty from related AYS units shall be considered. The review committee members, appointed by the unit head, will select its chair.

3. MATERIALS TO BE REVIEWED

The cumulative review should address accomplishments in teaching, research and service. The review will be based on available information. The faculty member will submit at least the following elements of the dossier required for the regular promotion review:

- Resume organized in the sequence shown in Appendix B;
- Copies of all publications during the five-year evaluation period;
- Materials documenting teaching effectiveness during the five-year evaluation period;
- Copies of annual evaluations during the five-year evaluation period;
- Additionally, a faculty member should provide a concise summary of accomplishments, expectations, and five-year goals not to exceed two pages in length.
5. FIVE YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT, SUBSEQUENT REVIEW, AND COMMENTS

A written report will be prepared by the five year review committee. The review committee’s report is forwarded in turn, to the unit head. The academic unit head will prepare a separate memorandum. Both the written report from the review committee, the memorandum from the unit head, the resume, and the two page statement will be sent to the Dean and cc’d to the administrative staff for processing. In turn, the Dean will prepare a memorandum and will forward the memorandum, along with the Five Year Review Committee’s written report, the memorandum from the unit head, the resume, and the two page statement to the Provost for review and comment.

The Provost reviews all College’s Five Year Review documents. After the Provost has added his/her comments, all reports and comments are sent to the faculty member with copies to other parties involved in the cumulative review process.

After completion of these assessments, a conference will be held between the unit head and the faculty member. This conference will produce a plan which focuses on professional goals and/or workload profile for subsequent approval by the Dean. The progress of the faculty member will be monitored through the regular process of annual faculty evaluations.

The final report will be retained in the faculty member’s file in the Dean’s Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
<td>The Dean’s office will notify all candidates of their eligibility for promotion (with a copy to the respective unit head) in the upcoming academic year by virtue of length of service for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1-31</td>
<td>Chair, College P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>The P&amp;T Committee holds an informational meeting to discussion NTT promotion and procedures. The meeting is open to all AYS faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Eligible faculty members who intend to apply for promotion respond in writing to his/her respective unit head with copies to the Chair, College P&amp;T Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate submits completed dossier to his/her respective unit head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Unit Head</td>
<td>The unit head ensures the unit’s NTT Promotion Committee is in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5</td>
<td>Unit Head</td>
<td>The unit head forwards the candidate’s dossier to the unit’s NTT Promotion Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>Unit NTT Promotion Committee</td>
<td>Unit NTT Promotion Committee presents its statements of assessment and recommendation to the respective unit head. Any dissenting letters are sent as well. A copy of the recommendation letter, and any dissent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
letters, are sent to the candidate.

**October 5**  Candidate
Final date candidate can add materials to his/her dossier.

October  Candidate
1) A candidate’s response, if any, to the unit committee’s letter of recommendation, and any dissenting letters, is due to the unit head within **three (3)** business days of receiving the report.
2) A candidate wishing to withdraw from further consideration informs his/her unit head in writing within **five (5)** business days of receiving the report.

**October 20**  Unit Head
The unit head prepares a letter of recommendation to the chair of the College Committee on NTT Promotion, and sends the letter along with the unit committee’s letter, any dissenting letters, and the candidate’s dossier to the College committee chair. A copy of the unit head’s letter is sent to the candidate.

**December 1**  College Committee on NTT Promotion
The committee forwards its letter of recommendation, the unit head’s letter, the unit level committee’s letter, and any dissenting letters plus the dossier to the Dean. A copy of the College committee’s recommendation letter, and any dissenting reports, are sent to the candidate and the unit head.

**December**  Candidate
A candidate’s response, if any, regarding the College committee’s recommendation is due to the dean (with a copy to the unit head) within **three (3)** business days of receiving the report.

**January 15**  Dean
The Dean completes the review of the candidate’s materials. The candidate and his/her unit head are informed in writing of the Dean’s recommendation.

**January**  Candidate
1) A candidate’s response, if any, regarding the College’s final recommendation is due to the Dean **three**
2) A candidate wishing to withdraw from further consideration informs the Dean in writing within five (5) business days from the date of the Dean’s letter.

3) A candidate wishing to appeal a negative recommendation from the Dean has ten (10) business days from the receipt of the Dean’s letter in which to appeal, in writing, to the Provost.

The exact dates for the notification of the outcomes of the University review will be determined by the Office of the Provost and communicated to the University faculty in advance of each year’s promotion cycle.

**February/March**  
The Dean forwards the promotion recommendations, positive and negative, to the Provost by the date established by the Provost’s office.

**May**  
Provost completes review of NTT promotion cases and responds to appeals from candidates.

Within three (3) business days of receiving the Provost’s recommendations, the Dean notifies the candidates.

**June**  
President completes review of NTT promotion cases and responds to appeals from candidates.

Within three (3) business days of receiving the President’s decisions, the Dean notifies the candidates.
The curriculum vita should be organized in the following sequence, with headings corresponding to the following. Items listed under a heading should be in ascending chronological sequence (earliest date first). Publication citations should be complete, following standard citation format including page numbers.

**Name**

**Current Rank**

**Academic Unit**

**Education and Professional Credentials**

- List degree, major, institution and year received (for each degree)
- List professional, non-degree programs and courses completed

**Fellowship and Awards**

**Work experience**

List relevant professional academic work experience (teaching and administrative), including internships, and other business/professional positions held.

**Scholarship and Professional Development**

**Publications: Refereed Scholarly**

Include papers published in refereed scholarly journals and refereed conference proceedings.

**Publications: Refereed Professional/Practitioner**

Include papers published in refereed professional/practitioner journals and other outlets.

**Publications: Books, Monographs, and Reports**
Include books, monographs, reports, chapters in books, case studies, instructor’s manuals and other supplemental materials for textbooks, and books edited.

**Publications: Non-Refereed and Other**

Include book reviews, essays, papers published in non-refereed conference proceedings; exclude media interviews, abstracts, letters to editors, papers presented at meetings not otherwise published, working papers, including papers under review and in process.

**Papers Under Review and In-Process**

**Externally-funded Research Projects**

List title of research project, beginning and ending dates of the project, the amount of funding of the grant, and the specific participation of the faculty member in the grant project (e.g., project director, principal investigator).

**Papers Presented at Professional Meetings and Conferences**

List title, any co-author, name and date of meeting.

**Instruction, including advising**

**Supervision of Doctoral Dissertations**

List author and title of dissertation; indicate whether involvement was as member of, or chair of, dissertation committee in each case.

**Continuing Education and Training Activities**

List name of program, date of program, involvement in program, (e.g., topic taught as faculty member or program director); include training program activities.

**Service**

**Service Activities Internal to the University**

Include service on unit, college and university committees by listing name of committee, time period served, and whether service was as a member or chair. Also include other assignments and responsibilities at the unit, college, or university level.

**Service Activities in Academic and Professional Organizations**

Include service in academic or professional organizations as an officer or local arrangements chair/member, chair of program committee, chair of a program session,
discussant. Also include referee and other editorial appointments with respect to journals sponsored by such organizations.

Service to the Community

Include only those activities which utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member in activities in the community which are directly related to being a faculty member.
APPENDIX C

CALENDAR FOR THIRD YEAR REVIEW

***************
ANY DATE THAT FALLS ON THE WEEKEND OR A HOLIDAY
AUTOMATICALLY BECOMES THE NEXT WORKDAY Please note-- Timelines may
adjust annually based upon completion dates issued from the Provost’s office.

Additional information can be found in the Structured Reviews section beginning on page 27.

March 1  Unit Third Year Review Committee appointed by the unit head.
March 1  Faculty member being evaluated will supply unit’s Third Year Review Committee the
appropriate documentation.
April 1  Third Year Review Committee submits to Unit Head and faculty member being evaluated
a written report of its recommendation and supporting documentation.
May 1  Unit Head’s third year review recommendation memo due to the Dean including the
Third Year Review Committee’s written report and supporting documentation.
May 31  Dean’s memo to the Provost includes the Unit Head’s memo, the Third Year Review
Committee’s written report, the resume, and the two page statement.
June-August  Provost reviews all College Third Year Review documents.

NOTE: After the Provost has added comments to the review documents, all reports
and comments are sent to the faculty member, with copies to the other
parties involved in the review process.
## APPENDIX D

### CALENDAR FOR FIVE YEAR REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Five Year Review committee members appointed by the unit head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Faculty member being evaluated will submit appropriate documents to the Five Year Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Five Year Review committee submits report along with supporting documentation to Unit Head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Unit Head’s five year review recommendation memo due to the Dean including the Five Year Review Committee’s written report and supporting documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>Dean’s memo to the Provost includes the Unit Head’s memo, the Five Year Review Committee’s written report, the resume, and the two page statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-August</td>
<td>Provost reviews all College Five Year Review documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** After the Provost has added comments to the review documents, all reports and comments are sent to the faculty member, with copies to the other parties involved in the review process.

Additional information can be found in the *Structured Reviews* section beginning on page 27.