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INTRODUCTION

It is the policy of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies (“AYSPS”) to base promotion and tenure decisions on impartial and informed evaluations of the qualifications of all candidates. Excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service shall be the standard against which these qualifications will be evaluated. The college is committed to providing an environment in which all members of the tenured and tenure-track faculty have the opportunity and resources needed to achieve the qualifications necessary for promotion to higher rank and, where applicable, for tenure, as well as to foster ongoing professional development. The tenure decision is grounded on the candidate’s likely contributions subsequent to being granted tenure based on an evaluation of past performance.

This document is intended to provide the AYSPS tenure-track faculty with essential information about the promotion and tenure criteria, standards, and review processes of the College, including the responsibilities of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, AYSPS departments, the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and the Dean of the College.

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 and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors (“GSU Policy”), 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 AYS and GSU or BOR policy will be resolved by compliance with the higher level policy.

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure is bound by the College and departmental promotion and tenure manuals in effect on January 31 of the calendar year in which the department and college reviews of the candidate occur.

Candidate’s 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; standards are expected to rise as the College continues its drive for excellence.

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

I. GENERAL POLICIES

Every tenured and tenure-track 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 and/or tenure must declare his/her candidacy in writing to the chair of his/her department by April 1 in order to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the following academic year.

Candidates for promotion or tenure have the right to withdraw from further consideration at any time prior to the deadline for submitting recommendations to the Provost (See Appendix A).

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

All materials delivered to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure 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 and/or tenure.

The Office of the Dean shall retain in its files all materials submitted by the departments, the departmental chair, the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and all letters from outside reviewers. All materials submitted by the candidate shall be returned to the candidate at the appropriate time.

II. ELIGIBILITY (TIME-IN-RANK) POLICIES

1. Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion and Tenure

Pursuant to the calendar for the promotion and tenure process, an assistant professor is normally considered for promotion and tenure in the sixth year of service at that rank. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an assistant professor may be considered for promotion and tenure in the fifth year of service. An assistant professor must be considered for promotion and tenure no later than the seventh year of service. A faculty
member hired at the rank of instructor and later promoted to the rank of assistant professor must be considered for promotion and tenure no later than the ninth year of service.

Credit received for service at other institutions or in the rank of instructor may be applied (at the candidate’s discretion) towards a candidate’s tenure. Thus, for example, an assistant professor with two years of credit could be considered for tenure in the fourth year of service at Georgia State University.

Normally assistant professors should simultaneously apply for promotion and tenure. Tenure is not granted without promotion, nor promotion without tenure, except under highly unusual circumstances.

2. Associate Professors Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure; Professors Seeking Tenure

Pursuant to the calendar for the promotion and tenure process, an associate professor seeking promotion to professor normally is not considered before the fifth year of service as associate professor. However, a candidate may be considered for promotion earlier if exceptionally strong justification exists for doing so. Earliest consideration in this case occurs in the fourth year of service.

A faculty member hired as the associate or professor level may be considered for tenure no earlier than the fifth year of service (including, at the discretion of the candidate, any years for which probationary credit is awarded) and must be considered for tenure no later than the seventh year of service at Georgia State University.

Credit received for service at other institutions may be applied (at the candidate’s discretion) toward tenure. Acceptance of these credits is subject to the approval of the Dean when the candidate first becomes eligible for promotion.

Non-tenured associate professors seeking promotion and tenure may not seek promotion prior to tenure; a candidate may seek tenure prior to promotion.

3. Early Promotion and/or Tenure

Consideration for early promotion or tenure 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.
III. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR TENURE-TRACK PROMOTION AND TENURE

1. Degree Requirements

No member of the faculty will be promoted to the rank of associate professor or above in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies who has not received the doctoral degree from an accredited institution of higher learning, except in cases of “degree equivalents” as stated in Regents’ Policies and University Statutes, and as made explicit and applicable for each department in the college. Possession of a doctoral degree does not guarantee tenure or promotion to any rank.

2. Length of Service and Promotion

Regents’ Policies indicate that “length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be promoted,” but stipulates that “longevity of service is not a guarantee per se of promotion.” The policy of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies is that longevity of service shall not be treated as a substantive standard of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion by any of its departments.

Regents’ policies address the issue of minimum time in rank for consideration for promotion.
V. CREDIT TOWARD TENURE DECISION DATES

According to Regents’ policy, members of the faculty who, at the time they were hired, negotiated credit toward the probationary period required for tenure consideration have the opportunity later to withdraw all or part of this credit period when the candidate with probationary credit is first eligible for consideration for promotion and tenure. Thus the faculty member would become eligible to apply for tenure consideration at a later date than was originally set, up to the actual seventh academic year of full-time employment at GSU. The candidate must notify the Dean in writing of his/her desire to withdraw the credit. In order for the credit to be withdrawn, the Dean must approve its relinquishment.

VI. TENURE AT TIME OF HIRING

In accordance with Regents’ policy (Section 4.04, Academic Affairs Handbook, June 2000), tenure may be awarded at the time a faculty member is hired in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, but only in exceptional cases. Normally, tenure will be awarded in such cases only if the candidate has been previously granted tenure at another institution. The review of the candidate will be based on the candidate’s vitae and other materials that the departmental chair determines are reasonable and appropriate. Review procedures for awarding tenure are the same as for other candidates except that the normal calendar (Appendix A) will not apply.
PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

I. DEPARTMENT

1. Introduction

The promotion and tenure process in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies begins in the department, where the departmental Committees on Promotion and Tenure and the departmental chair evaluate the credentials of those faculty members who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure and who request consideration in writing to his/her department chair. The qualifications of each eligible faculty member being considered must be evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth in the College’s Promotion and Tenure Manual and in the departmental manual on promotion and tenure.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Manual

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

3. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees

Each department will have a promotion and tenure committee that reviews and evaluates the credentials of all faculty members being considered for promotion to assistant professor or promotion to associate professor with tenure. This committee consists of all tenured associate professors and professors in the department. (Being a candidate for promotion to professor does not exclude the candidate from serving on this committee.) Each department will also have a promotion and tenure committee that reviews and evaluates the credentials of all faculty members being considered for promotion to professor or being considered for tenure at the rank of professor. This committee consists of all the tenured professors in the department. The chairs of these committees shall be appointed by the department chair. Departmental chairs are nonvoting members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee. However, as discussed in the next
section, the chair will not begin his/her consideration the merits of the case until the candidate has a chance to respond to the committee review.

In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of tenured faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members.

4. Evaluation of Candidates

The departmental committees on promotion and tenure and the departmental chair independently evaluate the credentials of all candidates in the department during the Summer and Fall semesters. A candidate’s credentials must be submitted to the departmental committee and the departmental chair in the form required in the College’s Promotion and Tenure Manual. Both the departmental chair and the departmental committee evaluate the credentials according to the criteria set forth in the departmental promotion and tenure manual and the College’s Promotion and Tenure Manual. Letters from at least five outside reviewers must be among the information considered by the chair and the departmental committee.

After reaching its decision, but not later than October 6, the departmental committee sends the chair of the department a written statement of its recommendation, along with a detailed justification of it. This letter reflects the opinion of the majority of the committee. The statement from the departmental 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 departmental 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 separate statements indicating differences of opinion in the justification, in the recommendations, and in the reasons for these recommendations. The committee report must be provided to the candidate and the candidate must be given an opportunity to respond before the department chair’s consideration and decision.

After reaching his/her decision, the departmental chair prepares a statement indicating his/her recommendation which contains evaluation of the candidates in all three areas described in the AYSPS P&T Manual’s section, Direction for Departments and Departmental I.B. not later than October 13.

Departmental chairs, not later than October 13, in accordance with University Policy will notify in writing each candidate of his/her recommendation and include a copy of the departmental promotion and tenure committee review and any minority reports.
The departmental chair, not later than **October 18**, must forward to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure the evaluation of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and the departmental chair statement.

The candidate has the right to respond in writing not later than **October 18** to the departmental chair’s recommendation to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Copies of the candidate’s response will be included in the dossier sent forward to higher levels in the decision process.

A candidate who wishes to withdraw from further consideration may do so by informing the department chair in writing prior to the deadline for submitting recommendations to the Dean. The candidate will have at least five working days from date of department chair’s decision in which to respond, but not later than **October 24**.

## II. COLLEGE

No person may serve at more than one level of review. The procedure and the criteria to be used for evaluating a candidate are those described in the edition of the College’s **Promotion and Tenure Manual** that is in effect on January 31 of the calendar year in which the department and college reviews of the candidate occur. The College Committee on Promotion and Tenure is charged by the **Bylaws of the College** with making recommendations to the Dean regarding the promotion and/or tenure of all candidates.

The departmental chair is responsible for providing the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure with:

1. (A) the dossier submitted by the candidate;
2. (B) copies of all letters from outside reviewers;
3. (C) copies of the statements of recommendations from the departmental committee, any individual committee member, and the departmental chair; and,
4. (D) any written responses from the candidate to prior evaluations.

The College Committee on Promotion and Tenure reviews the candidate’s record of accomplishments and analyzes the evaluations of the candidate’s accomplishments contained in the statements of recommendation from the department and departmental chair, and from the letters from outside reviewers. It assesses whether, according to the published criteria and standards of the department and College, the recommendations for
or against promotion are justified in light of the evaluations presented by the department, the departmental chair, and the outside reviewers. Specifically, it seeks to ascertain whether or not sufficient evidence has been presented regarding the quality of the candidate. If the Committee has reason to believe that one or both of the departmental recommendations have not been adequately substantiated, it may seek additional information from the department. If there are inconsistencies among the departmental statements and letters from the outside reviewers, it assesses the extent, if any, to which these inconsistencies militate against a recommendation for promotion/tenure.

If, as a result of its deliberations, the Committee concludes that a positive recommendation for promotion/tenure is warranted by the evaluation provided by the departmental committee, departmental chair, and the outside reviewers, it will so recommend and also provide a summary of this record and evaluations as part of its report to the Dean not later than November 6. If the Committee concludes that a positive recommendation is not justified by the record and the evaluations, it will recommend against promotion/tenure and also provide a summary of the record and evaluations in its report to the Dean not later than November 6. The report of the 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 (e-mail or memo) the departmental chair of the recommendation received from the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure not later than November 16.

The Dean will inform the candidate in writing of the recommendation received, not later than November 16, from the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure. 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 at least five working days from receipt of the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure recommendation in which to respond, but not later than November 23.

The Dean reviews the recommendations from the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the evaluations of the outside reviewers, the department, the departmental chair, and any responses from the candidate. At the same time, the Dean takes into account the relationship between the candidate’s potential contribution and the needs of the department and college.
The exact dates for the notification of the outcomes of College and University review will be determined by the Office of the Provost and communicated to the University faculty in advance of each year’s promotion and tenure cycle. For general dates, please reference Appendix A.

The Dean will forward all positive recommendations to the Provost during the third week of January (exact date to be determined by the Office of the Provost). This recommendation is accompanied by:

(A) copies of the evaluations from the departmental committee and the departmental chair, including any minority reports from the committee;

(B) copies of all letters from outside reviewers;

(C) a copy of the report and recommendation provided by the College’s Committee on Promotion and Tenure together with any minority reports; and,

(D) any written responses from the candidate to prior evaluations.

(E) any other documentation requested by the Office of the Provost.

A candidate, who is not recommended by the Dean, may appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost. This appeal must be made in writing no later than ten business days from the date of the Dean’s written decision.

III. UNIVERSITY

The University has established procedures and criteria for appeals of College recommendations. These procedures and criteria may be obtained from the Office of the Provost.
CRITERIA FOR JUDGING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE IN THE ANDREW YOUNG SCHOOL OF POLICY STUDIES

I. TERMS OF EVALUATION TENURED AND TENURE TRACK

The work of candidates will be evaluated as excellent, good or poor in each of the three areas of assessment: instruction, scholarship, and service.

An evaluation of excellent 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, where the opportunity exists, to guide them successfully in individual projects. An evaluation of good in the area of instruction means that the faculty member is successful in providing students with the basic materials of the subject matter taught.

An evaluation of excellent in the area of scholarship means, at the level of promotion to associate professor, that the faculty member has produced a considerable body of work that is recognized as important by leaders in his/her field of research, both within and outside the university, and that leads them to view the faculty member as having the potential to be a leader in his/her field in the near future. An evaluation of good in the area of scholarship means, at the level of promotion to associate professor, that the faculty member has produced a body of work that shows a commitment to scholarship in his/her field and that indicates scholarly progress is both possible and likely. In addition to articles in refereed journals, other types of publications are also important. Thus “body of work” includes, but is not necessarily limited to, referred journals articles, books, book chapters, reports, non-refereed journal articles, grant applications that involve new ideas, essays, and cases.”

An evaluation of excellent in the area of scholarship at the level of promotion to professor means that the faculty member has established a national or international reputation as a leader in his/her field, i.e. as one 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.

Scholarship shall be evaluated principally on the basis of its contribution to issues relevant to the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Contribution refers to how the scholarship advances the understanding of an issue or the solution to an issue. Issues relevant to the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies include policy issues, as well as all subject matter, broadly defined, of the departments within the Andrew Young School.
of Policy Studies. The quality, reputation, and readership of the publication outlet are important as indicators of the contribution of the research.

An evaluation of excellent in the area of service at the level of promotion to associate professor means that the faculty member has made valuable service contributions to the department and has been involved in service activities beyond the departmental level, e.g., in centers, on college or university committees, in professional or academic associations. Exceptional service at the departmental level may partially compensate for a lack of service beyond this level. An evaluation of good in the area of service at the level of promotion to associate professor means that the faculty member has played a useful role in the service activities of the department and school and shows promise of making greater contributions in the future, both within and outside the department.

An evaluation of excellent in the area of service at the level of promotion to professor means that, in addition to service to the department, the faculty member has rendered extensive, effective, and valuable service to centers and/or at the college or university level, and/or in academic/professional associations. An evaluation of good in the area of service at the level of promotion to professor means that the faculty member has made valuable service contributions to the department as well as in at least one area on the college or university level, or in academic/professional organizations over the period of time since the last promotion.

II. CRITERIA FOR TENURED AND TENURE TRACK

1. Assistant Professor

In order for a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, he/she must have the terminal degree or its equivalent in his/her discipline. In addition, each candidate must be evaluated as excellent in the area of instruction. He/she must also show considerable promise with respect to scholarship and service, and thus be evaluated as at least good in each of these two areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Tenure at the Rank of Assistant Professor**

Under highly unusual circumstances a candidate at the rank of Assistant Professor may be recommended for tenure only. In such cases, the candidate and his/her department must present compelling evidence of exceptional achievement and singular value to the University in one area and achievements evaluated as at least **good** in the other two areas. Recommendations for tenure without promotion should be exceedingly rare.

3. **Associate Professor**

In order to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must present evidence that he/she is recognized by professionals outside Georgia State University as a person who contributes to the advancement and development of his/her field of research. The rank of Associate Professor requires a commitment and potential to continue to be professionally active and genuinely productive. Since teaching and service are integral parts of the University’s mission, each candidate for Associate Professor must be judged to the contributing significantly to the instructional and service activities of the University. In order to be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must be judged excellent in the area of scholarship, and at least **good** in the remaining two areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Necessary Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

5. **Professor**
Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia State University. Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. In order to be recommended for promotion to Professor, a candidate must be judged excellent in both scholarship and instruction, and at least good in service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Tenure at the Rank of Professor

The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor.

7. Exceptions

Exceptions to these criteria for teaching and service will be made in cases in which the faculty appointment was principally administrative, e.g., dean, associate dean, departmental chair, or center or program director. In such cases, expectations regarding the quantity, but not the quality, of teaching and the expectations regarding the nature of service will be modified to reflect the nature of the appointment.

DIRECTIONS TO CANDIDATE FOR SUBMITTING MATERIALS TO THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

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.
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 (with the exception of those promoted to assistant professor from instructor and given probationary credit).

Candidates submit a completed electronic copy of the dossier to the appropriate departmental chair by **August 31**. After this date, materials can be added to the dossier until the departmental promotion and tenure committee makes its recommendation to the departmental chair but not later than **October 4**. The additional materials will be provided to the departmental chair who will notify all members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee that additional materials have been added to the dossier. Once the departmental 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 Promotion and Tenure, it can be viewed only by the members of the Committee, the administrative secretary of the Committee, and administrative officials at the college and the university charged with the responsibility for reviewing candidates for promotion and/or tenure. 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 scholarship, instruction, 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.

When candidates submit their dossier for review they must also submit a separate copy of their CV (in other words the file must include a copy of CV that is not contained in a larger PDF or other type of combined file) as the Provost only requires a CV, not a full dossier.
III. FORMAT FOR DOSSIER

1. The dossier begins with a cover sheet that includes the candidate’s name, present rank, department, 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. This sheet should state the candidate’s areas of specialization. The following format should be used (lines not applicable should be omitted):

   Name
   Highest Degree
   Present Rank
   Department
   Date of GSU Appointment and Rank Awarded
   Number of Years of Credit for Prior Service
   (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
   Areas of Specialization
   Proposed Rank

2. Departmental chair’s memorandum of recommendations and analysis to the Dean.

3. Statement of recommendation from the departmental committee on promotion and tenure.

4. Candidate written responses to the statements of recommendation.

5. Summary resumes of external reviewers.


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

8. Table of Contents (note: the items listed above will be received and prepared by the departmental chair 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).

9. Resume in the order specified in Appendix B.
10. 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 should be clearly separated from the others by dividers.

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

A. In order to determine whether or not candidates meet the criteria given in the College’s Promotion and Tenure Manual and the criteria given in the departmental manuals, the committees will review the credentials of all candidates in the areas of scholarship, instruction, and service. This review will consider only the material and documentation present in a candidate’s dossier (as well as any information received from outside reviewers and information received from the departmental chair and the departmental promotion and tenure committee). In each of the main areas, the College’s Promotion and Tenure 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 listed in the College’s Promotion and Tenure Manual. 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 Promotion and Tenure Manual for scholarship, instruction, or service. Materials inappropriate for listed categories must be placed in a separate category at the end of the area.

**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, for example five year reviews, but it can serve as a guideline or suggestion). The opening screen can also contain your combined statement and three separate folders: one each for 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.

IV. 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 department 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.
V. 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. These contributions are divided by the College Promotion and Tenure Manual into three major categories: activities in regularly scheduled classes; work with individual students on research projects, honors papers, theses, and dissertations; and the development of new or revised courses, programs, and/or concepts of instruction. 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. **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction:** These should be listed in tabular form.

4. **Independent Studies, Honors Theses, Theses, and Dissertations:** For each item include the name of student, title of project, date completed, and candidate’s role.

5. **Published Materials:** Textbooks and published articles related to the candidate’s teaching. A copy of each must be provided.

6. **Other Materials** that bear on the evaluation of instruction. Candidates are encouraged to include in their dossiers 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; however, this does not pertain to independent peer reviews of teaching.

VI. CATEGORIES FOR SERVICE

The College Committee on Promotion and Tenure 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 School’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 Department:** List memberships on departmental 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 consultantships, 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 date
I. RECOMMENDATION AND EVALUATION

A. Each candidate must present his/her complete dossier to the chair and appropriate departmental committee not later than **August 31**. The Dean provides at least five letters from outside reviewers to the chair and appropriate departmental committee no later than **August 17**. The candidate’s dossier and letters from outside reviewers constitute the complete set of materials to be evaluated by the departmental committee.

B. The appropriate departmental committee on promotion and tenure must forward to the departmental chair a written evaluation of each candidate, but not later than **October 6**. Each evaluation should consider each of the three areas: Scholarship, Instruction, and Service. For each area a forthright and detailed assessment of the accomplishments of the candidate should be given. Care should be taken to correlate the appraisals with the materials in the dossier. If a particular accomplishment is thought to be significant, then reasons should be given for this judgment. Also, each section must contain a statement explaining why the candidate is thought to meet the criteria given the College’s Promotion and Tenure Manual and the specific criteria outlined in any departmental manual. A concluding section stating the committee’s overall recommendation, with reasons in support of it, must be included. Each member of the committee must indicate in writing his/her acceptance of the recommendations. Members of the committee who disagree with the recommendations must so indicate, and must provide in writing their reasons for doing so.

C. The departmental chair must forward to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure the evaluation of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and a statement that contains his/her evaluation of the candidate in all three areas not later than **October 18**. The chair’s statement should follow the guidelines above in B.

D. At each step of the process, up to and including evaluation by the Dean, the candidate will receive a letter of evaluation and will have 5 days to respond to those letters if he/she so desires.

E. The evaluations of candidates from the departmental committees on promotion and tenure and departmental chairs are due to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure not later than **October 18**.
F. The College Committee on Promotion and Tenure presents its report, the departmental chair statement, the department promotion and tenure committee evaluation, and outside reviewer letters to the Dean not later than **November 6**.

G. The Dean forwards all positive promotion and tenure recommendations to the Provost during the 3rd week of January, unless the candidate chooses to withdraw.

---

**EXTERNAL REVIEWS**

Written external reviews of a candidate’s research and publications are required for all promotion decisions above the Assistant Professor level and tenure decisions. A minimum of five substantive external reviews must be obtained on each candidate for promotion and tenure. Individuals selected as external reviewers for tenure-track candidates should normally be senior faculty at other universities with academic reputations equal to or better than Georgia State University; in any case, they should be qualified to evaluate the candidate’s research and publications output in terms of its significance, quality and overall contribution to the field. 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 reviewers for candidates should not have a professional and/or close relationship with the candidate such as co-authoring a manuscript or a previous working relationship.

1. **Determination of external reviewers.**

   By **May 2**, the candidate will submit to the department chair a list of at least six (preferably 8) potential external reviewers. By **May 16**, in consultation with senior faculty in the department in the candidate’s area of expertise, the department chair will develop a list of at least six (preferably 8) external reviewers, which will include at least three of the reviewers on the candidate’s list. The number of reviewers on the list should be adequate to insure that at least five substantive reviews will ultimately be received. In any case, it is the responsibility of the department chair to assure that an adequate number of substantive reviews are received from qualified reviewers.

2. **Solicitation of external reviews.**

   All letters soliciting these reviews will be written by the Dean and mailed to the external reviewers by **June 15**, requesting and **August 1** deadline response. However, Chairs or head of the academic units should make the initial contact to the external reviewers from the consolidated list. The Chair or head of the academic unit will find out who agrees to be a reviewer and how he or she would
like the materials. (Chairs and or head of the academic unit must keep
documentation of yes and no responses, as this information is required by the
Provost’s office later in the process.) The Deans office will only be provided with
the names of those agreeing to review, after which, official documents will be
sent out from the Dean’s office. Each external reviewer will be sent the
candidate’s resume and copies of the candidate’s significant publications or other
research output (except lengthy books and monographs, for which a copy of the
title page and table of contents will be provided). If the number of publications is
extensive, then sample of the most significant publications selected by the
candidate in consultation with the department chair will be sent. By June 1, the
candidate will provide to the department chair for review the resume and copies
of other materials to be sent to the external reviewers.

The external reviewer for candidates will be asked to evaluate the candidate’s
research and publications output in terms of its significance, quality and overall
contribution to the field. All responses shall be addressed to the Dean. The
reviews of the external reviews will become part of the candidate’s dossier and
will be available to all internal reviewers, including the departmental committee
on promotion and tenure. The reviews will not be made available to the candidate
unless adjudication under the Georgia Open Records Law results in the reviews
becoming public.

3. Resume data on external reviewers.

As part of the candidate’s dossier, the information to be provided on external
reviewers is a listing prepared by the head of the academic unit (compiled
consecutively on 1-2 sheets of paper) of all the external reviewers with the
following information:

1. Name

2. Current affiliation

3. Biographical/resume data

This summary is to be incorporated in the dossier to be submitted to the College
Committee on Promotion and Tenure.
The following provisions pertaining to appeals of promotion or tenure recommendations originate with the GSU document titled “Policy on Promotion, Tenure Development for Tenure Track Faculty” approved by the University Senate.

I. APPEAL OF NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION BY THE DEAN

The Dean will provide the candidate a written statement of the college’s final decision during the 1st week of January (exact date to be determined by the office of the Provost), citing reasons for a negative decision. The candidate will have ten business days from the date of the Dean’s letter to appeal the negative recommendation to the Provost (see A). The grounds for appeal will be procedural errors detrimental to the candidate. Such procedural errors may include violations of due process, such as arbitrariness, capriciousness, and discrimination, as well as bias and other forms of nonprofessional judgment on the part of any person or group involved in the promotion and tenure review. A difference in the evaluation of candidate’s accomplishments among departmental committee on promotion and tenure, the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the departmental chair and/or the dean is not an adequate basis for appeal. The appeal to the Provost must be in writing and must provide a specific statement of the basis for the appeal. New information (e.g., in-process, accepted or published scholarship) which substantially alters the nature of the record as reviewed within the College may not, however, be included. Any such new information may instead be the basis for reconsideration of the recommendation at the appropriate college or unit level.

II. APPEAL OF NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PROVOST

During the 3rd week of February, the Provost will notify the President and Dean of candidate recommendations. Within three business days of receiving the Provost’s recommendations, the Dean will notify the candidates. In the case of a negative decision, the Provost will respond to appeals from candidate, providing the candidate and Dean a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected. A candidate wishing to appeal the Provost’s negative recommendation or decision regarding an appeal may appeal, in writing, to the President within ten business days of the date of the provost’s letter.
THIRD YEAR REVIEW

A formal review of any untenured faculty member will be conducted at the end of that faculty member’s third year.

I. PURPOSE OF THIRD YEAR REVIEW

The purpose of the review is to assess the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure, determine whether sufficient progress is being made to warrant retaining the faculty member, and to offer advice to the faculty member regarding the achievement of promotion and/or tenure.

II. DATE OF THIRD YEAR REVIEW

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

III. THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE

A review committee for a tenure-track candidate of at least three department tenured faculty members will be elected by the department’s tenured faculty no later than March 1. The review committee members will select its chair.

IV. MATERIALS TO BE REVIEWED

The newly elected third year review committee will review the faculty member’s research, teaching, and service activities. The faculty member will supply, by March 1, 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 may supply a concise summary of accomplishments, expectations, and three-year goals not to exceed two pages in length
V. THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

A written report will be prepared by the review committee and presented to the departmental chair, with a copy to the faculty member, by April 1. The report will contain an evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward tenure in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service; a recommendation regarding retention of the faculty member, and; observations and thoughts regarding what changes, if any, the committee believes the faculty member needs to make if the faculty member is to achieve promotion and tenure. The committee must have clear evidence that the faculty member is not making reasonable progress toward tenure before recommending dismissal. If the committee recommends that the candidate be dismissed, the departmental chair will request a vote of the department’s tenured faculty on the issue of whether to recommend to the departmental chair the dismissal of the candidate.

The departmental chair may call a meeting of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee to discuss the report. The departmental chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the report of the committee.

The departmental chair will prepare a separate memorandum. Both the written report from the review committee, the memorandum from the departmental chair, the resume, and the two page statement will be sent to the Dean not later than May 1. In turn, the Dean will prepare a memorandum and will forward the memorandum, along with letter from the review committee, the memorandum from the departmental chair, the resume, and the two page statement to the Provost not later than May 31.

The Provost reviews all College’s Third Year Review documents in the period of June through August. 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.

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.

Please note-- Timelines may adjust annual based upon completion dates issued from the Provost’s office.
CUMULATIVE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT FOR TENURED FACULTY

The following provisions pertaining to cumulative review for tenured faculty originate with the GSU document titled “GSU Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors” approved by the University Senate in on January 19, 2012.

I. PURPOSE OF CUMULATIVE REVIEW

The purpose of the cumulative review is to assess faculty development goals and achievements, to provide assistance to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth, and to provide objectives and plans for the faculty to help the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies fulfill its mission.

II. YEAR IN WHICH CUMULATIVE REVIEW IS CONDUCTED

The cumulative 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.

III. TENURED FACULTY TO WHOM CUMULATIVE REVIEW APPLIES

The cumulative review applies to all tenured-faculty excepting those with administrative appointments as departmental chair with faculty appointed to them, directors of centers with faculty appointed to them, and the associate dean. The departmental chairs, the directors and the associate dean are subject to triennial reviews. In order to accomplish the spirit of post-tenure review which is to provide for continual professional development of all tenured-faculty, the triennial review of heads of academic units and associate deans must address their academic and professional activities as well as their managerial and leadership performance.
IV. CUMULATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND CHAIR

The committee of faculty conducting the cumulative post-tenure review will consist of at least three tenured faculty from within the University elected no later than March 1 by the tenured faculty within the department of the faculty member being evaluated. Faculty being evaluated during the year under consideration will neither participate in the selection of the committee nor serve on the committee. The department chair will appoint the chair from the cumulative post-tenure review committee membership. The department may select separate cumulative post-tenure review committees for each faculty member to be reviewed.

V. 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 by March 15 at least the following elements of the dossier required for the regular tenure 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 ly 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.

Please note—Timeline may adjust annual based upon completion dates issued from the Provost’s office.

VI. CUMULATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT, SUBSEQUENT REVIEW, AND COMMENT

A written report will be prepared by the cumulative review committee. The review committee’s report is forwarded in turn, to the departmental chair by May 1. The departmental chair will prepare a separate memorandum. Both the written report from the review committee, the memorandum from the departmental chair, the resume, and the
two page statement will be sent to the Dean by May 31. The materials must also be cc’ed to the Dean’s administrative support who will process the materials for the Dean. In turn, the Dean will prepare a memorandum and will forward the memorandum, along with the cumulative review committee’s written report, the memorandum from the department chair, the resume, and the two page statement to the Provost no later than June 15 for review and comment.

The Provost reviews all College’s Cumulative Review documents in the periods of June through August. 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 departmental chair 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.
By March 31  
Annual College Meeting for Promotion and Tenure Candidates within the College-
Open to All Faculty Members in the College

April 1  
All faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion or tenure notify
his/her respective departmental chairs. (Page 2)

May 2  
Candidates provide the departmental chairs with a list of six (preferably 8)
possible outside reviewers. (Page 28)

May 16  
Departmental chairs provide the Dean with a list of six (preferably 8) possible
outside reviewers. The list will include at least three names from the list the candidate
provided. (Page 28)

June 1  
Candidates will have provided materials to be sent to the external reviewers. (Page 29)

June 15  
Dean will have written and mailed all letters to external reviewers soliciting their
reviews. (Page 28)

August 1  
External reviewers response deadline. (Page 28)

August 17  
Dean provides at least five letters from outside reviewers to the department. (Page 27)

August 31  
Candidates submit complete dossiers to the appropriate chairs. (Pages 19 and 27)

October 4  
Final date candidates can add materials to his/her dossiers. (Pages 19-20)

October 6  
Departmental promotion and tenure committees present their statements of assessment
and recommendation to the departmental chairs. (Pages 9 and 27)

October 13  
Departmental chair prepares a statement indicating his/her recommendation which
contains evaluation of candidates in all three areas described in the AYSPS P&T
Manual’s section, Direction for Departments and Departmental I.B.
October 13  Departmental chair in accordance with University Policy will notify in writing each
candidate of his/her recommendation and include a copy of the departmental promotion
and tenure committee review and any minority reports. (Page 9)

October 18  Department chair must forward to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure the
evaluation of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and the departmental
chair statement. (Pages 9 and 27)

October 24  Deadlines:

1) Candidates’ response, if any, to reports of the chair and the departmental
committee is due to the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure.  (Page 9)

2) Candidates wishing to withdraw from further consideration inform
departmental chairs in writing.  (Page 10)

November 6  College Committee on Promotion and Tenure presents its report, the departmental chair
statement, the departmental promotion and tenure committee evaluations, and the outside
reviewer letters, if any, to the Dean.  (Page 11)

November 14  Dean informs departmental chairs (e-mail or memo) of the College Committee Promotion
and Tenure recommendations.  (Page 11)

November 16  Dean informs candidates in writing of the decision of the College Committee on
Promotion and Tenure including the deadline for the candidate’s response, if any, and a
copy of the College Committee’s report.  (Page 11)

November 23  Candidates’ response, if any, to College Committee on Promotion and Tenure report is
due to the Dean.  (Page 11)

November 26  Dean informs (e-mail or memo) departmental Chairs of College’s final
recommendation.

1st Week of January  Dean to inform candidates in writing (e-mail or memo) of the College’s final
recommendation decision for Promotion and Tenure.

Candidates’ response, if any, regarding College’s final recommendation is due to
the Dean three business days from the date of the Dean’s letter.

A candidate wishing to appeal a negative recommendation of a Dean has ten
business days from the date of the Dean’s letter in which to appeal, in writing, to

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

November 26  Dean informs (e-mail or memo) departmental Chairs of College’s final
recommendation.

1st Week of January  Dean to inform candidates in writing (e-mail or memo) of the College’s final
recommendation decision for Promotion and Tenure.

Candidates’ response, if any, regarding College’s final recommendation is due to
the Dean three business days from the date of the Dean’s letter.

A candidate wishing to appeal a negative recommendation of a Dean has ten
business days from the date of the Dean’s letter in which to appeal, in writing, to
A candidate wishing to withdraw from further consideration informs the Dean in writing within ten business days from the date of the Dean’s letter.

**3rd Week of January**
Dean forwards all College’s final positive promotion and tenure recommendations to the Provost unless a candidate withdraws.

**3rd Week of February**
Provost notifies the President and Dean of candidate recommendations.

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

Provost responds to appeals from candidates, providing the candidate and Dean with a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected.

A candidate wishing to appeal the Provost’s negative recommendation or decision regarding an appeal may appeal, in writing, to the President within ten business days of the date of the Provost’s letter.

**3rd Week of March**
President notifies the Dean of promotion and tenure decisions.

Within three business days of receiving the President’s decisions, the Dean notifies the candidates.

President responds to appeals from candidates.

-------------------BOR Data Systems process information------------------

**TBA**
Deadline for P&T recommendations to be entered into the BOR/Manage Faculty Events system.
APPENDIX B

OUTLINE OF RESUME TO BE USED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATION

The resume 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

Department

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 departmental, 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 departmental, 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

Calendars/timeline date may adjust annually based upon completion dates issues from the
Provost’s office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Departmental Third Year Review committee elected by the department tenured faculty. (Page 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Faculty member being evaluated will supply Departmental Third Year Review committee the appropriate documentation. (Page 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Departmental Third Year Review committee submits to Department Chair and faculty member being evaluated a written report of its recommendation and supporting documentation (Page 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Departmental Chair Third Year Review recommendation memo due to the Dean including the Departmental Third Year Review committee’s written report and supporting documentation. (Page 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Dean’s memo to the Provost includes the Departmental Chair memo, the Departmental Third Year Review committee’s written report, the resume, and the two page statement. (Page 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-Aug</td>
<td>Provost reviews all College Third Year Review documents. (Pages 30)</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.
**APPENDIX D**

**CALENDAR FOR CUMULATIVE REVIEW**

***************

ANY DATE THAT FALLS ON THE WEEKEND OR A HOLIDAY AUTOMATICALLY BECOMES THE NEXT WORKDAY

Calendars/timeline date may adjust annually based upon completion dates issues from the Provost’s office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Cumulative Review committee elected by tenured faculty within the department of faculty being evaluated. (Page 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Faculty member being evaluated will submit appropriate documents to the Cumulative Review committee. (Page 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Cumulative Review committee submits report along with support documentation to Departmental Chair. (Page 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Departmental Chair Cumulative Review recommendation memo due to the Dean including the Departmental Cumulative Review committee’s written report and supporting documentation. (Page 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Dean’s memo to the Provost includes the Departmental Chair’s memo, the Cumulative Review committee’s written report, the resume, and the two page statement. (Page 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-August</td>
<td>Provost reviews all College Cumulative Review documents. (Pages 32)</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.