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I. INTRODUCTION

Promotion and tenure decisions are extremely important to the life of the institution. They are the means by which the University retains its most valuable scholars, sustains excellence in its instructional program, and promotes its mission to advance knowledge. Promotion and tenure evaluations are also among the most important events in a faculty member’s professional life. Accordingly, it is essential that all faculty members be treated fairly and granted due process in the deliberations that determine tenure and promotion.

The tenure criteria and procedures established by Georgia State University conform to the requirements of the Board of Regents. The most current version of these policies can be found in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents (http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section 8.3.7). Each college within the university is charged with specifying and making available to its faculty an elaboration of University criteria, processes, and procedures relating to promotion and tenure as they apply to that college. This document serves that purpose. In addition, each academic unit is encouraged to develop additional criteria that are specific to that particular academic unit; these criteria may not be less stringent than those of the College.

The College elaboration is supplementary to the Georgia State University Statutes and Bylaws, the bylaws and policies of the Regents of the University System of Georgia, and provisions contained in the Georgia State University Faculty Handbook. Therefore, faculty members are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with the portions of these documents that contain promotion and tenure policies and procedures.

The promotion and tenure standards, policies, and procedures outlined in this document require ongoing reassessment to maintain consistency with University, College, and academic unit levels. Faculty will be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the College and unit criteria in effect at the time a specific review process is requested.

Excellence in research, teaching, and service is the general standard at Georgia State University against which candidate qualifications are evaluated for promotion and tenure. The School of Public Health (SPH) Mission statement is an interpretation of the University's general standard of excellence within the context of public health. As a school located in an urban environment, the School of Public Health believes its Mission is best achieved by having faculty who are involved in diverse scholarly and professional activities. These include unique opportunities for application of state of the art information to practice situations as evidenced in research, teaching and service activities. Faculty development and evaluation processes within SPH recognize the variety of roles our faculty must assume and acknowledge that there are multiple paths to excellence.

II. SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

A. Overview
Tenure and Promotion Goals and Standards: The main purposes of tenure are to recognize high quality performance of faculty members, to protect academic freedom, and to enable the University to attract and retain outstanding faculty. The decision to award tenure is based on the merit of the individual faculty member’s demonstrated accomplishments in research, teaching, and service, the trajectory of continued accomplishments throughout the faculty member’s career, and the mission of the department, SPH, and the University.
The candidate’s record will be evaluated according to University, SPH, and department criteria, and professional standards for conduct in research, teaching, and service. In each area: (1) research; (2) teaching; and (3) service the candidate will be evaluated as either having met or having not met the standards for promotion or tenure. It is necessary to meet the standards in each of the three areas for promotion or tenure.

Tenure after or before Promotion to Associate Professor: It is customary for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor to be considered concurrently. The criteria for tenure are the same for faculty hired at the rank of associate professor and faculty up for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Similarly, the criteria for tenure at the rank of professor are the same as those for promotion to the rank of professor with tenure.

Special Circumstances: The president may approve an outstanding distinguished faculty member for the award of tenure upon the faculty member’s initial appointment; such action is otherwise referred to as tenure upon appointment. Each such recommendation shall be granted only in cases in which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an associate or professor, was already tenured at a prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution. If the person is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the chancellor must approve the award of tenure.

Tenure and Promotion Process: The promotion and tenure process begins during the spring semester when a candidate, who has been notified of his/her eligibility by the academic unit head, notifies the academic unit head, the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Dean of the intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure during the upcoming academic year. Academic unit heads are notified of their eligibility by the Dean. When an academic unit head applies for promotion or tenure, the academic unit head candidate notifies the Dean of his/her intent.

The candidate compiles a dossier in the format stipulated in Section IV of this manual. The dossier substantiates the applicant's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The dossier submitted by the candidate includes materials prepared by the candidate, substantiating documentation, and space for external review letters and recommendation letters (added during the review process) from the academic unit Promotion and Tenure committee, the academic unit head, the SPH Promotion and Tenure committee, and the Dean of SPH. The applicant’s credentials are evaluated by the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, academic unit head, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the SPH Dean according to the criteria and procedures stipulated in the current academic unit and SPH Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures Manual. Committee decisions are determined by a majority vote; written dissent letters by Committee members who disagree with the majority opinion become a part of the dossier. When an academic unit head applies for promotion or tenure, review by the academic unit head is deleted from the review process.

The recommendations made at each level of review, any dissenting letters resulting from academic unit or SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee review, and responses by the candidate to any recommendation become part of the dossier and are considered at each successive level of review. All letters of recommendation should include a summary statement of the candidate's accomplishments and justification for the recommendation based on the evidence in the candidate's dossier. Letters of recommendation from promotion and tenure review committees must be signed by all members of the committee in agreement with the recommendation. Any dissent letter(s) must be signed. Every member
of the academic unit or SPH Promotion and Tenure committee must sign either the Committee's letter of recommendation or a dissent letter.

At all levels of review within SPH, candidates will receive a copy of the letters of recommendation and any dissent letters. Copies are to be sent to the candidate in the most expeditious and confidential manner possible. Candidates have the opportunity to respond in writing to any recommendations within the time frame specified in the SPH Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures Manual. Candidates have the right to withdraw their application for promotion and/or tenure following any level of review.

Between February 1 and March 15 of each year, SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee will hold an informational meeting to discuss promotion and tenure policies and procedures. Candidates and academic unit heads are encouraged to attend. The meeting is open to all members of SPH.

B. Notification of Eligibility
The academic unit head based on the time in service and rank, including years of prior credit as defined in writing and approved at the time of initial appointment, and excluding a maximum of two years interruption of service because of a leave of absence or part-time service, makes determination of faculty eligibility. It is the candidate’s option to use approved prior credit toward tenure. Faculty members are notified of their upcoming eligibility in writing by the academic unit head no later than February 1 of the academic year preceding the year in which they become eligible. Notification occurs annually as long as a faculty member remains eligible for promotion and/or tenure.

Faculty are responsible for notifying the academic unit head of intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure by March 15 with copies to the Chair of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the SPH Dean. In the case of the academic unit head that is applying for promotion and/or tenure, he/she is responsible for notifying the Dean of intent to apply at the appropriate time.

C. External Review Letters
1. The primary purpose of the external review is to assess the candidate’s scholarly achievements and prominence in the field. External reviewers must be able to provide an independent assessment and therefore may not have any personal or professional investment in the career of the candidate. Input from external evaluators will be solicited for any candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure above the level of Assistant Professor. External review letters will be sought from nationally known scholars in the candidate’s field. Reviewers should have rank equivalent to or greater than that being sought by the candidate. Each external reviewer should be from a research-extensive university outside of Georgia, should not be a recent collaborator with the candidate, and should not be currently employed by the institution that awarded the candidate’s doctorate.

2. The candidate shall submit a list containing at least five (5) names of individuals who are qualified to assess his/her work to the academic unit head. The head of the academic unit in consultation with senior faculty shall also prepare a list of at least five (5) names of individuals who are qualified to serve as external reviewers. For all candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or below, the two lists should be submitted to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. For all candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure to Professor, the two lists should be submitted to the Chair of the SPH Committee for Promotion to Professor. 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. In
special circumstances (with written justification from the department chair and with the approval of the dean), external reviewers may be used who are not affiliated with academic institutions or with academic institutions that are not research universities.

External reviewers from academic institutions must hold the rank of associate professor or professor (or the international equivalent) for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor and the rank of professor (or the international equivalent) for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor. Appropriate rank and scholarship should be the deciding factors for selecting an external reviewer.

Neither the candidate nor the academic unit head should contact any of the individuals on the lists of external reviewers concerning a possible request for an evaluation. The candidate and academic unit head should be reminded of the principles of professional ethics associated with external reviews. These principles prohibit reviews that would involve a conflict of interest.

3. The candidate and academic unit head shall provide the following information about potential reviewers:
   a. Name, academic credentials, organizational affiliation, and complete mailing address with zip code, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address at the employing institution.
   b. Title/rank
   c. Areas of expertise
   d. A one-paragraph narrative describing the individual’s qualifications to serve as an external reviewer (as specified in Section II. C. 1. above), including his/her major achievements, standing in the discipline, and nature and extent of any personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate. Additional rationale for inclusion as an external reviewer should include, if applicable:
      i. Organizational/departmental affiliation – e.g. peer institution, aspirational institution, highly ranked department (discipline)
      ii. Leading scholar/expert in the candidate’s research area and/or discipline

4. The Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor will provide the candidate list of suggested external reviewers to the academic unit head and, similarly, the academic unit head’s list of suggested external reviewers will be provided to the candidate. Either individual may notify the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor of his/her opinion of the qualifications or biases of the reviewers submitted by the other party within 5 working days of receipt of notification of external reviewers. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor may request additional external reviewer names if concerns are raised by either the candidate or the academic unit head.

5. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor may also request additional names from the candidate and academic unit head if the suggested reviewers do not appear to meet the stated criteria.

6. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor will review the lists of names and select five (5) external reviewers to be contacted from the candidate’s list and the academic unit head’s list. Two (2) alternate external reviewers, one from the candidate’s list and one from the academic unit head’s list, will also be selected and contacted in the event that one or more of the initial reviewers does not agree to be a reviewer or does not complete assessment of the candidate.
A total of five (5) letters will be secured from external reviewers from individuals whose names are on the candidate’s list and from individuals whose names are on the academic unit head’s list. Once the committee has determined the top five external reviewers and two alternate external reviewers, the committee chair will send the list to the dean for final review. The dean will have five (5) working days to approve the final list and will consult with the committee chair if questions arise about the external reviewers. Attempt will be made to obtain majority of the letters from the academic unit head’s external reviewer list. If additional reviewers are needed, the committee chair will seek additional names from the candidate and unit head. If after repeated efforts five reviewers are not found a dean may accept fewer letters (but not less than three) with a memorandum in the candidate’s dossier summarizing the steps taken to obtain reviewers and the number of people contacted from both lists.

7. The candidate will submit seven (7) packets of materials to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor for mailing to the external reviewers. The seven packets are required for the following purposes: four for the selected external reviewers, one for SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/ Committee for Promotion to Professor files, and two in the event that alternate external reviewers are contacted. Materials will include a copy of the candidate’s curriculum vita, three examples of scholarly work published or accepted for publication during the time interval under review, and, at the option of the candidate, a two page narrative statement linking accomplishments in scholarly activity to the criteria for promotion and tenure. Each packet should be placed in an unsealed, unaddressed manila envelope ready for mailing. None of the materials will be returned to the candidate.

8. The dean is responsible for communicating with the external reviewers. The dean sends the packet of materials and a standard letter (Appendix A) to each external reviewer requesting that the reviewer evaluate in writing the quality and level of the candidate’s professional development, academic and scholarly achievements, and potential for continuing scholarly contributions to her/his field. In evaluating the candidate in the area of scholarship, the review is not limited to the examples of scholarly work included in the packet. The external reviewer may address the candidate’s accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service if he/she has knowledge related to these areas. It is not necessary to make a specific recommendation regarding the candidate’s application for promotion to the rank of Assistant/Associate/ Professor and/or for tenure. The external reviewer will be asked to send the written (not faxed) evaluation, an electronic copy of the evaluation, along with his/her brief curriculum vita or bio-sketch in electronic form, to the dean of SPH.

9. All letters from the external reviewers will be treated as confidential and included in the material to be considered by the relevant committees, as well as by any individual or group subsequently involved in the review beyond the initial level. Reviewers will be notified of the Georgia open records law.

D. Academic Unit Review Process
1. Guidelines for Review: Each academic unit is expected to have a specific review process that follows the general guidelines provided in SPH Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedure Manual. Each academic unit may have more rigorous expectations for promotion and tenure, but in no case may expectations be less than those of the SPH.

2. Completion of Materials: Candidates submit their Promotion and Tenure dossier to the academic unit head. The academic unit forwards the dossier to dean who inserts the letters in the space provided in the dossier. The dean also inserts the background information about the external reviewers initially
provided as part of the potential reviewers list (as specified in Section II. C. 3). The dean then forwards the dossier to the Chair of the academic unit’s Promotion and Tenure committee. All information pertaining to and received from the external reviewers shall be treated in a confidential manner.

3. Review by Academic Unit Committee: The academic unit Promotion and Tenure committee receives the dossier, evaluates the candidate’s materials, and prepares a recommendation letter addressed to the academic unit head. The recommendation letter must be signed by all members of the unit committee who are in agreement; written dissent by unit committee members who disagree accompany the majority opinion recommendation letter and become a part of the dossier. All members of the unit level Promotion and Tenure Committee must sign either the unit committee recommendation letter or provide a dissenting letter(s). The recommendation letter should state areas of agreement and disagreement with prior evaluation(s) and respond with specific rationale for the stated opinion. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (met or not met). Any faculty member who has reviewed a candidate as member of a unit level Promotion and Tenure Committee is ineligible to serve on the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Committee for Promotion to Professor for review of that same candidate. The chair of the unit level Promotion and Tenure Committee inserts the committee's recommendation letter and dissent letter(s), if any, in the candidate's dossier and forwards the dossier to the academic unit head. At the same time, a copy of the recommendation letter and dissent letters, if any, are sent to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to the academic unit head within 5 working days of the receipt of the unit level Promotion and Tenure committee recommendation.

4. Review by Academic Unit Head: The academic unit head receives and evaluates the candidate’s dossier. If the candidate is applying for tenure, the academic unit head addresses the degree to which the candidate meets the present and probable future needs of the academic unit. The academic unit head prepares a recommendation letter addressed to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, inserts the recommendation letter in the candidate’s dossier, and forwards the dossier to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. The recommendation letter should state areas of agreement and disagreement with prior evaluation(s) and respond with specific rationale for the stated opinion. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e. met or not met) based on promotion criteria (Section III.D.1): At the same time, the academic unit head sends a copy of his/her recommendation letter to the candidate and to the unit level committee. The candidate may respond in writing to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee within 5 working days of the receipt of the academic unit head’s recommendation letter.

5. Review of Candidates to Rank of Professor: This shall consist of review and evaluation of the candidate’s dossier by the academic unit head. SPH level review of candidates to the rank of professor shall consist of review and evaluation of the candidate’s dossier by the SPH Committee for Promotion to Professor (Section II.E.3)

6. Negative Recommendation Letters: If the recommendation letter by either the unit level Promotion and Tenure committee or the academic unit head is negative, the candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure. Otherwise, the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure proceeds to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee for continued review.
E. School of Public Health Review Process

1. Review of Candidates and Recommendation by the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee: Following receipt of the candidate's dossier, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the candidate’s dossier, outside reviewer letters, other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier, and the recommendations of the unit head, and unit committee. At the completion of deliberations, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards a written recommendation letter (addressed to the Dean) and the candidate's dossier to the Dean. The Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee also sends a copy of the Committee recommendation letter to the candidate and to the academic unit head. The recommendation letter should state areas of agreement and disagreement with prior evaluation (s) and respond with specific rationale for the stated opinion. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (met, not met). No person can serve at more than one level of review. Any member of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee who disagrees with the Committee recommendation letter must submit a letter of dissent addressed to the Dean. A copy of the dissent letter shall also be provided to the candidate and to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may respond in writing to the Dean within 5 working days of the receipt of the SPH Promotion and Tenure recommendation letter. If the recommendation letter is negative, the candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure.

2. Review of Candidates and Recommendation by the Dean: The Dean reviews the candidate's dossier and accompanying external review letters, unit and SPH Promotion and Tenure committee recommendation and dissent letters, if any, with responses of the candidate to any negative recommendations, and considers all other pertinent data, such as information regarding present and probable future academic needs of the unit and SPH. The Dean then makes a recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding promotion and/or tenure. The recommendation letter should state areas of agreement and disagreement with prior evaluation (s) and respond with specific rationale for the stated opinion. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e. met, not met).

If the Dean's decision is positive, a recommendation letter for promotion and/or tenure is sent to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Dean’s recommendation letter is accompanied by the candidate's dossier, unit, and SPH Promotion and Tenure committee recommendation and dissent letters, if any, and any responses of the candidate to the recommendations. The Dean will notify the chair of the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate's academic unit head of the recommendation in writing.

If the Dean's decision is negative, a letter outlining the decision and the reasons for it will be sent simultaneously to the candidate, the chair of the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee and the candidate’s academic unit head within 10 working days of the negative decision. Candidates who are not recommended by the Dean may appeal the Dean's decision to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The appeal must be made in writing no later than 10 working days after receipt of the Dean's written decision as specified in the University Policy on Promotion, Tenure and Development for Tenure Track Faculty. Alternatively, the candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure.
If the Dean’s decision differs from the recommendations of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, a joint informational meeting of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean shall be held to discuss the differences.

3. Review of Candidates to Rank of Associate Professor and Professor: The faculty of the SPH will elect a committee to review candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure to the rank of Associate Professor and rank of Professor during the fall semester to take office the following spring semester. The committee for Associate Professor shall consist of three tenured associate professor or professors, and the committee for Promotion to Professor shall consist of three professors, elected by the general faculty, who shall serve one-year terms. Each committee shall elect a chair from among its members. The committee for Associate Professor also reviews and evaluates the credentials of faculty members who already hold the rank of Associate Professor and who are candidates only for tenure. The Committee for promotion to Professor will also perform post-tenure review of Assistant professors and Professors. With the exception of the Dean, all tenured SPH faculty members with the rank of Associate professor are eligible to serve on the committee for Associate Professor and faculty members with the rank of professor are eligible for Committee for promotion to Professor. If the candidate’s Chair is a member of the committee that Chair is ineligible to serve for the purpose of review of that candidate. If there are eligible professors (a minimum of three) at the unit level, then the candidate for promotion may be reviewed at that level. However, if the minimum is not met, there will be no unit level faculty review and the candidate will be reviewed by appropriate SPH committee for promotion. In accordance with University policy, the unit head will submit an evaluative review of the candidate.

The Committee for Promotion to Professor shall consist of four members, elected by the general faculty, who shall serve one-year terms. This committee will elect a chair from among its members. This committee is responsible for the selection and procurement of external reviewers for all candidates seeking promotion to professor as described in Section II.C. Following receipt of the candidate’s dossier, the Committee for Promotion to Professor evaluates the dossier based on the SPH P&T Policies and Procedures Handbook. At the completion of deliberations, this committee forwards a written recommendation letter and the candidate’s dossier to the Dean. The chair of the Committee for Promotion to Professor also sends a copy of the recommendation letter to the candidate, the academic unit head, and the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. The recommendation letter should state areas of agreement and disagreement with prior evaluation(s) and respond with specific rationale for the stated opinion. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e. met, not met).

Any member of the Committee for Promotion to Professor who disagrees with the Committee’s recommendation letter must submit a letter of dissent addressed to the Dean. A copy of the dissent letter shall also be provided to the candidate and to the Chair of the Committee for Promotion to Professor. The candidate may respond in writing to the Dean within 5 working days of the receipt of the Committee for Promotion to Professor’s recommendation letter. If the recommendation letter is negative, the candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application for promotion.

F. University Review Process
1. Provost’s Review: The provost will conduct an independent review of the materials forwarded by the dean and any other materials directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms, and expectations for the University, college and department, and make his/her promotion and tenure decision. The provost will consult with an Advisory Panel to the Provost on Promotion and Tenure. The panel will provide the Provost with a written recommendation (including
the reporting of minority views as expressed) on each tenure and promotion case. In cases where the recommendation of the panel is to reverse the College recommendation, the panel shall provide a justification for such a recommendation. All recommendations (concurrences or reversals) and justifications of the panel will be conveyed in a written document that accompanies the Provost’s recommendation and will be shared with the candidate and respective dean.

Members of the committee, who have had earlier involvement in a particular promotion or tenure case at unit, area committee, or College level, shall recuse themselves from discussions about the case when it reaches the University committee.

Taking the recommendation of the panel under consideration along with the other materials pertinent to the decision, the provost will make a recommendation on each case and forward it to the president, notifying the appropriate dean. Within three business days after receiving notice of the provost's recommendation, the dean shall notify the candidate of the provost's recommendation.

Before forwarding a negative recommendation to the president, the provost will consult with the dean. In response to the query from the provost, the dean may gather additional information from the candidate, the departmental chair, the department or college promotion and tenure committee, and other materials directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy. The dean will notify the candidate and department chair of his/her reply to the provost.

2. President’s Review: The president will conduct an independent review of the candidate’s curriculum vitae and statement, outside reviewer letters, recommendations, and any other material directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms, and expectations for the University, college and department, and make his/her promotion and tenure decision. Within three business days after receiving notice of the president’s decisions, the dean shall notify the candidate of the decision.

G. Appeal of SPH Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations
1. Appeals to the Provost: Appeals of negative recommendations by college deans may be made to the provost. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the college dean, the departmental chair, the departmental or college promotion and tenure committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or outside the University. The provost shall provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected, by the date specified in the calendar.

2. Appeals to the President: A candidate may appeal the provost’s negative recommendations or decision regarding his/her appeal to the president. The appeal to the president shall conform to the principles and processes stated above for appeals to the provost. The president shall provide the candidate a written decision including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate’s appeal is supported or rejected by the date specified in the calendar.

H. Promotion and Tenure Calendar and Responsibilities
These dates/deadlines for academic unit head, school committees and Dean must comply with the review schedule provided annually by the Office of the Provost. As such, the dates listed below are guidelines that may require adjustments to assure compliance with the Office of the Provost. Candidates, Department Chairs, and P&T Committees will receive notice of the actual dates/deadlines with notice of promotion and/or tenure eligibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early February</td>
<td>Academic Unit Head</td>
<td>The academic unit head notifies in writing faculty who will be eligible in the upcoming academic year by virtue of length of service for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February through Mid-March</td>
<td>SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee</td>
<td>The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee holds an informational meeting to discuss promotion and tenure procedures. Candidates and academic unit heads are encouraged to attend. The meeting is open to all faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-March</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Eligible faculty who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure respond in writing to the academic unit head with copies to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor and to the SPH Dean. The candidate also provides the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor with a list of five (5) possible external reviewers (including their qualifications and credentials) who meet the criteria set forth in Section II C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late March</td>
<td>Academic Unit Head and Candidate</td>
<td>Complete and sign “P &amp; T Face Sheet” in Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Unit Head</td>
<td>The academic unit head provides a list of five (5) possible external reviewers (including their qualifications and credentials) who meet the criteria set forth in Section II C and submits the list to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor. The Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for Promotion to Professor provides the candidate’s list of external reviewers to the academic unit head. The Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Chair of Committee for promotion to Professor provides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>the academic unit head’s list of external reviewers to the candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early April</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>The candidate notifies the Chair, SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor of any concerns regarding the list of external reviewers submitted by the academic unit head. The academic unit head notifies the Chair, SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor of any concerns regarding the list of external reviewers submitted by the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-April</td>
<td>Academic Unit Head</td>
<td>The candidate’s Academic Unit Head sends the candidate’s list of 5 external reviewers, and the Academic Unit Head’s list of 5 external reviewers to the Dean. The Dean selects the external reviewers from the list of ten reviewers provided by the candidate’s Academic Unit Head. Five external reviewers, with two alternates, will be selected from the list, with the majority of reviewers coming from the list of the Academic Unit Head. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor selects five (5) external reviewers, two (2) from the candidate’s list and two (3) from the academic unit head’s list. Two (2) alternates, one from each list, are also selected. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor contacts the selected external reviewers to ascertain their willingness to serve as reviewers. The committee chair sends list of top five external reviewers and two alternate external reviewers to the dean for approval. The candidate submits the seven (7) packets of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Role and Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Candidate</strong></td>
<td>Committee Candidate submits materials (including the CV, narrative for scholarly activity if desired, and three examples of scholarly work as specified in Section II C) to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor for forwarding to the external reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of April</strong></td>
<td>Dean and Chair of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor sends a standard letter including a request for the external reviewer’s CV or biosketch, along with the candidate’s packet of materials, to the five (5) external reviewers who agree to serve. The review should be completed for return to the Dean within 3 weeks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-May</strong></td>
<td>Dean and Chair of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor contacts reviewers who have not completed the review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-May</strong></td>
<td>Dean and Chair of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor alternate reviewers are contacted if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early June</strong></td>
<td>Dean and Chair of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor forwards external review letters and the CV’s/bio-sketch’s of the external reviewers in paper and electronic formats are due to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early June through Mid-June</strong></td>
<td>Dean and Chair of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor forwards external review letters and the CVs of external reviewers to the academic unit head for inclusion in the candidate’s dossier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-August</strong></td>
<td>Candidate submits the dossier and copies of materials (including the CV, narrative for scholarly activity if desired, and three examples of scholarly work as specified in Section II C) to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor for forwarding to the external reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>Academic Unit Head</td>
<td>The academic unit head forwards copies of the candidate’s CVs and dossier (including the external review letters) to the chair of the unit level Promotion and Tenure Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-September</td>
<td>Academic Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee</td>
<td>The academic unit level Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards their letter of recommendation and any dissenting letters, along with copies of the candidate’s CV and dossier, to the academic unit head and sends a copy of the recommendation letter to the candidate. The candidate has 5 working days after receipt of the recommendation to respond. An electronic copy of academic unit level Promotion and Tenure Committee’s letter of recommendation should be forwarded to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early October</strong></td>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
<td>The last day for the candidate to add material to his/her dossier. The academic unit head forwards his/her letter of recommendation to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair/Committee for Promotion to Professor Chair, along with copies of the candidate’s CVs and dossier, and sends a copy of the recommendation letter to the candidate. An electronic copy of the academic unit head’s letter for recommendation should be forwarded to the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor. The candidate has 5 working days after receipt of the recommendation to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Unit Head</strong></td>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
<td>A candidate who receives a negative recommendation letter(s) determines whether to withdraw the application for promotion/tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-October</strong></td>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
<td>SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor forwards its letter of recommendation to the Dean of SPH along with the candidate’s CV and dossier, and sends a copy of the recommendation letter to the candidate and the candidate’s unit head. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee adds all electronic copies of the internal and external review letters, the curriculum vita of the external reviewers, and the candidate’s curriculum vitae to the electronic file on the media securely enclosed in the front of the dossier’s three-ring binder. The candidate may respond in writing to the Dean regarding the recommendation within 5 working days of receipt of the Committee’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-November</strong></td>
<td><strong>SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late November</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td>The Dean reviews and independently evaluates the candidate’s materials. In the case of a positive recommendation, the Dean forwards the candidate’s CV and dossier, external review letters, recommendations from the academic unit...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and SPH Promotion and Tenure Committees, any dissenting letters, responses of the candidate, and any other information requested by the Provost to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the Dean’s recommendation is negative, the Dean notifies the candidate within 10 working days of the decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-December</th>
<th>Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Dean notifies the candidate, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor, and the academic unit head in writing of the recommendation made. If the Dean's decision differs from the recommendation of SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor, a joint informational meeting of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor and the Dean shall be held to discuss the differences.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Dean forwards the promotion and tenure recommendation to the Provost by the date established by the Provost’s office.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

**A. General Requirements for Promotion and/or Tenure**

1. Educational Requirement: All candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor or higher and/or tenure shall hold an earned doctoral degree. Only assistant professors, associate professors and professors are eligible for tenure. Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall not acquire tenure. The award is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments, such as adjunct appointments. Exceptions to this rule may be made in the case of members of the faculty who have served the University for a number of years and in the case of those who may qualify as having the equivalent of such degree as specified in the Statutes of Georgia State University, Article XI, Section 15.

2. Relationships between Promotion and Tenure: The granting of promotion to associate professor without tenure or tenure at the assistant professor level without promotion should occur only in discipline-specific or exceptional individual circumstances.

**B. Performance Areas**

Research, teaching and service are the primary activities and responsibilities of faculty. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in each of these three areas. Criteria for each area are shown in Appendix B. Each candidate is expected to summarize his/her accomplishments and to address how his/her accomplishments meet the expectations in each of these areas in the Comprehensive Statement of the Candidate (see Section IV C 2, 3).
1. Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Activities: Research, activities include organized inquiry undertaken to establish facts, develop principles, or illuminate or answer questions posed within a particular field or discipline. Areas of inquiry range from abstract intellectual pursuits to applied clinical investigations or interventions, using a variety of research methods. Research activities include professional development. Professional development is defined as the maintenance and enhancement of professional skills and competencies, as appropriate to the field or discipline. Evaluation of professional development consists of ongoing training and performance that contributes to the goals of the academic unit. Judgments of the quality of professional development activities are based on the candidate’s history of accomplishments and external validation of accomplishments such as certification or advanced credentialing.

Publication is the primary evidence of academic productivity. Other activities providing additional evidence of scholarly activity include but are not limited to the presentation of scholarly papers; internal and external funding; serving as a grant reviewer, on an editorial review board, or as a referee for a journal; and mentoring other faculty and students in the research process.

Candidates shall indicate which of their publications appear in peer-reviewed journals, and the quality and standing in the profession of the journals in terms of journals impact factors. In addition, candidates with multi-authored works should describe their contribution to the works. Acknowledging that methods of disseminating research are changing, when using alternative methods of sharing scholarly output, candidates are encouraged to provide assessments of the quality and standing of those alternative methods.

Evaluation of scholarly work includes significant contributions to the knowledge of the field or discipline, a history of sustained participation in scholarly activities, evidence of a program of research, an increasing leadership role in scholarly activities, and increasing prominence and recognition by professional colleagues for an area of scholarly expertise. The emphasis of evaluation is on the quality and importance of the candidate’s work. Judgments of the quality of scholarly activities are based on evaluations of the candidate’s published work, scholarly presentations, professional stature, funding and research awards, and other evidence of scholarship.

2. Teaching: Teaching is defined as any professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and skills and typically involves teaching in the university classroom. Activities include but are not limited to the supervision of student independent studies or other special projects and chairing or serving as a member on master’s thesis or project and/or doctoral dissertation committees. Teaching activities may also include the delivery of instructional workshops, training seminars, and the like to professional peers and practitioners, the mentoring of other faculty members in the teaching process, and the development and implementation of new courses, programs, instructional approaches, textbooks, and other curricular materials for both university and other students. These materials come from a variety of sources that reflect different dimensions of teaching performance.

Judgments of the quality of teaching are based on a variety of evidence, including student or other participant evaluations, examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations, teaching awards, contributions to student accomplishments, and a course or teaching portfolio. Evaluation of the quantity of teaching takes into consideration the extent of administrative responsibilities as well as the teaching history, i.e., the number of courses taught, the types of courses, the number of students, and the number of times the faculty member has offered the course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to: selected examinations.
and quizzes, students’ passing rates on licensure/certification examinations, a teaching portfolio, new course and/or program development, use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, teaching awards received, and student accomplishments.

3. **Service**: Service is defined as professional activities that enhance the University, community, and individual profession. These include community activities, service to professional organizations (e.g., design and development of professional conferences), and contributions to the mission and goals of the academic unit, the College, and the University. Activities that are related to the development of the candidate’s professional recognition, scholarship, and teaching are encouraged.

Judgments of the quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contribution and on participation at the international, national, regional, state, and local levels. It also takes into consideration chairing or serving as a member on committees and/or fulfilling administrative appointments and assignments within the academic unit, College, or University.

C. **Tenure: Criteria and Time Requirements**

1. **Tenure Criteria**: Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are normally employed full-time by Georgia State University are eligible for tenure.

2. **Time Requirements**: The following table highlights time regulations for the award of tenure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in Service for the Award of Tenure</th>
<th>At the Rank of Assistant Professor or above(^1,2)</th>
<th>Any Combination of Full-time Instructional Appointments(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum time</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in the:</td>
<td>6(^{th}) year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum time in service without award of tenure</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: (1) A maximum of three years’ credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of instructor or lecturer at the same institution. (2) Review for tenure normally occurs in the sixth year of service. In the case of highly exceptional achievement, an assistant professor or higher may be reviewed for tenure in the fifth year of service.]

Time in service must be continuous except that a maximum of two years interruption because of a leave of absence or part-time service may be permitted; provided, however, that no probationary credit for the period of an interruption shall be allowed. For candidates who were awarded years of credit towards tenure, the Promotion and Tenure committee will equate those years of credit to a specific time frame in the following manner. Any period of professional leave or educational leave that falls within the awarded years for credit will not be counted toward the total number of years awarded. For example, a candidate hired at Georgia State University in fall semester of 2003 with three years of credit toward promotion and tenure will include the following academic years in his/her promotion and/or tenure documentation: 2002-2003, 2001-2002, and 2000-2001. If a candidate has a year of sick leave, military leave, maternity leave, family leave, and/or miscellaneous leave as defined by the Board...
of Regents during that time frame, s/he will include academic year 1999-2000, as well. The SPH Promotion and Tenure committee will give heavier consideration to the candidate’s performance during his/her years of employment at Georgia State University than to earlier years of employment at previous institutions.

3. Terminal Contract: A terminal contract for a seventh year/tenth year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Board of Regents. Listed below is the timetable for terminal contracts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Contract</th>
<th>At the Rank of Assistant Professor or Above</th>
<th>Any combination of Full-Time Instructional Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th year</td>
<td>10th year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Promotion: Criteria and Time Requirements

1. Promotion Criteria: Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member’s accomplishments evaluated according to the expectations for promotion as described in Section III B. The following ratings may be used to evaluate promotion to the ranks listed below:

   a. Promotion to assistant professor
      □ Good = in teaching
      □ Good = in scholarly activity/professional development
      □ Good = in service

   b. Promotion to associate professor
      □ Very good = in teaching
      □ Very good = in scholarly activity/professional development
      □ Good = in service

   c. Promotion to professor
      □ Excellent = in teaching
      □ Excellent = in scholarly activity/professional development
      □ Very good = in service

2. Time Requirements: Normally, an assistant professor will apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor in the fifth year of service and be considered for promotion during the sixth year of service. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an assistant professor may apply for promotion in the fourth year of service and be considered for tenure during the fifth year of service. Strong justification must be provided to support consideration for promotion whenever the candidate has served fewer than four years at the rank of assistant professor at Georgia State University. Nevertheless, where national standards deviate from these norms, the dean of SPH may request a waiver from the provost on behalf of SPH. At a minimum, an associate professor is expected to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers within and outside of the University, and have a record of growth in research, teaching, and service accomplishments that demonstrates a strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory in terms of high quality and productive research, scholarship, and/or service activities. Candidates for promotion to associate professor should be establishing a national reputation.
in their field. They also must demonstrate high quality teaching and appropriate evidence of service. Normally, an associate professor will not apply for promotion to the rank of professor before the fourth year of service at the rank of associate professor and will not be considered for promotion before the fifth year of service at the rank of associate professor. An associate professor may seek early promotion if a strong justification exists for doing so. Earliest consideration in this case occurs, however, during the fourth year of service.

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

Regents’ policy indicates that "strong justification" must be provided in support of any recommendations for promotion in which the candidate has served less than these numbers of years in rank at Georgia State University.

Board of Regents Policy: The policy of the Board of Regents with respect to minimum time in rank for consideration for promotion (Section 4.03.01 of the Academic Affairs Handbook) states that the normal minimum time in rank for promotion from the rank of instructor to assistant professor is three years in residence, from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor is four years in residence, and from the rank of associate professor to professor is five years in residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of credit awarded at hire</th>
<th>Time frame reviewed for promotion and/or tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year of credit</td>
<td>One full academic year immediately preceding your employment contract at Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years of credit</td>
<td>Two full academic years immediately preceding your employment contract with Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years of credit</td>
<td>Three full academic years immediately preceding your employment contract with Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Board of Regents Timetables for Application for Promotion and Tenure

Listed below is the timetable for promotion to the various ranks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Promotion To:</th>
<th>Must Serve a Minimum Of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3 years as an instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>4 years as an assistant professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5 years as an associate professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF CANDIDATE’S PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER

A. General Guidelines

Materials submitted by candidates must be organized according to the format specified in the following sections. The dossier must be contained in ONE large three ring binder. Additionally, the candidate’s curriculum vita should be submitted in an electronic file on media securely enclosed in the front of the binder. Other required electronic files, i.e., external review letters, curriculum vitae of external reviewers, and all internal review letters (unit-level, unit head) will be added to the dossier by the Chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee/Committee for Promotion to Professor as they are submitted.

Each candidate must submit a complete curriculum vitae and a dossier that describes activities completed since arriving at Georgia State University or since the first positive committee recommendation for promotion to current rank at Georgia State University, whichever is relevant. Candidates who receive probationary credit may submit work done during the period for which such credit is given. Candidates applying for tenure only or promotion with tenure should submit material related to all work performed since joining Georgia State University as well as material related to all work performed during a period for which probationary credit was given. The complete dossier and copies of the candidate’s CV (6 copies of the CV for the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee and one for each member of the academic unit level committee) must be received by the academic unit head on August 15; the complete dossier and copies of the CV are forwarded by the academic unit head to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee by October 5. Letters of acceptance from journals and notification of publication of books as well as any other support material may be submitted up to October 5.

Up-to-date curriculum vitae, candidate evaluation from the Dean, candidate evaluation from the Department Chair, candidate evaluation from the Department P&T Committee, candidate evaluation from the College P&T Committee, the external review letters for each P&T candidate, statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of teaching performance, evidence of research/scholarly productivity including external assessment of the candidate’s work in the form of citations or book reviews where appropriate and evidence of service activities is electronically forwarded by the Dean to the Provost. When the dossier is returned to the Dean, external letters of review and all letters of recommendation are removed for filing in the Dean's office. The dossier is returned successful candidate. The dossier is retained by the University if decision is negative and the candidate is in final year.
B. Specific Instructions for Curriculum Vita

General comments on CV format
** Do not include publications submitted and/or under review; include only publications in print or in press
** Do not double list items (i.e., included in publications sections i-v)
** In general, limit professional presentations to the last 5 years
** For grants, check with business manager to make sure what you have listed is the same as what is listed in the GSU’s Office of Research and Sponsored Projects

The curriculum vita should be organized in reverse chronological order according to the following format:

Name:
Rank: Department:
Office mailing address:

I. Education (Academic degrees earned)
II. Professional credentials, certifications, and licensure
III. Research and Professional Development

a. Publications
i. Journal articles
Include journals of national circulation; each article should be identified as refereed or invited in parentheses following the citation information. Published articles are to be listed first with the word “published” preceding this group of entries. Articles accepted and in press are to be listed second with the word “accepted” preceding those entries. Provide documentation via letter or email correspondence that the work is accepted and in press.

ii. Book chapters
1. Include published book chapters
2. Include book chapters in press with documentation that the work is in press

iii. Books
1. Include published or edited works
2. Include books in press or under contract with documentation that the work is in press or under contract

iv. Monographs
1. Include published monographs
2. Include monographs in press with documentation that the work is in press

v. Proceedings and Abstracts
1. Include only refereed proceedings or abstracts that have been published
2. Include proceedings or abstracts in press with documentation that the work is in press

vi. Other significant publications (Do not include publications intended for lay public in this section; include under service.)

b. Scholarship and Professional Development
i. Grants and Funding (include source and funding for each grant)
1. External
a. For funded projects include title of project, your role (PI, Co-PI), funding source, dollar amount, dates of project
b. For projects submitted and pending review include title of project, your role, funding source, dollar amount, and date submitted
c. Other funding, including research foundations or intellectual property funding that are not included as external grants

2. Contracts/Subcontracts
   a. For contracted or subcontracted projects, include title of project, funding source, dollar amount that comes to Georgia State, and dates of project

3. Internal
   a. For funded projects include title of project, your role (PI, Co-PI), funding source, dollar amount, dates of project
   b. For submitted projects include title of project, your role, funding source, dollar amount, and date submitted

4. Grants submitted but not funded
   a. Identify research projects submitted for external funding that have not been funded to show scholarship effort; dollar amount
   b. Identify research projects submitted for internal funding that have not been funded to show scholarship effort; include title of project, your role, agency submitted to, and dollar amount

5. Other funding not captured in 1-3
   ii. Professional Presentations (limit to approximately the latest five years)
      Presented papers to Include title, date, organization, refereed or invited, podium or panel presentation, local, state, regional, national or international
      Poster presentations to include title, date, organization, refereed or invited, podium or panel presentation, local, state, regional, national or international
   iii. Editorial or Reviewer Projects (includes editor of a publication as well as reviewer for scholarly publications)
      1. Include those works published or in press, with documentation of in press status
   iv. Other Scholarship and Professional Development not captured in i-iii

IV. Professional and Honor Organization Activities (Organizational affiliations, disciplinary and/or professional)
   a. Membership
   b. Offices held (include name of organization, office title, and dates served)
   c. Committees (include name of committee and dates served)
   d. Other Professional and Honor Organization activities not captured in a-c

V. Honors, Awards, Recognitions
   a. Include name of honor, award or recognition, organization, and date of award, honor or recognition

VI. Instruction
   a. Teaching
      i. Include course name and title, semester taught, and number of students
      ii. Include guest lecturing in other courses (course number and title, lecture title, date)
      iii. Other teaching not captured in i-ii (Evidence of teaching effectiveness may
include, but is not limited to: peer evaluations, selected examinations and quizzes, students’ passing rates on licensure/certification examinations, a teaching portfolio, new course and/or program development, use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, teaching awards received, and student accomplishments.

b. Student Advisement
   i. Include dissertation, thesis or MS projects (list chaired committee first, followed by membership on committees; include student’s name, home department, title of research project and date of completion or “in progress”)
   ii. Include advisement of honors projects
   iii. Other contributions to student accomplishments (such as advisor to student for undergraduate research project)
   iv. Other student advisement not captured in i.-iii ((Examples such as student research funding directed by faculty, student awards sponsored by faculty or directed activity, student exit projects or honors project committee membership

VII. Service
   a. Administrative service (such as program director, unit head, internship director)
   b. Include service to the University System, University, College, and Academic Unit with title of committee, your role (chair or committee member) and dates of service
   c. Include service to the professional disciplines if not captured in section IV
   d. Include service to the community as related to professional discipline (such as volunteer to mentor children in juvenile justice facilities or volunteer nutritionist to non-profit organization; do not include volunteer activities in your community, such as president of home owners association or providing holidays gifts for your church or synagogue members)
   e. Publications in local newspapers, magazines, newsletters, or websites
   f. Media presentations (television, radio, webcasts)
   g. Additional significant service activities not captured in a-f

C. Specific Instructions for Dossier
   The dossier consists of three sections.
   1. The first section will eventually include letters of recommendation from the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, the academic unit head, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean and the external review letters with the CVs of the external reviewers. This section will also include any dissenting letters and responses of the candidate to any recommendations.

   2. The second section consists of materials submitted by the candidate including the CV and the candidate's comprehensive statement (described below).

   3. The third section includes documentation of scholarship and teaching effectiveness.

The candidate submits ONE three-ring binder with labeled dividers, a table of contents, a title page for each of the three sections, and completed materials for second and third sections. The first section is completed as various levels of review are completed.

The candidate is responsible for compiling the dossier and providing sufficient copies of the curriculum vitae for all members of the academic unit Promotion and Tenure committee and the College Promotion and Tenure committee. A dossier and CV that are not prepared according to the
format above will be returned to the candidate for reformatting and resubmission in 5 working days.

The dossier should specifically include the following:
1. Table of contents (including the following sections as specified below)

2. Section One (letters of recommendation and external review letters)
   a. Recommendation letter of academic unit Promotion and Tenure Committee
   b. Recommendation letter of academic unit head
   c. Recommendation letter of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee
   d. Recommendation letter of the Dean
   e. Any dissent letters
   f. Any responses of the candidate
   g. External review letters
   h. CV/biosketch’s of external reviewers

3. Section Two (materials submitted by candidate)
   a. Curriculum vitae
   b. The comprehensive narrative statement provides the candidate an opportunity to link his/her accomplishments to the criteria for promotion and tenure. Each narrative statement is to be no longer than two single spaced pages, double spaced between paragraphs.
      i. Summary and self-evaluation of teaching activities
      ii. Summary and self-evaluation of scholarly activities and professional development
      iii. Summary and self-evaluation of service activities
   c. Candidates who have been awarded years of credit towards tenure and/or promotion must include a copy of the agreement, typically issued at the time of hire. Candidates who have been granted professional or educational leave, sick leave, military leave, maternity leave, family leave, and miscellaneous leave as defined by the Board of Regents must include a copy of that documentation.

4. Section Three (documentation submitted by candidate)
   a. Copies of all journal publications or other evidence of scholarly work, with a brief notation of the candidate's contribution to the work.
   b. Documentation of teaching effectiveness including all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations, course syllabi (if a course was taught more than once, include only the most recent syllabus), and a list of teaching assignments and number of students in each course.
   c. Individual annual reports.
   d. Annual evaluations.
   e. Candidates applying for promotion only should submit materials limited to the past 5 years (documentation of teaching effectiveness, individual annual reports, and annual evaluations). If publications are numerous, then the 10 most recently published articles, 10 articles selected by the candidate from all journal publications, or other evidence of scholarly work during the previous 5 years are to be included.
V. TENURE ON APPOINTMENT AND TENURE CREDIT AT TIME OF INITIAL APPOINTMENT

A. Eligibility for Tenure on Appointment
The University can request tenure on appointment for senior distinguished faculty appointments. The Board of Regents has requested that this privilege be reserved for faculty rather than for administrative appointments.

B. Review Procedures
In recruiting a candidate for a senior position, a request is made by the head of the academic unit prior to the formulation of an offer for the Dean's permission to conduct a tenure review at time of initial appointment. If the Dean concurs that the candidate is eligible for such a review, other aspects of an offer to the candidate are first formulated and agreed to by the Dean. The tenure review is then initiated by the academic unit head, who submits the required materials to the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Committee. The review procedures contained in the Promotion and Tenure manual are to be followed as closely as possible with some exceptions as noted in this section. The candidate is reviewed within the academic unit and at the College level by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Usually, this review will only be conducted during fall or spring semesters. The time deadlines for candidates being reviewed for tenure as specified in the College Promotion and Tenure document will not apply to candidates who are being considered for tenure on appointment or for tenure credit on appointment at time of initial appointment. The materials to be reviewed will include the candidate's CV, three letters of reference from colleagues who are familiar with and address the candidate's scholarship and teaching, and five (5) recent publications that best exemplify the candidate's contributions to the discipline.

VI. PRE-TENURE AND POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

A. Pre-Tenure Review

1. Purpose
The department will conduct a pre-tenure review of each tenure-track faculty member. A formal review of the progress made toward promotion and tenure will be made after three years so that the tenure track faculty member has a clear idea of how adequately he or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure. When a faculty member is hired with one or two years of probationary credit towards tenure and promotion there shall also be a mid-course pre-tenure review. A faculty member hired with three years of probationary credit may waive pre-tenure review with written approval of the department chair and dean.

The pre-tenure review should provide an opportunity for colleagues to review accomplishments and provide assistance to the tenure track faculty member seeking tenure and promotion. Such review should complement efforts to implement mentoring programs within each department. This review is distinguished from the annual review in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments.

2. Procedures
This review will be conducted by a committee of either at least three faculty of the appropriate rank elected from the tenured faculty or all departmental faculty of appropriate rank and tenure. Normally these faculty members will be from the department; however, in small units faculty of appropriate rank from outside the department may be elected. This cumulative review should address accomplishments in research, scholarship, and creative activities; teaching; and service. It will be based on available information as articulated in the department or college guidelines: e.g., annual reports, student and
peer evaluations of teaching, curriculum vita, publications, etc.; a candidate should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the cumulative review but may prepare a short statement.

The pre-tenure evaluation conducted by the department should be reviewed and commented on by the department chair, the dean and the provost. Faculty must receive a written report of the results of this review and comments by department chair, the dean, and the provost.

The University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee shall review the university’s pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions, and submit these to the provost for final approval.

Organization of materials for pre-tenure review: Review materials shall include the faculty member’s curriculum vita, annual reports from the previous three years, selected evidence of scholarly contributions (publications, grant proposals, presentation abstracts, etc.), all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations of teaching, and any other available materials that address accomplishments in teaching, advising and serving students, scholarly activity, and service.

Materials should be organized in one three-ring binder with the following sections:

- a. Curriculum vita
- b. Annual reports
- c. Selected evidence of scholarship, (e.g., publications, grant proposals, presentation abstracts)
- d. All student and peer evaluations of teaching, including all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments
- e. Other materials addressing accomplishments
- f. Two page statement of effectiveness
- g. One page outline of five year goals

B. Post-Tenure Review

1. Purpose

All colleges will also conduct a post-tenure review of tenured faculty. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the university. Post-tenure review is one of several types of faculty performance reviews (e.g., annual, promotion, and tenure reviews) and is intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member’s career.

2. Procedure

With the exception of tenured administrators whose majority of duties is administrative, all tenured faculty will be reviewed. Each faculty member must be assessed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews will continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion or leave of absence.

The post-tenure review should focus on the faculty member’s accomplishments in research, scholarship and creative activities, teaching, and service, relating these to the stated expectations for performance developed by the institution. The faculty member being reviewed should prepare a
dossier based on available information such as annual reports, student/peer evaluations of teaching, curriculum vita, publications, etc. In addition, the faculty member should provide a statement that summarizes his/her accomplishments and effectiveness in research, scholarship, and creative activity, teaching, and service over the previous five years and outlines goals for the next five years.

Each college shall determine the details of the post-tenure review process, subject to the following considerations. The review shall involve the department chair, the dean, the provost, and at least one elected committee of tenured faculty of similar or higher rank. The initial review shall be conducted either by the department chair or by the faculty review committee. The initial reviewer will prepare a report based on the faculty member’s dossier and statement that assesses the faculty member’s accomplishments in research, scholarship, and creative activity, teaching, and service over the previous five years. The initial report will be reviewed and commented on by the department chair or the faculty review committee (whichever was not involved in the initial review) as well as by the dean and the provost. The faculty member must receive copies of the initial review as well as of all subsequent comments.

The results of post-tenure reviews must be linked to rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements. This may include merit pay increases, and study and research leave opportunities. When a faculty member has not met the standards for promotion to the rank of professor or maintained the standard for the rank of professor in his/her research, scholarly and creative activities, teaching, or service, the faculty member’s chair and/or dean and the faculty member will work together to develop a formal plan for faculty development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy.

Faculty members with tenure and who also have some combination of administrative and teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their duties are administrative in nature. At such time when a faculty/administrator returns full-time to the faculty, she/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under those guidelines as a faculty member in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five-year intervals.

The University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee shall review the university’s post-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions, and submit these to the provost for final approval.

**Organization of materials for post-tenure review:** Review materials shall include the faculty member’s curriculum vita, annual reports, publications, all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations of teaching, and any other available materials that address accomplishments in teaching, advising and serving students, scholarly activity, and service.

A two-page statement of effectiveness in teaching, research, and service over the previous five years and a third page outlining projected five-year goals are also required.

Materials should be organized in one three-ring binder with the following sections:

a. Curriculum vita
b. Annual reports
c. Publications

d. All student and peer evaluations of teaching, including all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments

e. Other materials addressing accomplishments

f. Two page statement of effectiveness

g. One page outline of five year goals

C. Timetable for Pre- and Post-Tenure Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By September 30</th>
<th>The Dean’s Office notifies the faculty member in writing of his/her review during the upcoming Spring semester and sends a copy of the letter to the academic unit head.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By October 30</td>
<td>The academic unit head initiates the nomination/election process of the unit to establish Pre-Tenure Review Committee for involved faculty and notifies faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 10</td>
<td>The faculty member submits one copy of materials to the chair of his/her Pre-Tenure Review Committee. The faculty member submits one copy of materials to the chair of the College P&amp;T Committee for Post-Tenure Review. Full professors should submit one copy of materials to the chair of the Committee for Promotion to Professor for Post- Tenure Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before March 1</td>
<td>The Review Committees review materials and comment upon the faculty member’s achievements and progress toward meeting his/her established goals (including promotion, if applicable). The Review Committees provide a written report to the faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before March 15</td>
<td>The Review Committees meet to discuss the written report with the faculty member. The Review Committees and the faculty member may add any additional information that results from that meeting in an addendum to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By March 15</td>
<td>The faculty member’s Review Committee forwards the written report, including any addenda, to the unit head of the faculty member reviewed and to the faculty member. The materials submitted by the faculty member are forwarded with the written report to the academic unit head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. April 1</td>
<td>The academic unit head reviews the materials and forwards the materials submitted by the faculty member, the written report of the Review Committee, and any addenda to the Dean of SPH within 10 working days of receipt of the materials. A copy of the academic unit head’s report will be sent to the faculty member being reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. April 15</td>
<td>The Dean of SPH reviews the materials, comments on the materials, and forwards the materials submitted by the faculty member, the written report, and any addenda to the Provost within 10 working days (when possible) of receipt of the materials. A copy of the Dean's report will be sent to the faculty member being reviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Dr. NAME:

Thank you so much for agreeing to review the enclosed materials for Dr. CANDIDATE’S application for promotion to the rank of Assistant/Associate/Full Professor and tenure (note: delete tenure for candidates to full professor) in the Department/School of NAME, School of Public Health, at Georgia State University. The materials include Dr. CANDIDATE’S CV and examples of her/his scholarly work. In addition, I have enclosed the College’s criteria for promotion and tenure.

Please review and evaluate the quality and level of Dr. CANDIDATE’S professional development, academic and scholarly achievements, and potential for continuing scholarly contributions to her/his field. In evaluating Dr. CANDIDATE in the area of scholarship, your review is not limited to the examples of scholarly work included in the packet. They are provided for your convenience. You are also welcome to address Dr. CANDIDATE’s accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service if you have knowledge related to these areas. It is not necessary to make a specific recommendation regarding Dr. CANDIDATE’s application for promotion to the rank of Assistant/Associate/Full Professor and/or for tenure.

Please send your written letter of evaluation to me by June 1, YEAR. It is important that an electronic copy as well as a hard copy of your letter of evaluation be submitted. Please include a copy of your curriculum vita or biosketch with the candidate’s letter of evaluation. Your letter will be reviewed by members of the school/department, college, and university who are involved in the promotion and tenure process. Dr. CANDIDATE may also obtain permission, through the Georgia Open Records law, to review your letter of evaluation.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at CHAIR ADDRESS, TELEPHONE NUMBER, and E-MAIL ADDRESS

Again, we greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in the external review process for Dr. CANDIDATE. Sincerely,

CHAIR NAME
Dean,
School of Public Health

Enclosures
APPENDIX B

Table: Ratings Required for Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C
Criteria by Rating Category for Promotion in the Area of Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The category of fair is reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the criteria for good performance</td>
<td>The candidate is a competent scholar who regularly publishes scholarly perspectives and research findings; has published a sufficient number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of good quality (peer-reviewed work will be given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed work and both the quality and quantity of publications will be assessed)</td>
<td>The candidate is a highly competent scholar who regularly publishes scholarly perspectives and research findings; has published a significant number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of very good quality (peer-reviewed work will be given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed work and both the quality and quantity of publications will be assessed)</td>
<td>The candidate is a superb scholar who regularly publishes scholarly perspectives and research findings; has published a large number of important and influential refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality (peer-reviewed work will be given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed work and both the quality and quantity of publications will be assessed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks internal funding for support of scholarship</td>
<td>Obtains intramural funding and seeks external funding for support of scholarship</td>
<td>Establishes a focused program of research</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the beginnings of a program of research</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 4 of the following 6 activities:</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 5 of the following 8 activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows evidence of 2 of the following 4 activities:</td>
<td>Collaborates with faculty colleagues and students to address common research interests and clinical problems</td>
<td>Is recognized at the regional level for an area of scholarly expertise</td>
<td>Provides leadership in research endeavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is recognized at the local and/or state levels for an area of scholarly expertise</td>
<td>Serves as a grant reviewer, as referee for a scholarly journal, or in any type of editorial capacity</td>
<td>Regularly makes scholarly presentations at national and international professional meetings</td>
<td>Provides guidance and assistance to faculty colleagues and students related to research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes scholarly presentations at local and/or state professional meetings</td>
<td>Regularly makes scholarly presentations at state, regional, and national professional meetings</td>
<td>Obtains awards for research/scholarly activities</td>
<td>Is recognized nationally for an area of scholarly expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively maintains and enhances technical/scientific/clinical competence as appropriate OR receives professional certification and/or advanced credentialing</td>
<td>Actively maintains and enhances technical/scientific/clinical competence as appropriate OR receives professional certification and/or advanced credentialing</td>
<td>Actively maintains and enhances technical/scientific/clinical competence as appropriate OR receives professional certification and/or advanced credentialing</td>
<td>Regularly makes scholarly presentations at national and international professional meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops models that are effective in addressing policy issues OR provides professional consultation resulting in significant scholarly outcomes OR develops and evaluates policy innovations that benefit communities</td>
<td>Develops models that are effective in addressing policy issues OR provides professional consultation resulting in significant scholarly outcomes OR develops and evaluates policy innovations that benefit communities</td>
<td>Develops models that are effective in addressing policy issues OR provides professional consultation resulting in significant scholarly outcomes OR develops and evaluates policy innovations that benefit communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### APPENDIX D
Criteria by Rating Category for Promotion in the Area of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The category of fair is reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the criteria for good performance</td>
<td>Achieves good teaching effectiveness ratings from students and/or has evidence of teaching effectiveness validated through a peer-review process as appropriate</td>
<td>Achieves very good teaching effectiveness ratings from students and/or has evidence of teaching effectiveness validated through a peer-review process as appropriate</td>
<td>Achieves excellent teaching effectiveness ratings from students or has evidence of teaching effectiveness validated through a peer-review process as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 3 of the following 4 activities: Plans and organizes the learning experiences for existing courses</td>
<td>Shows evidence of 5 of the following 7 activities: Plans and organizes the learning experiences for existing courses</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops effective curriculum materials and/or delivery approaches</td>
<td>Develops effective curriculum materials and/or delivery approaches</td>
<td>Develops innovative, effective curriculum materials and/or delivery approaches</td>
<td>Provides leadership in the development of new courses, programs, and instructional materials, especially at the graduate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in the development of new courses/programs</td>
<td>Participates in curriculum development and develops new courses</td>
<td>Develops and implements seminars/workshops for professional peers and practitioners</td>
<td>Develops and implements seminars/workshops for professional peers and practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides advisement to students including special projects/independent studies</td>
<td>Provides academic and research advisement to students</td>
<td>Provides guidance and mentoring in the teaching process to other faculty members</td>
<td>Provides guidance and mentoring in the teaching process to other faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervises students for independent studies or special projects</td>
<td>Contributes to student accomplishments in the form of student awards/scholarships, grants, and professional presentations and publications</td>
<td>Contributes to student accomplishments in the form of student awards/scholarships, grants, and professional presentations and publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serves as committee member on thesis, masters project, and/or doctoral dissertation committees</td>
<td>Chairs thesis, masters project, and/or doctoral dissertation committees</td>
<td>Chairs thesis, masters project, and/or doctoral dissertation committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receives teaching awards</td>
<td>Receives teaching awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publishes teaching/instructional materials</td>
<td>Publishes teaching/instructional materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E
Criteria by Rating Category for Promotion in the Area of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The category of fair is reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the criteria for good performance.</td>
<td>Serves as an elected and/or appointed member of a committee and/or fulfills assignments within the academic unit and college.</td>
<td>Serves as an elected or appointed member of committees and/or fulfills administrative appointments and assignments within the academic unit and college.</td>
<td>Provides leadership on committees and/or fulfills administrative appointments and assignments within the academic unit, college, or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serves on committees and in leadership positions in: professional organizations at the local level OR community agencies at the local level.</td>
<td>Serves on committees and assumes leadership roles in: professional organizations at the local and state levels OR community agencies and organizations at the local and state levels.</td>
<td>Serves an increasing leadership role: in professional organizations at the national and international level OR serves in positions of leadership in community agencies and organizations at the national and international level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

P & T Application Face Sheet

Part A: (To be completed and signed by unity head and candidate. Please indicate the month, day, and year for each required date)

Date of employment (full-time, tenure track) from: __________ to: __________

Date of employment (full-time, non-tenure track) from: __________ to: __________

Date of first approved leave of absence from: __________ to: __________

Date of second approved leave of absence from: __________ to: __________

Date of third approved leave of absence from: __________ to: __________

Years of prior credit granted: __________

Earliest possible year eligible for initiation of promotion review procedures: __________

Earliest possible year eligible for initiation of tenure review procedures: __________

Candidate’s Signature

Chair’s Signature

Part B: Summary of Review Actions: (please check appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Level P &amp; T Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPH P &amp; T Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>