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1. INTRODUCTION TO PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion and tenure decisions are extremely important to the life of the academic 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 (Section 8.3.7; http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/). Each school/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 (GSU Promotion and Tenure Manual; https://faculty.gsu.edu/ptr/) as they apply to that school/college. This document serves that purpose. Any changes to the Board of Regents and/or Georgia State University Policy that counter information in this document will supersede the content herein.

The school/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, school/college, and department levels. Faculty will be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the school and department criteria in effect at the time the candidate notifies the department chair of intent to apply.

Excellence in scholarship, 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 scholarship, 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.

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 scholarship, 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 and school criteria and professional standards for conduct in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. In each of the three areas, the candidate will be evaluated as either having met or having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure. It is necessary to meet the standards in all three areas for promotion and/or tenure.

2. **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

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

2.1.1. **Educational Requirement**

All candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor or higher and/or tenure shall hold an earned doctoral degree. Faculty with non-tenure track appointments are not eligible for tenure. The award of tenure 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.

2.1.2. **Relationship Between Promotion and Tenure**

It is customary for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor to be considered concurrently. As such, the criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor are the same. The criteria for being granted tenure are the same regardless of whether the candidate is an assistant professor who is applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor or the candidate was hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure and is applying for tenure without promotion. For a candidate who has hired at the rank of professor without tenure, the criteria for the award of tenure are the same as for those at the rank of associate professor with tenure applying for promotion to the rank of professor with tenure. For an associate professor without tenure who is applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of professor, meeting the criteria for promotion to professor automatically satisfies the tenure criteria; however, it is possible such a candidate may meet the criteria for tenure but not for promotion to professor. Thus, for those at the rank of associate professor without tenure, award of tenure and promotion to the rank of professor may be considered separately.

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 on appointment. See section 3.5, Tenure on Appointment. Each such recommendation shall be granted only in cases in which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an associate professor 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.
2.2. Eligibility and Timing

2.2.1. Eligibility for Tenure

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors with full time status who are normally employed full-time by Georgia State University are eligible for tenure. The department chair identifies faculty who are eligible for promotion and or tenure, based on the time in service and rank, years of prior credit awarded at the time of initial appointment, and tenure/promotion clock stoppages.

2.2.2. Time in Service for the Award of Tenure

The review for tenure normally occurs in the sixth year of service, with candidates declaring their intent to apply for tenure in the Spring semester of their fifth year of service. The minimum time in service for being awarded tenure is five continuous years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher, and the maximum time in service without award of tenure is seven years. In the case of highly exceptional achievement, an assistant professor or higher may be reviewed for tenure in the fifth year of service, but there must be a strong justification for doing so.

2.2.3. Probationary Credit for Tenure

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. Such credit for prior service shall be approved in writing by the president at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher. For candidates who are awarded probationary credit, the appropriate number of years immediately preceding their appointment at GSU will be included in their tenure review. For example, a candidate hired in the 2014-15 academic year with two years of probationary credit, will include 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 in their period of review. (However, if the candidate was on leave during either of those years, the 2011-2012 year would be included.)

A candidate for promotion and tenure may relinquish some or all probationary credit received, with notification to the department chair. When a candidate with probationary credit is first eligible for consideration for promotion and tenure, the candidate must notify the department chair if they will keep or relinquish some or all of the awarded credit. This notice will be provided to the department chair at the beginning of that year’s promotion and tenure cycle at the time the candidate informs the department chair whether they would like to be considered for tenure.

2.2.4. Tenure/Promotion Clock Stoppage

A suspension of the probationary period for tenure/promotion or interruption of continuous time in service is also referred to as a tenure “clock stoppage.” A maximum of two years’ clock stoppage may be granted because of an FMLA leave of absence based on birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member. Such a clock stoppage must be approved by the president, separate from the approval for the FMLA leave of absence itself. Once a clock stoppage is taken for whatever reason, it cannot be waived at a later point in time. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period,
the maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or higher without the award of tenure shall be seven years.

2.2.5. Time in Service for Promotion

Typically, an assistant professor will apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor in the fifth year of service at the rank of assistant professor 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 during the fifth year of service, but there must be strong justification for doing so.

Typically, an associate professor will apply for promotion to the rank of professor in the fifth year of service at the rank of associate professor and be considered during the sixth year of service. An associate professor may seek early promotion if a strong justification exists for doing so, but the earliest consideration would be during the fourth year of service.

Regents’ policy indicates that a strong justification is needed 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. The policy of the Board of Regents with respect to minimum time in rank for consideration for promotion (Section 4.5 of the Academic Affairs Handbook, https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C689) 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.

2.3. Performance Areas

Scholarship, 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 the Appendices. Each candidate is expected to summarize their accomplishments and to address how their accomplishments meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure in their statements included in the dossier.

2.3.1. Scholarship

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

Evaluation of scholarship 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.

Scholarly activities also include professional development, 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 department and school. 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.

2.3.2. Teaching

Teaching is defined as any professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and skills and typically involves teaching in the university classroom. Other 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, the reimagining and updating of existing courses, 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 and trainee accomplishments.

2.3.3. Service

Service is defined as professional activities that enhance the department, school, 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 department, school, and 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 department, school, or University.

2.4. Promotion Criteria

Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member’s accomplishments evaluated according to the expectations for promotion as described here in the Appendices. At a minimum, a candidate applying for promotion to associate professor is expected to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of their 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 scholarship, teaching, and service activities. Candidates for promotion to associate professor should be establishing a national reputation for scholarship in their field. They also must demonstrate high quality teaching and appropriate evidence of service.

Promotion to the rank of professor is based on scholarship, 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 their field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive scholarship, research, and/or creative activities. The faculty member must demonstrate high quality teaching and provide significant service to the University and professional communities.

Based on the criteria rubrics described in the Appendices, candidates must achieve the following ratings to have met the criteria for promotion to the ranks listed below.

For promotion to Associate Professor:
- “Very good” in teaching
- “Very good” in scholarship
- “Good” in service

For promotion to Professor:
- “Excellent” in teaching
- “Excellent” in scholarship
- “Very good” in service

2.5. 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.

In recruiting a candidate for a senior position, a request is made by the department chair 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 department chair, who submits the required materials to the departmental 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 by the departmental and school Promotion and Tenure Committees.

The time deadlines for candidates being reviewed for tenure as specified in the school 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 C.V., three letters of reference from colleagues who are familiar with and address the candidate's scholarship and teaching, and five recent publications that best exemplify the candidate's contributions to the discipline.

3. **MATERIALS: EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL DOSSIERS**

3.1. **External Dossier: Candidate Materials for External Review**

The candidate will prepare a set of materials to be sent to each of the external reviewers. These materials are different from the internal dossier and should be provided electronically to the department chair. The materials will include: (1) a copy of the candidate’s curriculum vitae (described below), (2) three examples of scholarly work published or accepted for publication during the time interval under review, and (3) a narrative statement linking accomplishments in scholarly activity to the criteria for promotion and tenure that is single spaced and not more than four pages.

3.2. **Internal Dossier: Candidate Materials for Internal Review**

Candidates will prepare a series of documents that comprise the electronic dossier. The dossier should emphasize activities during the full period of the candidate’s (credited) time in service at their current rank at Georgia State University.

External review letters, candidate materials for external reviewer, and recommendation and dissenting letters from the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, department chair, SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, along with candidate responses will be added to the dossier. The documents that candidates should prepare consist of primary documents and supporting documents. Primary documents include: (1) annual evaluations by the department chair (or academic unit head); (2) curriculum vitae; (3) statement of scholarship; (4) statement of teaching activities and effectiveness; and (5) statement of service activities.

3.2.1. **Primary Documents for Dossier**

(1) **Annual Evaluations**

- The candidate should assemble all annual evaluations for the evaluation period into a single PDF.

(2) **Curriculum Vitae**

- There is no specific format required for the curriculum vitae
- The following sections are common
  - Candidate information
  - Education and work history: degrees, professional credential, certifications, licenses
o Publications: journal articles, book chapters, books, other publications, monographs; candidates may indicate student/trainee authors
o Grants and funding: external grants, internal grants, other funding; candidates may list awarded grants, not-awarded grants, and pending grants
o Presentations: generally, limit to last five years.
o Professional development: memberships in professional organizations, offices held and dates served, journal editor or editorial board; grant reviewer
o Awards, honors, and recognitions
o Instruction: courses taught, title, semester; guest lectures
o Student advising: graduate students mentored, Thesis and Dissertations committees and roles; undergraduate honors projects
o Service: Formal administrative duties in department, school, or University; department, school, and University committees chaired and served, external service to the profession, service to the community.
o Media contributions: television, radio, newspapers, magazine, etc.

(3) Statement of Scholarship
- Statements should be no more than five single-spaced pages.
- Candidates should describe their scholarly endeavors and provide an overall focus of their work.
- Candidates should link scholarly activities to the criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Candidates should describe the contribution and impact of their most important peer-reviewed publications.
- Candidates should describe efforts and successes in securing external and internal grant funds to conduct research.
- Candidates should describe other scholarly activities that demonstrate their reputation in the field including, but not limited to, invited conference presentations, serving on grant review panels, serving as a reviewer for scientific journals, editorial work for journal or books, awards for scholarly achievements, etc.

(4) Statement of Teaching Activities and Effectiveness
- Statements should be no more than three single-spaced pages.
- Candidates should write a statement that describes their effectiveness in teaching activities.
- Candidates may wish to describe courses taught, courses developed, summarize teaching evaluations, and highlight qualitative feedback given by students.
- Candidates may highlight other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as: mentorship of students, supervision of Thesis and Dissertation projects, innovative methods used in for classroom instruction, participation in curriculum design and revision, and any awards or nominations received for teaching effectiveness.

(5) Statement of Service Activities
- Statement should be no more than two single-spaced pages.
- Candidates should describe service activities for department, school, and University such as departmental or SPH committees (faculty affairs, student affairs, academic affairs, admissions, hiring committees), and University services roles such as faculty senate.
• Candidates should describe community and professional service roles such as partnerships with local community-based or governmental agencies, membership or leadership in professional organizations, and other forms of service.

3.2.2. Supporting Documents for Dossier

Several supporting documents should be prepared that support the primary documents. The supporting documents are as follows (examples of supporting documents are available from department chairs):

(1) Copies of all teaching evaluations
   • Combine all teaching evaluations chronologically into a single PDF.

(2) Summary of courses taught and course evaluations
   • Summarize courses taught, number of students, and evaluations in a tabular, easy-to-read format. Provide summary of representative qualitative comments from students.

(3) Syllabi, and examples of homework and exams (optional)
   • Provide examples of syllabi, assignments, or exams to the extent to which those things demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

(4) Ten (10) significant peer-review publications
   • Provide PDFs of up to ten most significant publications within the evaluation period. These works should best represent the candidate’s scholarly contribution during the evaluation period and are often the most heavily referenced.

(5) Significant publication summary page
   • Candidates should create a summary of the significant peer review publications in a table format. For each of the significant publications, the candidate should create a short summary documenting
     o Their role (lead author, co-author, mentor of student) and contribution to each (e.g., study design, conceptualizing the research questions, data analyses, drafting the manuscript, editing the manuscript, supervising student work).
     o The impact of each publication, which may include journal impact factor, number of citations, media coverage, awards for specific publications, or other indices of impact.

(6) Memo describing updates to curriculum vitae since it was sent to external reviewers (if applicable)
   • It is not uncommon for the candidate to have professional achievements in the time between when materials were prepared for external reviewers and when materials are compiled for departmental and school review (e.g., manuscript accepted for publications, grant notice of award received, professional presentation made, etc.). The candidate may update their curriculum vitae but any modifications should be clearly documented in an accompanying memo.

(7) Credit toward tenure; Promotion/tenure clock stoppage
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 promotion/tenure clock stoppage must include a copy of corresponding documentation granting the clock stoppage request.

4. REVIEW PROCEDURES

4.1. Timeline and Responsibilities

The table below lists dates, responsible parties, and actions in the Promotion and Tenure review process. Candidate responsibilities are highlighted in blue. These deadlines are meant to comply with the review schedule provided annually by the Office of the Provost. If the provost’s schedule changes, the dates listed below may require adjustments to assure compliance. Candidates, department chairs, and Promotion and Tenure Committees will receive notice if the due dates listed below are changed for a given cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>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>March 1</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Research</td>
<td>Holds an informational meeting to discuss promotion and tenure procedures. The meeting is open to all faculty members. Candidates and department chairs are encouraged to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Notifies department chair in writing of intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure. Department chair notifies the dean and chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committees of the candidate’s intent. Assembles the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Provides the department chair with a list of five possible external reviewers, including their qualifications and credentials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Provides a list of five possible external reviewers, including their qualifications and credentials to the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. Also provides the candidate’s list of five possible external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee</td>
<td>Provide the candidate’s list of external reviewers to the department chair, and the department chair’s list of external reviewers to the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Notifies the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee of any concerns regarding the list of external reviewers submitted by the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Notifies the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee of any concerns regarding the list of external reviewers submitted by the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee</td>
<td>Identifies five recommended external reviewers, including at least two from the candidate’s list and two from the department chair’s list, along with two alternates, one from each list. Sends lists along with recommendations to the dean for review and selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Selects external reviewers and contacts them to ascertain their willingness to serve as external reviewers for the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Submits external dossier materials electronically to the dean and department chair to be sent to the external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>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 external reviewers who agree to serve. Reviews should be completed and returned to the dean within six weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Adds external letters and CVs/biosketches of external reviewers forwarded by the dean to the electronic dossier, along with the candidate’s material sent to the external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Contacts reviewers who have not completed the review and contacts alternate reviewers if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 15</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Submits internal dossier materials electronically to the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Adds final external letters and CVs of external reviewers, forwarded by the dean, to the electronic dossier. Forwards dossier to the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and notifies chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 7</td>
<td>Departmental P&amp;T</td>
<td>Completes review including letter of recommendation and any dissenting letters. Sends letters to the department chair for inclusion in the electronic dossier. Makes letter available to the candidate. Reports from the departmental committee, as well as minority reports, sent to the candidate may remove the signature page or section which identifies committee members by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>May respond in writing to the department chair within five working days of receipt of the recommendation letter from the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. If receiving a negative recommendation letter, may choose to withdraw the application for promotion/tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Completes review and adds letter of recommendation to the electronic dossier. Sends recommendation letter to the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee and makes recommendation letter available to the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>May respond in writing to the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee within five working days of receipt of the department chair recommendation letter. If receiving a negative recommendation letter, may choose to withdraw the application for promotion/tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 21</td>
<td>SPH P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Completes review including letter of recommendation and any dissenting letters. Sends letters to the dean for review and the department chair for inclusion in the electronic dossier. Makes recommendation letter available to the candidate. Reports from the school committee, as well as minority reports, sent to the candidate may remove the signature page or section which identifies committee members by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>May respond in writing to the dean recommendation within five working days of receipt of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee letter. If receiving a negative recommendation letter, may choose to withdraw the application for promotion/tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Reviews and independently evaluates the candidate’s materials. Makes recommendation letter available to the department chair, SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate. If a positive recommendation is made, the dean forwards the recommendation, all materials, and any other information requested to the provost by the date established by the Office of the Provost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate

If receiving a negative recommendation letter, may choose to withdraw the application for promotion/tenure.

If receiving a negative recommendation letter, may choose to appeal to the provost in writing within 10 working days of receipt of the dean’s letter.

| Spring semester | Provost and president | Candidate’s dossier is reviewed at the University level by Provost and President. |

4.2. Notification of Eligibility and Intent to Apply

Faculty members are notified of their upcoming eligibility for tenure and/or promotion in writing by the department chair no later than February 1st 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 department chair of their intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure by March 15th, and the department chair will notify the appropriate committees and the dean. In the case of a department chair applying for promotion and/or tenure, the dean will notify the department chair of their eligibility; the department chair is responsible for notifying the dean of their intent to apply, and the dean will notify the appropriate committees.

4.3. External Review Procedures

4.3.1. Criteria for External Reviewers

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 tenure at their institution and hold a rank equivalent to or greater than that being sought by the candidate. Each external reviewer should be from a research-intensive university, and should not be a recent collaborator with the candidate.

The external reviewers from academic institutions should 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 tenured associate professor or professor (or the international equivalent) for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor and must hold the rank of tenured 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.

The candidate should not contact any of the individuals on the lists of external reviewers concerning a possible request for an evaluation. The candidate should be reminded of the principles of professional ethics associated with external reviews. These principles prohibit reviews that would involve a conflict of interest.

4.3.2. Selection of External Reviewers

The candidate and department chair will each submit the names of five potential external reviewers to the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee by March 31st. The department chair may consult with the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee or other senior faculty in selecting names of potential reviewers to ensure reviewers have sufficient expertise in the candidate’s area of study.

For each potential reviewer, the following information should be provided:

- Name, academic credentials, institution, and complete mailing address with zip code, telephone number, and e-mail address.
- Title/rank, and areas of expertise.
- A brief narrative describing the individual’s qualifications to serve as an external reviewer (as specified above), including their major achievements, standing in the discipline, and the nature and extent of any personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate.

Any additional rationale for inclusion as an external reviewer; for example,

- Organizational/departmental affiliation – e.g. whether the institutions is a peer institution, aspirational institution, or a highly ranked department within a discipline.
- If the reviewer is a leading scholar/expert in the candidate’s research area and/or discipline.

The chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide the candidate’s list of reviewers to the department chair and the department chair’s list of reviewers to the candidate. Either individual may notify the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee of their opinion of the qualifications or biases of the reviewers submitted by the other party within five working days of receipt of notification of external reviewers. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee may request additional external reviewer names if concerns are raised by either the candidate or the department chair. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee may also request additional names from the candidate and department chair if the suggested reviewers do not appear to meet the stated criteria or if there are duplicate names across the two lists.

The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee will determine at least five recommended external reviewers to be contacted along with at least two recommended alternate external reviewers to be 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. At least two of the recommended external reviewers must come from the candidate’s list and at least two must come from the department chair’s list. At least one recommended alternate must come from each list.
Once the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee has decided on their set of recommended external reviewers and alternates, the committee chair will send both lists of five external reviewers along with their recommendations to the dean for final review and selection. The dean will have five working days to complete the selection of external reviewers and will consult with the committee chair if questions arise about the external reviewers. If additional reviewers are needed, the committee chair, at the request of the dean, will seek additional names from the candidate and department chair. If, after repeated efforts, five reviewers are not found, the dean may accept fewer than five 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.

4.3.3. Submission of External Dossier

Candidates must submit to the dean and department chair their complete external dossier to be sent to external reviewers by May 31st. There is no opportunity to revise or update the external dossier materials sent to external reviewers after submission on May 31st.

4.3.4. Communication With External Reviewers

The dean is responsible for communicating with the external reviewers. The dean sends a standard letter to each external reviewer and the materials prepared by the candidate for external review (departmental coordinators will assist with the logistics, tracking, and follow-up with external reviewers). The letter requests that the reviewer evaluate in writing the quality and level of the candidate’s professional development, academic and scholarly achievements (and only scholarship; not teaching or service), and potential for continuing scholarly contributions to their 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 will be asked to send an electronic copy of the written evaluation, along with their brief curriculum vitae or bio-sketch in electronic form, to the dean.

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. As recommendation letters are written and submitted, they will be added to the electronic dossier.

4.4. Submission of Internal Dossier

Candidates must submit complete internal dossier materials to the department chair by August 15th. Candidates with major accomplishments (e.g., new federal grant, high impact publication) after August 15th can add updated materials to their internal dossier up to September 15th. After September 15th, candidates may submit a written request to the department chair to allow updated materials be added to their dossier for consideration in reviews not yet completed, up to the dean’s review. Committees that have completed their review will not re-review the dossier in light of new materials. If updates are made to the dossier after September 15th, a memo should be included documenting the additions. If there are additional achievements which occur after the dean’s review that the candidate believes are significant enough to warrant inclusion for the provost and president’s review, the candidate may submit a written request to the dean to allow a dossier modification.
4.5. Departmental Review Procedures

4.5.1. Formation and Composition of Departmental Committee

The department chair will assemble a committee to act as the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or Committee for Promotion to Professor for each candidate. The departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will consist of three tenured associate professor or professors, and the Committee for Promotion to Professor shall consist of three tenured professors. Each committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

4.5.2. Process of Submitting Materials

Candidates submit internal dossier with supporting materials electronically for promotion and tenure to the department chair, who assembles an electronic dossier, which is shared with departmental and SPH Promotion and Tenure Committees and the dean. The department chair will add the external review letters forwarded by the dean to the electronic dossier when received, along with background information provided by the external reviewers. All information pertaining to and received from the external reviewers shall be treated in a confidential manner.

4.5.3. Review by Departmental Committee

The departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews and evaluates the dossier and accompanying external review letters and prepares a recommendation letter addressed to the department chair. The recommendation letter must be signed by all members of the departmental committee who are in agreement with the recommendations; committee members who disagree with the recommendation of the majority must write and sign a dissenting letter that also becomes part of the dossier. Each member of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee must either sign the majority letter or provide a dissenting letter. 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 (see Appendices) on which the recommendation is based for scholarship, teaching, and service (i.e., met or not met).

The chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee provides a signed electronic copy of the committee's recommendation letter and any dissent letters to the department chair, which are then added to the electronic dossier. A copy of the recommendation letter and any dissent letters are sent to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to the department chair within five working days of the receipt of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation, and the response is added to the dossier. The response is an opportunity for the faculty member to provide clarifications and corrections to the reports.

If the recommendation letter by departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee is negative, the candidate may exercise their 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 department chair for continued review.
4.5.4. Review by Department Chair

The department chair reviews and evaluates the candidate’s dossier and accompanying external review letters; departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee’s recommendation and dissent letters, if any; and responses of the candidate to any negative recommendations. The department chair prepares a recommendation letter addressed to 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 (see Appendices) on which the recommendation is based for scholarship, teaching, and service (i.e., met or not met).

The department chair provides a signed electronic copy of their recommendation letter to the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, which is then added to the electronic dossier. A copy of the recommendation letter is sent to the candidate and the departmental committee. The candidate may respond in writing to the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee within five working days of the receipt of the departmental chair recommendation letter, and the response is added to the dossier. The response is an opportunity for the faculty member to provide clarifications and corrections to the reports.

If the recommendation letter is negative, the candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application. Otherwise, the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure proceeds to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee for continued review.

4.6. School of Public Health Review Process

4.6.1. Formation and Composition of Committee

The faculty of the SPH will elect a standing committee to review candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of three tenured professors, elected by the general faculty, who shall serve three-year terms. Rotation of the three members off of the SPH committee will be staggered so that each year, one member rotates off of the committee and one new member is elected.

With the exception of the dean and department chairs, all tenured SPH faculty members with the rank of professor are eligible to serve on the committee. The committee shall elect a chair from among its members. No person can serve at more than one level of review (i.e., members of the departmental committee cannot serve on the school committee).

4.6.2. Review by the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee

The SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews and evaluates the candidate's dossier and accompanying external review letters; departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee’s recommendations and dissent letters, if any; department chair recommendation letter; and responses of the candidate to any negative recommendations. At the completion of deliberations, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee prepares a written recommendation letter addressed to the dean. 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 whether the criteria were met or not met for each of scholarship, teaching, and service. Any member of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee
who disagrees with the majority committee recommendation letter must submit a letter of dissent addressed to the dean. The letter should indicate where there are areas and reasons for disagreement. Each member of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee must either sign the majority letter or provide a dissenting letter.

The chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee provides a signed electronic copy of the committee's recommendation letter and any dissent letters to the dean, which are then added to the electronic dossier. A copy of the recommendation letter and any dissent letters are sent to the candidate and the department chair. The candidate may respond in writing to the dean within five working days of the receipt of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation, and the response is added to the dossier. The response is an opportunity for the faculty member to provide clarifications and corrections to the reports.

If the recommendation letter by SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee is negative, the candidate may withdraw the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure. Otherwise, the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure proceeds to the dean for continued review.

4.6.3. Review of Candidates and Recommendation by the Dean

The dean evaluates and reviews the candidate's dossier and accompanying external review letters; department chair recommendation letter; departmental and SPH Promotion and Tenure Committees' recommendations and dissent letters, if any; and responses of the candidate to any negative recommendations. The dean also considers all other pertinent data, such as information regarding present and probable future academic needs of the department and SPH. The dean then makes a recommendation to the provost 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 research/scholarship, teaching, and service (i.e., met or not met).

If the dean's decision is positive and recommends promotion and/or tenure, a recommendation letter for promotion and/or tenure is sent to the provost. The dean’s recommendation letter is accompanied by the candidate's dossier, department chair letter, departmental and SPH Promotion and Tenure Committees’ recommendations and dissent letters, if any, and responses of the candidate to any negative recommendations. The dean will notify the candidate, the chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the department chair 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 departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair of the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate’s department chair within 10 working days. Candidates who are not recommended by the dean may appeal the dean's decision to the provost. 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.
4.6.4. Appeal to the Provost

Appeals of negative recommendations by the dean may be made to the provost. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the dean, the department chair, the departmental and school Promotion and Tenure Committees, 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.

4.6.5. Appeals to the President

A candidate may appeal the provost’s negative recommendations or decision regarding their appeal to the president within 10 working days after receiving the negative recommendation. 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.

4.7. University Review Process

4.7.1. 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, school, and department, and make their 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 school 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 Advisory Panel, who have had earlier involvement in a particular promotion or tenure case at the department or school level, shall recuse themselves from discussions about the case when it reaches the provost’s Advisory panel.

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 department chair, the department or school/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 their reply to the provost.

4.7.2. 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, school, and department, and make their 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.

4.8. Dean’s Feedback to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee

The dean will meet annually (usually in the spring semester) with the standing SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, following the conclusion of the review process of all promotion and tenure candidates for that year, and provide feedback on the outcome of the year’s tenure and/or promotion cases and discuss the committee’s assessments and recommendations in light of the final tenure and/or promotion outcomes.

5. PRE-TENURE AND POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESSES

5.1. Pre-Tenure Review

5.1.1. Purpose

The department will conduct a pre-tenure review of each tenure-track faculty member. The pre-tenure review should provide an opportunity for colleagues to review accomplishments and provide assistance to the tenure-track faculty member seeking tenure. 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.

5.1.2. Procedures

A formal review of the progress made toward tenure will be made during the third year so that the tenure-track faculty member has a clear idea of how adequately they are progressing toward successfully achieving tenure. When a faculty member is hired with one or two years of probationary credit towards tenure, there shall be a pre-tenure review in the second year. 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 for each tenure-track faculty member will be conducted by a committee of at least three tenured faculty of the appropriate rank assembled by the department chair. This cumulative review should address accomplishments in research, scholarship, and creative activities; teaching; and service. It will be based on the materials as described below.

The pre-tenure evaluation conducted by the departmental Pre-Tenure Review Committee is then 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 once the full review is completed. The faculty member, department chair, and/or dean may meet to discuss the review as needed, and especially if the faculty members is not believed to be on track for promotion and tenure.

5.1.3. Organization of Materials for Pre-Tenure Review

Review materials shall include the faculty member’s curriculum vitae, annual reports from the previous three years (if applicable), 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 scholarship, teaching, and service.

Candidates should prepare the following documents. Electronic copies will be sent to the department chair to form an electronic evaluation packet:
- Curriculum vitae
- All annual reports combined into a single document
- All teaching evaluations (student and peer) combined into a single document
- Any other materials addressing accomplishments
- A statement of scholarship, not to exceed two single-spaced pages
- A statement of teaching, not to exceed one single-spaced page
- A statement of service, not to exceed one single-spaced page
- A one-page outline of five-year goals

5.1.4. Timeline and Responsibilities

The table below delineates the timeline, responsibilities and tasks for carrying out pre-tenure review. At the conclusion of the pre-tenure review process, the faculty member, department chair, and/or dean may meet to discuss the review as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Notifies the faculty member in writing of their review during the upcoming Spring semester and sends a copy of the letter to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Assemble the Pre-Tenure Review Committee for involved faculty and notifies faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Submits materials to the department chair for inclusion in their evaluation packet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Pre-Tenure Review Committee</td>
<td>Reviews the faculty member’s materials and completes report and recommendations regarding the faculty member’s achievements and progress toward meeting their established goals (including promotion, if applicable). Sends a written report with recommendations to the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Reviews faculty member’s materials and the Pre-Tenure Review Committee’s recommendations and completes their own report and recommendations regarding the faculty member’s achievements and progress toward meeting their established goals (including promotion, if applicable). Provides letter with recommendations to the dean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2. Post-Tenure Reviews

5.2.1. Purpose

All colleges must conduct post-tenure reviews 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.

5.2.2. Eligibility

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.

If a faculty member has been awarded Regents or Distinguished Professorship in the same time period in which they would be subject to post-tenure review, the faculty member does not have to complete post-tenure review (because being named Regents or Distinguished Professor involves a rigorous review). Post-tenure review commences for those faculty when they are no longer a Regents or Distinguished Professor. The first post-tenure review will be done the first year they are no longer Regents or Distinguished Professor because it will have been five years since their last review.

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.

5.2.3. Procedure

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 review will involve the department chair, the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean, and the provost. The initial review shall be conducted by the department chair who 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 SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean, and the provost. The faculty member must receive copies of the initial review as well as of all subsequent comments once the full review is completed. Following the review, the faculty member, department chair, and/or dean may meet as needed to discuss its contents.

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. The designation of "exceptional merit" for post-tenure review in the School of Public Health is defined by evidence of sustained high performance in all three areas of professional activity: research, scholarship, and creativity activity; teaching; and service to the school, University, and profession. The faculty member must have a rating of "excellent" in all three areas (see Appendices) to be considered for the “exceptional merit” designation, but specific performance in all three areas will be taken into consideration by the department chair and committee in formulating their recommendations to the dean, who makes the final decision.

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 their scholarly activities, teaching, or service, the faculty member’s department 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.

5.2.4. Organization of Materials for Post-Tenure Review

Review materials shall include the faculty member’s curriculum vitae, annual reports, publications, all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations of teaching (if any), and any other available materials that address accomplishments in teaching, advising and serving students, scholarly activity, and service. The faculty member should also write a two-page statement describing accomplishments and effectiveness in research/scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous five years, and a one-page document outlining goals for the next five years. Candidates should prepare the following documents. Electronic copies will be sent to the department chair to form an electronic evaluation packet:

- Curriculum vitae
- All annual reports from the previous five years combined into a single document
- All teaching evaluations (student and peer) from the previous five years combined into a single document
- Any other materials addressing accomplishments of the previous five years (e.g., exemplar publications, grant awards, etc.)
- A statement describing accomplishments and effectiveness in research, teaching, and service over the previous five years, not to exceed two single-spaced pages
- A one-page outline of five-year goals
5.2.5. Timeline and Responsibilities

The table below delineates the timeline, responsibilities and tasks for carrying out post-tenure review. At the conclusion of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member, department chair, and/or dean may meet to discuss the review as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Notifies the faculty member in writing of their review during the upcoming Spring semester and sends a copy of the letter to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Submits materials to the department chair for inclusion in their evaluation packet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Reviews the faculty member’s materials and completes report and recommendations regarding the faculty member’s achievements and progress toward meeting their established goals (including promotion, if applicable). Sends report and recommendations to the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>SPH P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Reviews faculty member’s materials and the department chair’s recommendations, and completes their own report and recommendations regarding the faculty member’s achievements and progress toward meeting their established goals (including promotion, if applicable). Provides letter with recommendations to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>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 of receipt (when possible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Returns a written report of the post-tenure review and comments by the department chair, SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee, dean, and provost to the faculty member and department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of May</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Meets with faculty member to discuss results of the pre-tenure review (optional).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. APPENDIX A, LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Dear Professor/Dr. [External Reviewer Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate Professor/Dr. [Candidate Name], [Rank] Professor in the College/School of [Discipline] at Georgia State, in candidacy for [promotion and/or tenure] to the rank of XXX.

A key part of this process is assessing the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly/creative contributions from experts in the field of scholarship and research from outside of GSU. We understand that you do not have access to this candidate's teaching and service accomplishments, so our request is to assess only the scholarly/creative accomplishments, which are an important part of the decision process.

We are specifically interested in the following:

- The length and nature of your relationship with Professor/Dr. [Candidate name];
- Quality and significance of the candidate’s scholarship/creative contributions;
- The candidate’s professional reputation and standing in the field at the national and/or international level; and
- How Professor/Dr. [Candidate name] compares to others in the field at approximately the same stages in their careers.

In assessing the quantity of the [insert candidate's name] scholarly/creative works, please be mindful that the COVID-19 pandemic has presented a unique set of challenges for some candidates.

These challenges may include but are not limited to the cancellation of conference presentations or performances/exhibitions, changes in the timelines for publication or performances/exhibitions leading to gaps in the candidate’s scholarly record, and modifications by granting agencies in terms of new or existing funding.

Enclosed with this letter for your review are

- the School of Public Health’s criteria for promotion and tenure;
- a research and scholarship narrative statement prepared by Dr. X;
- Dr. X’s curriculum vitae; and
- three samples of their scholarly work.
Please direct your letter to me at the address indicated in this letter at your earliest convenience, but no later than [Date]. You can email your letter to me at [dean@gsu.edu]. Please also include a short biosketch for members of our review committees that may not be familiar with your work.

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

Thank you for your help in this important matter.

Sincerely,

[Dean]

School of Public Health
7. **APPENDIX B, CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN SCHOLARSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good*</th>
<th>Excellent**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Required criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Required criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The candidate is a competent scholar who regularly publishes scholarly perspectives and research findings</td>
<td>• The candidate is a highly competent scholar who regularly publishes scholarly perspectives and research findings</td>
<td>• The candidate is a superb scholar who regularly publishes scholarly perspectives and research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has published a sufficient number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of good quality.</td>
<td>• has published a significant number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of very good quality</td>
<td>• has published a large number of important and influential refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks internal funding for support of scholarship</td>
<td>• Establishes a focused program of research</td>
<td>• Peer review work will be given greater weight than non-peer review work, and both the quality and quantity of publications will be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the beginnings of a program of research</td>
<td>• Peer review work will be given greater weight than non-peer review work, and both the quality and quantity of publications will be assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Must show 2 of the following 4 activities**
- Is recognized at the local and/or state levels for an area of scholarly expertise
- Makes scholarly presentations at local and/or state professional meetings
- Actively maintains and enhances technical/scientific/clinical competence as appropriate OR receives professional certification and/or advanced credentialing
- 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

**Must show 4 of the following 6 activities**
- Collaborates with faculty colleagues and students to address common research interests and clinical problems
- Is recognized at the regional level for an area of scholarly expertise
- Serves as a grant reviewer, as referee for a scholarly journal, or in any type of editorial capacity
- Regularly makes scholarly presentations at state, regional, and national professional meetings
- Actively maintains and enhances technical/scientific/clinical competence as appropriate OR receives professional certification and/or advanced credentialing
- 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

**Must show 6 of the following 8 activities**
- Provides leadership in research endeavors
- Provides guidance and assistance to faculty colleagues and students related to research
- Is recognized nationally for an area of scholarly expertise
- Serves as a grant reviewer, is on an editorial review board, or regularly serves as referee for scholarly journals
- Regularly makes scholarly presentations at national and international professional meetings
- Obtains awards for research/scholarly activities
- Actively maintains and enhances technical/scientific/clinical competence as appropriate OR receives professional certification and/or advanced credentialing
- 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

**Note:** Peer-reviewed work will be given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed work and both the quality and quantity of publications will be assessed.

* Required for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor

** Required for promotion to Full Professor
### APPENDIX C, CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Required criteria</th>
<th>Very Good* Required criteria</th>
<th>Excellent** Required criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 and/or has evidence of teaching effectiveness validated through a peer-review process as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Must show 3 of the 4 activities**

- Plans and organizes the learning experiences for existing courses
- Develops effective curriculum materials and/or delivery approaches
- Participates in the development of new courses/programs
- Provides advisement to students including special projects/independent studies

**Must show 5 of the 7 activities**

- Plans and organizes the learning experiences for existing courses
- Develops effective curriculum materials and/or delivery approaches
- Participates in curriculum development and develops new courses
- Develops and implements seminars/workshops for professional peers and practitioners
- Provides academic and research advisement to students
- Supervises students for independent studies or special projects
- Serves as committee member on thesis, masters project, and/or doctoral dissertation committees

**Must show 6 of the 8 activities**

- Develops innovative, effective curriculum materials and/or delivery approaches
- Provides leadership in the development of new courses, programs, and instructional materials, especially at the graduate level
- Develops and implements seminars/workshops for professional peers and practitioners
- Provides guidance and mentoring in the teaching process to other faculty members
- Contributes to student accomplishments in the form of student awards/scholarships, grants, and professional presentations and publications
- Chairs thesis, masters project, and/or doctoral dissertation committees
- Receives teaching awards
- Publishes teaching/instructional materials

* Required for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor

** Required for promotion to Full Professor
### 9. APPENDIX D, CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good*</th>
<th>Very Good**</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Serves as an elected and/or appointed member of a committee and/or fulfills assignments within the department and school</td>
<td>• Serves as an elected or appointed member of committees and/or fulfills administrative appointments and assignments within the department and school</td>
<td>• Provides leadership on committees and/or fulfills administrative appointments and assignments within the department, school, or University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>

* Required for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor
** Required for promotion to Full Professor