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I. PREAMBLE

(A) Non-Tenure Track Faculty, College Mission, and Long-Range Plan

The development and application of promotion and reappointment criteria within Georgia State University at the university, college, and unit levels are probably the most important determinants of whether the College and University achieve their mission and goals over time. At the Robinson College of Business, non-tenure track (NTT) faculty play a significant role in achieving its mission. This document provides a statement of promotion standards and procedures for NTT faculty in the Robinson College of Business. As the University and College continue their drive to excellence, ongoing reassessment of the standards applied in NTT promotion decisions at the university, college and unit levels is needed, and standards should be expected to continue to rise.

(B) Relationship to Other Governing Documents

The policies and procedures contained in this document are supplementary to the Georgia State University Statutes, the document titled "Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty," the bylaws and policies of the Regents of the University System of Georgia, and provisions contained in the Georgia State University Faculty Handbook. To avoid duplication, many provisions pertaining to promotion and reappointment contained in these documents have been omitted from these policies and procedures or are incorporated only by reference. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure (BOR Policy Manual Section 8.3.8).

II. LIST OF NTT FACULTY POSITIONS AND RANKS AT THE ROBINSON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

The Robinson College of Business currently has faculty that hold appointments in the four NTT Faculty categories described herein. At this time, the College does not anticipate hiring faculty to hold any other NTT Faculty categories. For each category, the ranks utilized in the Robinson College of Business are listed in parentheses. Faculty members are eligible for merit-based career progression (promotion) within the category to which they were hired, but not for transfer across position categories1. A faculty member who is interested in employment in a different position category may

1 Non-tenure track faculty members who were hired before clinical titles were established at Georgia State University in 2002 and who have been awarded the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor continue to hold those titles unless they apply for and are awarded promotion: non-tenure track assistant professors and associate professors upon promotion become clinical associate professors and clinical professors, respectively.
apply through the faculty recruiting process if such a position is advertised, and will receive the same consideration as any other applicant.

1. Clinical Faculty (Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor)
2. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
3. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)
4. Instructor

Clinical Faculty. In the Robinson College of Business, the primary responsibility of Clinical faculty is teaching, with significant secondary responsibility to engage in research activities consistent with the College’s criteria for AACSB faculty qualifications for faculty holding research doctoral degrees (PhDs). As part of their workload, Clinical Faculty members are also expected to engage in service activities.

Lecturer Faculty. In the Robinson College of Business, the primary responsibility of Lecturer faculty is teaching. As part of their workload, Lecturers are also expected to engage in service activities. While they are not required to engage in research activities, they are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in their discipline.

Academic Professional Faculty. In the Robinson College of Business, a few faculty will be in the Academic Professional position category with a primary responsibility of highly specialized professional service, with limited or no teaching responsibility. As per Board of Regents requirements, an Academic Professional “may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment” (BOR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.8.3). Current GSU practice requires that new hires to Academic Professional positions hold a terminal degree (e.g., PhD), further reducing RCB’s likelihood of hiring to this position category. In the few instances where Academic Professionals are employed in RCB, they will be evaluated in accordance with their assigned workloads, given the very different responsibilities of the small number of Academic Professionals in RCB.

In the Robinson College of Business, the primary responsibility of Instructor faculty is teaching. As part of their workload, Instructors are also expected to engage in service activities. There is no promotion path for NTT faculty holding the position of Instructor at Georgia State University.

III. PROMOTION: CRITERIA AND TIME REQUIREMENTS

(A) Promotion Criteria
Teaching. Where the assigned workload of a faculty member (non-tenure track) includes teaching, teaching effectiveness is a necessary condition for promotion. Teaching is defined as any activity undertaken by a faculty member within the formal academic programs of the College that contributes to the efforts of students to acquire intellectual skills, to extend knowledge and understanding, or to develop attitudes and habits that foster continuing growth. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to, course and program development and improvements, instruction, and counseling and advising of students.

For candidates in the Clinical or Lecturer track, promotion to an intermediate rank (e.g., to Clinical Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer) requires the candidate to demonstrate a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as excellent.

For candidates in the Clinical or Lecturer track, promotion to the highest rank (e.g., to Clinical Professor or Principal Senior Lecturer) requires the candidate to demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness that is evaluated as excellent with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion.

If a candidate’s workload includes teaching (but it is not the candidate’s primary responsibility), then for promotion to an intermediate rank or to the highest rank (e.g., Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional), the candidate must demonstrate high quality teaching.

Research. The conduct of research and its publication are necessary conditions for promotion for non-tenure track faculty in the clinical ranks. Research is defined as inquiry undertaken that establishes facts, develops principles, or illuminates or answers questions posed within an area of intellectual pursuit through the systematic collection of evidence that can be subjected to replication, verification, or critical evaluation by persons other than the original researcher. Research will be evaluated primarily by the quality of the faculty member’s work that has been published or formally accepted for publication in refereed journals. Presentations at professional and other meetings can enrich a portfolio of publications in refereed journals and thus help to establish a faculty member’s national reputation.

For non-tenure track clinical faculty, the criteria for promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor are excellence in teaching and demonstrated evidence of high quality research involving their professional expertise, which must include contributions in the scholarship of teaching and learning (sometimes referred to as pedagogical scholarship or as pedagogical research) and/or research related to practice. In the Robinson College of Business, publications related to the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or related to practice in refereed journals are necessary for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. An essential criterion for promotion to Clinical
Professor is national prominence in the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or research related to practice. Accomplishments in disciplinary scholarly research in refereed journals and securing grants from extramural sources will complement but not substitute for accomplishments in the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or research related to practice.

Scholarship of teaching and learning should demonstrate teaching creativity and innovation and research related to practice should demonstrate creativity and innovation in contributions to practice. Both scholarship of teaching and learning and research related to practice must be disseminated in public forums that provide the opportunity for critical evaluation and adoption. Publications in refereed journals are an important form of public dissemination for both pedagogical research and research related to practice. Additional forms of public dissemination include publications in refereed outlets that aim to share knowledge or innovation with industry constituencies, textbooks, cases, creative or technical artifacts, or other forms as relevant for the discipline.

It is not possible to quantify the number of publications or the type of publications necessary for promotion. However the following guidelines will apply to the various parties involved in conducting a review for promotion:

Some indication of capability of independent scholarship is desirable. Candidates with multi-authored works should describe their contribution to the works.

A continuous history of research and publications is more important than a short period of intensive activity.

The candidate must have some of his/her research related to the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or related to practice published (or accepted for publication) in refereed journals of the highest quality. Candidates shall identify which of their publications are peer-reviewed and shall provide evidence of the quality and standing in the profession of the publication venues.

External reviews of a candidate’s scholarship will be required of all non-tenure track clinical faculty members seeking promotion to Clinical Professor. See Section IV (C), “External Reviews.”

Service. Service activities of faculty that are considered for promotion and related purposes are of three kinds:

Activities internal to the university. The activities of a faculty member in serving on committees and doing administrative work within the Academic Unit, College or University are essential inputs to achieving the goals of the College's
various programs. With respect to these internal service activities, a faculty member who is to be recommended for promotion should have fulfilled service activities which might include but not be limited to service on committees.

Involvement in academic and professional organizations. Service activity in academic organizations may include serving as an officer or local arrangements chair/member, chair of program committee, chair of a program session, discussant, or in other roles. With respect to journals sponsored by the organization, it includes serving as a referee or in any type of editorial capacity. In other words, service includes involvement in an academic organization other than presentation of a paper, which is classified as research and publications activity. It is expected that the involvement of faculty in professional (as opposed to academic) organizations will be a function of the faculty member’s disciplinary area. For example, those Academic Units that have industry affiliations often have faculty who “work their way through the chairs” of local chapters, or state/regional/national/international professional organizations.

Service to the community. As a general rule, those service activities in the community which could be considered for promotion are those which utilize in a significant way the professional expertise of the faculty member.

If a candidate’s primary responsibility is service, for promotion to the highest rank (e.g., Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional), the candidate must provide a sustained excellent level of service to the department, college and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community, with continued growth in the time period of holding the position.

If a candidate’s workload includes service (but is not the candidate’s primary responsibility), then for promotion to an intermediate rank or to the highest rank, the candidate must provide high quality service to the department, college and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community.

(B) Time Requirements for Promotion

The Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty states that unless the college or department NTT promotion manual states otherwise, in general, full time service of at least five years in rank at Georgia State University is appropriate to be considered for promotion to the next level.

Clinical Faculty. Consistent with the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, non-tenure track faculty in the clinical ranks in the Robinson College of Business will be eligible for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor after five years in residence at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor. The normal minimum
time in rank of a Clinical Associate Professor for promotion to Clinical Professor is five years in residence. A maximum of three years’ credit towards the Georgia State University service period may be allowed based on previous service by the candidate at another institution or within Georgia State University (e.g., visiting faculty). Such credit for prior service shall be approved in writing by the Provost.

Lecturer Faculty. The policy of the Board of Regents with respect to promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer states that lecturers who are in their fifth year of service at the employing institution may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer effective in the seventh year of service if the institution has adopted the title and has clearly stated promotion criteria (BOR 8.3.8.2), and that reappointment of a lecturer who has completed six (6) consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution (BOR 8.3.8.1). The policy of the Board of Regents is silent with regard to a position of Principal Senior Lecturer, therefore the Georgia State University Manual guideline of “at least five years in rank at Georgia State University is appropriate to be considered for promotion to the next level” will apply for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer in the Robinson College of Business.

Academic Professional Faculty. The policy of the Board of Regents with respect to Academic Professionals indicates that career ladders may be established for academic professionals but is silent with regard to timing of such promotions, therefore the Georgia State University Manual guideline of “at least five years in rank at Georgia State University is appropriate to be considered for promotion to the next level” will apply for promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional in the Robinson College of Business.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING PROMOTION REVIEWS

The procedures contained in this Section (IV) are for the conduct of reviews for promotion.

(A) Calendar of Events (Overview)

The exact dates for the notification of the outcomes of College and University review will be determined by the Office of the Provost and communicated to the University faculty in advance of each year’s promotion cycle. The timeline for candidates to submit their dossiers, as well as the timeline for reviews by the Academic Unit Committee, Academic Unit Head, and College Committee will be communicated by the Dean’s office to Unit Heads. Unit Heads will communicate this information to the faculty in their Units. A tentative timeline is listed below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Notification of faculty members eligible to be considered for promotion (see Section IV.B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>Declaration of consideration by candidate whether he/she wishes to be considered for promotion during the upcoming academic year (see Section IV.B). Candidates for Clinical Professor submit list and short bios of potential external reviewers to Academic Unit Heads to start process of soliciting external reviews (see Section IV.C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1-15</td>
<td>For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, Head of Academic Unit develops list of potential external reviewers and by August 15 provides list of and information on potential external reviewers for review and approval by the Dean (see Section IV.C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, faculty member provides Head of Academic Unit materials to be sent by Dean to external reviewers. Head of Academic Unit reviews materials for compliance with this policy and submits to Dean's Office by August 22 (see Section IV.C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25</td>
<td>For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, Head of Academic Unit ascertains willingness of reviewers approved by Dean to provide reviews, and notifies Dean's Office (see Section IV.C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6</td>
<td>For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, Dean's request letter and candidate’s materials sent to external reviewers, with review letter due date in 3rd week of October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd week of October</td>
<td>All candidates for NTT promotion complete preparation and organization of dossier and submit two copies of dossier to Head of Academic Unit (see Section IV.D). Head of Academic Unit reviews dossier for compliance with policy. For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, external review letters are received by Dean for inclusion in candidate's dossier (see Section IV.D).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 1

For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, Head of Academic Unit adds external reviewer letters and external reviewer information to dossier copies.

November 1

Head of Academic Unit appoints Unit NTT Promotion Committee Chair, notifies Unit Committee of dossiers' availability for review, and advises Unit Committee of November deadline date when signed committee memorandum is due to Head of Academic Unit (see Section IV.E).

November 21

Faculty committee of Academic Unit completes review of candidate's dossier and forwards its written recommendations signed by all committee members to Head of Academic Unit (see Section IV.E). The Head of the Academic Unit provides a copy of the Academic Unit committee's report to the candidate, who has three (3) business days to provide written comments, if desired, for inclusion in the materials to be reviewed at all higher levels.

2nd week of December

Head of Academic Unit completes review of candidate's dossier, including recommendations of the faculty committee of the Academic Unit, and completes written recommendation to the Dean (see Section IV.E). The Head of the Academic Unit provides a copy of his/her written recommendation to the candidate, who has three (3) business days to provide written comments, if desired, for inclusion in the materials to be reviewed at all higher levels. The Head of the Academic Unit ascertains whether or not the candidate desires to withdraw from further consideration (see Section IV.E).

3rd week of December

Head of Academic Unit forwards dossier with written recommendations to the Dean's Office (see Section IV. E).

2nd week of February

College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee completes its review and sends its written recommendations to the Dean (see Section IV.F). The Dean's Office provides a copy of the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee’s report to the candidate, who has three (3) business days to provide written comments, if desired, for inclusion in the materials to be reviewed at all
higher levels. The Head of the Academic Unit ascertains whether or not the candidate desires to withdraw from further consideration (see Section IV. E).

1st week of March

Dean completes review and prepares written recommendations to the Provost (see Section IV. G).

1st week of March

Dean provides a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate. Candidates not positively recommended by the Dean have ten (10) business days from the date of the Dean’s letter in which to appeal, in writing, to the Provost (see Section V.A).

2nd week of March

College/Unit promotion recommendations are due to the Provost (see Sections IV.G and H).

1st week of May

Provost completes promotion review and consultation with the Deans; Provost responds to appeals from candidates; Provost notifies College and President of promotion recommendations (see Sections IV.H and V.A).

1st week of May

Dean notifies candidates of Provost’s promotion recommendations within three (3) business days of receiving notice of those recommendations. Candidates have ten (10) business days from the date of the Provost’s letter in which to appeal, in writing, to the President (see Sections IV.H and V.B).

End of May

President completes promotion review; President responds to appeals from candidates; President notifies the Deans of promotion decisions. Within three (3) business days of receiving the President’s decisions, the Deans notify the candidates (see Section IV.I).

(B) Notification of Eligibility and Declaration of Candidacy

By approximately July 1 of each year, the Dean’s Office will notify the Head of each Academic Unit of all non-tenure track faculty members appointed to that Academic Unit who are eligible to be considered for promotion on the basis of meeting the minimum time periods (as specified in Section III).

The Head of the Academic Unit will inform, in writing, each faculty member who is eligible for promotion (in terms of time requirements) and request that the faculty
member indicate, in writing, whether the faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion during the upcoming academic year.

Any technical questions (e.g., whether a faculty member has served a "normal" period of time with respect to being considered for promotion) should be brought up by the Head of the Academic Unit or the candidate with the Dean's Office at the beginning of the process to avoid misunderstandings later in the recommendation process with respect to how a specific situation may be viewed by the various parties involved in the process.

(C) External Reviews

For non-tenure track faculty who are seeking promotion to Clinical Professor, external reviews of the candidate’s contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or research related to practice are required. 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. A minimum of three reviews must be obtained. Candidates are encouraged to suggest names for reviewers. Individuals selected as reviewers should be recognized experts qualified to evaluate the candidate’s contribution to the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or research related to practice (e.g., current or former editors/associate editors of high quality peer-reviewed pedagogical journals and/or peer-reviewed practice-related journals, Clinical Professors at peer or aspirational universities, teaching-oriented faculty at peer or aspirational universities). All reviewers must be external to Georgia State University and should possess national reputations in the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or research related to practice. The burden of establishing the credentials of reviewers lies with candidates seeking promotion and their Academic Unit Heads.

**Determination of external reviewers.** By August 1, the candidate for non-tenure track promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor will submit to the Head of the Academic Unit a list of at least four potential external reviewers. By August 15, in consultation with senior faculty in the Academic Unit in the candidate’s area of expertise, the Head of the Academic Unit will develop a list of at least five external reviewers, which will include at least two of the reviewers on the candidate’s list, for review and approval by the Dean. By August 25, the Head of the Academic Unit will informally contact the potential reviewers to get an indication of their willingness to complete the review. The number of reviewers on the list should be adequate to insure that at least three substantive reviews will ultimately be received. In any case, it is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that an adequate number of substantive reviews are received from qualified reviewers.

**Solicitation of external reviews.** By August 15, the candidate for promotion to Clinical Professor will provide to the Head of the Academic Unit for review the resume and
copies of other materials to be sent to the external reviewers. All letters soliciting these
reviews will be written by the Dean (see sample letter in Appendix A) and mailed to the
external reviewers by September 6, requesting a response by the 3rd week of October.
Each external reviewer will be sent the candidate’s resume and copies of the
candidate’s significant publications or scholarship (except lengthy books and
monographs, for which a copy of the title page and table of contents will be provided).
The candidate may include a research statement as part of the materials being sent to
the external reviewers. The research statement should be descriptive of the candidate’s
research focus and any relationship among the papers, rather than evaluative of the
candidate’s work. If the number of publications is extensive, then a sample of the most
significant publications selected by the candidate in consultation with the Head of the
Academic Unit will be sent.

The external reviewer will be asked to evaluate the scholarship, especially the
pedagogical research and research related to practice, in terms of its significance,
quality and overall contribution to the field. All responses shall be addressed to the
Dean. The reviews of the external reviewers will become part of the candidate’s dossier
and will be available to all internal reviewers, including the faculty review committee
within the candidate’s Academic Unit. The reviews will not be made available to the
candidate.

**Information on external reviewers.** As part of the candidate’s dossier, the information
to be provided on external reviewers is a listing prepared by the Head of the Academic
Unit (compiled consecutively on 1-2 sheets of paper) of all the external reviewers with
the following information:

1. Name
2. Current affiliation
3. One paragraph of biographical/resume data
4. Relationship, if any, with the candidate (any relationship should be strictly
   professional—the reviewer should not have the appearance of a personal or
   professional investment in the candidate’s career)

This summary is to be incorporated, at the point indicated in Section III.D below, in the
dossier to be submitted to the Dean’s Office.

**(D) Preparation and Organization of Candidate’s Dossier**

The dossier should be able to make the case by itself (i.e., without formal or informal
oral discussion, or presentations) with respect to the candidate’s qualifications. Two
copies of the dossier are required to facilitate timely review by the various parties included in the review process. All materials should be placed in a large three-ring binder notebook, in the following order:

**Items Inserted in Dossier by Head of Academic Unit:**

Head of Academic Unit’s memorandum of recommendations and analysis to the Dean.

Comments by the candidate (if any) in response to Head of Academic Unit’s evaluation.

Memorandum from the faculty committee of the Academic Unit to the Head of the Academic Unit (further discussed in Section IV.E below).

Comments by the candidate (if any) in response to evaluation by the faculty committee of the Academic Unit.

For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, one paragraph summary resumes of external reviewers. (see Section IV. C above)

For candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, letters from the external reviewers.

**Items Inserted in Dossier by Candidate:**

Index tabs with the following labels (bold words), followed by the materials:

- **Table of Contents** (note: the items listed above will be received and prepared by the Head of the Academic Unit subsequent to the candidate preparing and submitting credentials to the Academic Unit for review; thus, the table of contents will only include the items listed below as submitted by the candidate).

- **Resume** organized in the sequence shown in Appendix B.

- **Comprehensive statement** from the candidate addressing the candidate’s performance and record with respect to the following, to the extent they are relevant to the candidate’s workload: teaching effectiveness, research and publications (including quality of publications if applicable), and service as defined in Section II.
Publications: refereed pedagogical. Attach a statement to each publication that is not single authored indicating the specific contribution made by the candidate to the publication, e.g., junior or senior author, conceptualized the publication, responsible for methodology, research design, statistical analysis, writing, etc. Include rationale for order of authorship.

Publications: refereed professional/practitioner. Attach a statement to each publication that is not single authored, as above. Include rationale for order of authorship.

Publications: refereed scholarly. Attach a statement to each publication that is not single-authored, as above. Include rationale for order of authorship.

Publications: books and monographs. Attach a statement to each publication that is not single authored, as above. Include rationale for order of authorship.

Working papers: Attach a statement to each publication that is not single authored, as above. Include rationale for order of authorship.

Grants/Extramural funding for research: If not sole Principal Investigator, include a statement indicating the specific contribution made by the candidate in obtaining and executing the grant, the grant amount, funding source and duration.

Teaching effectiveness—Provide (1) a listing of all courses taught with enrollment by semester since date of appointment or last rank promotion, and (2) materials documenting teaching effectiveness, which must include copies of Student Evaluation of Instructor Profiles for all courses taught as well as additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as (but 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.

The College will prepare a report for each faculty being considered for promotion entitled “Overall Teaching Effectiveness of Instructor for All Classes Since Initial Semester of Employment, Reappointment, Awarding of Tenure or Last Promotion.” The content (categories) of that report is approved by the RCB Faculty Affairs Committee and the RCB Executive Committee. Faculty members will include this report in their dossier, and may provide a narrative analysis of the results if they wish. The use of this
report in no way precludes faculty members from selecting, summarizing, and discussing other information (e.g., Student Evaluation of Instructor form items) of their choosing.

Organize other information into the categories delineated in the College document titled "Outline of Faculty Activities/Accomplishments Report" (FAAR) used for annual faculty performance evaluation purposes. Typically, FAAR reports completed for previous years will be the best source of information for completing this section of the dossier.

**Service Effectiveness**--materials documenting effectiveness in service activities.

The candidate should have all the materials ready by the time requested by the Head of the Academic Unit, which will normally be near the third week of October. When the Dean receives at least the minimum of three external review letters for candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor, these will be forwarded to the Head of the Academic Unit for inclusion in the ring binder notebook to be reviewed by the committee of faculty of the Academic Unit. (Letters beyond three are included as well.)

(E) **Review Within Academic Unit**

The candidate’s dossier, including outside reviewer letters (if applicable), and other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier are reviewed by a committee of faculty members of the Academic Unit who prepare written recommendations to the Head of the Academic Unit. Prior to the promotion review of a non-tenure track faculty candidate, the Head of the Academic Unit will convey to the review committee the assigned workload of the candidate since the last review. In turn, the Head of the Academic Unit reviews the candidate’s dossier, outside reviewer letters if applicable, other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier, and the report of the faculty committee of the Academic Unit and any candidate response, and completes a review and prepares written recommendations addressed to the Dean and College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Composition of faculty committee of Academic Unit.** For recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty from lecturer to senior lecturer, the review committee is comprised of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors, plus those non-tenure track faculty at the rank of Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor with assigned workloads which, in the opinion of the Head of the Academic Unit, are similar to the candidate for promotion. For recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer, the review committee is comprised of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors, plus those non-tenure track faculty at the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor.
For recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional, the review committee is comprised of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors, plus those non-tenure track faculty at the rank of Senior Academic Professional, Principal Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor with assigned workloads which, in the opinion of the Head of the Academic Unit, are similar to the candidate for promotion.

For recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty to Clinical Associate Professor, the review committee is comprised of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors plus those non-tenure track faculty at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor with assigned workloads which, in the opinion of the Head of the Academic Unit, are similar to the candidate for promotion. For recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty to Clinical Professor, the review committee is comprised of all tenured Professors plus those non-tenure track faculty at the rank of Clinical Professor with assigned workloads which, in the opinion of the Head of the Academic Unit, are similar to the candidate for promotion.

The Head of the Academic Unit will appoint the chair from the committee membership. At least one member of the committee must be a non-tenure track faculty of appropriate rank. If an Academic Unit does not have at least one non-tenure track faculty meeting the criteria for being on a faculty review committee, a non-tenure track faculty of appropriate rank appointed in another Academic Unit will be added to the committee. If an Academic Unit does not have at least three faculty meeting the criteria for being on a faculty review committee, faculty appointed in other Academic Units will be added to the committee to reach, at least, the minimum of three. These faculty will be chosen by the Head of the Academic Unit in consultation with the Dean.

**Form of written recommendations from faculty committee of the Academic Unit.**

For each of the decision categories, each faculty member constituting the committee in the Academic Unit is expected to sign a memorandum of recommendations to the Head of the Academic Unit. In the case of a split decision, the report, signed by all committee members, should include both majority and minority views. The memorandum must include an evaluation of each part of the candidate’s assigned workload. In accordance with University policy, the Academic Unit Head will provide the faculty member with a copy of the written recommendation of the faculty review committee of the Academic Unit. The faculty member has the right to respond in writing to that evaluation, and a copy of the faculty member’s response will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels. If the candidate chooses to respond, the candidate’s written response has to be submitted to the Dean (with a copy to the Unit Head) within three (3) business days of receiving the report.

**Memorandum of recommendations from the Head of the Academic Unit.** The memorandum of recommendations from the Head of the Academic Unit to the Dean should, in addition to serving as the recommendation of the Head of the Academic Unit, provide context to the deliberations that have occurred in the Academic Unit. For
example, this memorandum should fully address any split recommendations from the faculty committee of the Academic Unit, or issues that are not possible to document in a dossier. As soon as possible but prior to the deadline for submitting recommendations to the Dean and the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee, the Head of the Academic Unit will notify in writing to each faculty member who previously declared in writing a wish to be considered for promotion as to whether or not the faculty member is being recommended by the Head of the Academic Unit to the Dean and the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee. In accordance with University policy, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of the memorandum of recommendations from the Head of the Academic Unit. The faculty member has the right to respond in writing to that evaluation, and a copy of the faculty member’s response will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels. If the candidate chooses to respond, the candidate’s written response has to be submitted to the Dean (with a copy to the Unit Head) within three (3) business days of receiving the report. A faculty member who wishes to withdraw from further consideration may do so. The faculty member may withdraw by informing the Head of the Academic Unit in writing prior to the deadline specified by the College (the deadline for Academic Units to submit the Unit recommendations to the Dean’s Office).

(F) Review by the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee

Composition of Committee. In the first year of implementation of this policy (academic year 2014-2015), the existing RCB College Promotion and Tenure Committee will serve as the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee. In subsequent years, by the spring semester faculty meeting, the members of the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee will have been selected in accordance with Section VII E of the Bylaws of the Robinson College of Business. To evaluate NTT faculty, the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee will consist of all five members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate tenure track faculty augmented by two additional NTT faculty members, preferably with the rank of Clinical Professor. The chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate tenure track faculty will also chair the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee. No person can serve at more than one level of review. Members of the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee will typically recuse themselves from serving on the unit committee, but may serve on the unit committee (see Section IV (E) for details on membership of unit committee) if appointed by the Dean, in which case they will recuse themselves from participation in the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee for candidates they reviewed at the unit level.

Two complete sets of each candidate’s dossier will be transmitted to the Dean’s Office. The chair of the committee will be notified for purposes of calling an initial meeting of the committee to establish its internal operating procedures. The chair reviews the dossiers for any required information that appears to be missing and requests it accordingly from the Academic Units.
The committee will review the candidate's dossier, outside reviewer letters if applicable, other materials directly relevant to the candidate's dossier, and the reports of the faculty committee of the Academic Unit and the Academic Unit Head and any candidate responses. The committee will complete its review of each candidate's materials by time deadlines established in conference with the Dean's Office to meet the deadlines of the University Administration. The committee may go back to the Academic Unit Head for clarification of questions that arise during its review of a candidate's dossier.

Form of written recommendations to the Dean. All members of the committee are expected to sign a memorandum of recommendation to the Dean. For non-tenure track candidates, the memorandum must include an evaluation of each part of the candidate's assigned workload. In the case of a split decision, the report, signed by all committee members, should include both majority and minority views. It is not necessary to repeat the contents of the written recommendations received from the review committee in the Academic Unit or the Head of the Academic Unit; however, it may be appropriate to incorporate these by reference.

The committee will submit its recommendations to the Dean. In accordance with University policy, the Dean will provide the faculty member with a copy of the written recommendation of the college committee. The faculty member has the right to respond in writing to that evaluation, and a copy of the faculty member's response will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels. If the candidate chooses to respond, the candidate's written response has to be submitted to the Dean (with a copy to the Unit Head) within three (3) business days of receiving the report.

(G) Recommendations by the Dean to the Provost and the President

The Dean reviews the candidate's dossier, external reviewer letters if applicable, other materials directly relevant to the candidate's dossier, and the reports of the faculty committee of the Academic Unit, Academic Unit Head and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and any candidate responses and prepares written recommendations to the Provost. The memorandum of recommendation from the Dean should, in addition to serving as the recommendation of the Dean, provide context to the deliberations that have occurred within the College. For example, this memorandum should address split recommendations of the College review committee, issues that are not possible to document in a dossier, or other matters of relevance to the Provost and President in arriving at their recommendation.

At this time, the Dean informs in writing each candidate for promotion of the recommendation being made by the Dean and, in accordance with University policy, the faculty member is provided with a copy of the Dean's memorandum of recommendations. In all instances of a positive recommendation by the Dean, a file containing the candidate's curriculum vita and statement, the various letters of internal assessment, the candidate's responses (if any), and the letters of external review (if applicable) will go forward for review.
Candidates not positively recommended by the Dean must be notified in writing within three business days after the Dean’s decision. Candidates who are not positively recommended by the Dean have ten business days from the date of the Dean’s letter in which to appeal, in writing, to the Provost (see Section V).

(H) 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 and the College, and make his/her promotion 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 Head of the Academic Unit, the Academic Unit or College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and other materials directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy. The Dean will notify the candidate and the Academic Unit Head of his/her reply to the Provost.

(I) President’s Review

The President will conduct an independent review of the candidate’s curriculum vitae and statement, external review letters if applicable, recommendations, and any other material directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms, and expectations for the University and College, and make his/her promotion decision. Within three business days of receiving notice of the President’s decision, the Dean shall notify the candidate of the decision.

V. APPEALS

The following provisions pertaining to appeals of promotion or tenure recommendations originate with the GSU document titled “Georgia State University Promotion Manual For Non-Tenure Track Faculty” approved by the University Senate on October 10, 2013.

(A) Appeal of Negative Recommendation Made by the Dean

A candidate may appeal to the Provost a negative recommendation by the Dean. Upon receipt of the Dean’s negative recommendation, the candidate shall have ten business days to appeal the negative recommendation to the Provost. The grounds for appeal shall only be those that involve errors of due process. These would include procedural
errors such as failure to receive notification at each stage of review. Errors of due
process would also include substantive errors such as arbitrariness, capriciousness,
and discrimination, as well as bias and other forms of nonprofessional judgment on the
part of any person or group involved in the promotion review. In reviewing the appeal,
the Provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the
candidate, the Dean, the Academic Unit Head, the Unit Committee, and other
appropriate individuals inside or outside the University. By the date specified in the NTT
promotion and reappointment manual calendar, 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.

(B) Appeal of Negative Recommendation Made by the Provost

A candidate may appeal to the President a negative recommendation by the Provost or
a decision by the Provost rejecting the candidate’s appeal to the Provost. Upon receipt
of the Provost’s negative recommendation, the candidate shall have at least ten
business days to appeal the negative recommendation to the President. The appeal to
the President shall conform to the principles and processes stated above for appeals to
the Provost. By the date specified in the promotion manual calendar, the President shall
provide the Provost, the appropriate Dean and the candidate a written decision
including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate's appeal is supported or
rejected.

VI. STRUCTURED REVIEWS OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Structured Reviews are intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually
provided by an annual review. Structured Reviews contribute to the determination of
whether the faculty members are performing at the level necessary for reappointment,
to the determination of whether faculty members who are seeking promotion are
progressing towards promotion, and to the identification of opportunities that will enable
faculty members to reach their full potential in terms of contribution to the University.

All NTT faculty whose initial appointment at GSU is at an entry level will have a review
no later than three years after the initial appointment (Structured Third Year Review),
and a review no later than five years after the initial appointment (Structured Five Year
Review). Thereafter, subsequent structured reviews will take place every five years,
unless a faculty member is promoted sooner. If a NTT faculty member is promoted,
subsequent structured reviews will occur every five years after the most recent
promotion.

All NTT faculty whose initial appointment at GSU is above the entry level shall have a
review no later than three years after the initial appointment (Structured Third Year
Review). After this review, subsequent structured reviews will take place every five
years (Structured Five Year Review). If a NTT faculty member is promoted, subsequent
structured reviews will occur every five years after the most recent promotion.

For all NTT faculty members, the Structured Third Year Review has to be completed by the end of the third year of service and for entry level appointments the first Structured Five Year Review has to be completed by the end of the fifth year of service. For Lecturers appointed at the entry level, the first Structured Five Year Review is also the review for promotion to Senior Lecturer. This timeline enables the University to meet Board of Regents deadlines for the reappointment and promotion of Lecturers (BOR Policy Manual, Sections 8.3.8.1 and 8.3.8.2).

The Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty states “A maximum of three years’ credit towards the Georgia State University service period may be allowed based on previous service by the candidate at another institution or within Georgia State University (e.g., visiting faculty). Such credit for prior service shall be approved in writing by the Provost” (Section IV, lines 290-293). Therefore, the year in which the first structured review will be conducted depends on the amount of service credit toward promotion granted at the time of initial appointment. A faculty member hired with three or two years of service credit will have their initial structured review (Structured Third Year Review) in the spring semester of their first full year of employment. Those with one year of service credit will have their initial structured review in the spring semester of their second full year of employment. Those with no credit will have their initial structured review in the spring semester of their third full year of employment. (Note: A full year of employment excludes years in which paid or unpaid leaves of absence and partial years due to employment starting after fall semester.)

The year in which an NTT faculty member comes up for promotion does not have to coincide with the year in which the NTT faculty member is subject to a Structured Review, with the exception of the Five Year Review for Lecturers. Structured Reviews are conducted as per the timeline specified above. An NTT faculty member who meets the time requirements outlined in Section III (B) above can be a candidate for promotion in any year he/she chooses, subject to policies outlined in the college promotion manual, and after consultation with the candidate’s Academic Unit Head and Dean.

(A) Annual Appointment Renewal Decision

An appointment to a NTT faculty position is for a one-year period. All NTT faculty appointments should be made in compliance with the Georgia State University Faculty Handbook and Board of Regents policies. All NTT faculty should be reviewed on an annual basis.

As with minimum time in rank policy of the Board of Regents, the schedule of renewal notice described next is recognized at Georgia State University as applying to non-tenure track faculty members who have been awarded the rank of clinical assistant.
professor, clinical associate professor, or clinical professor, as well as non-tenure track faculty members who were hired before clinical titles were established at Georgia State University in 2002 and who have been awarded the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. In accordance with Section 8.3.4.2 of The Policy Manual of The Board of Regents:

All non-tenured faculty who have been awarded academic rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor), are employed under written contract, and who served full-time for the entire previous year, have the presumption of renewal of the next academic year unless notified in writing, by the president of an institution or his/her authorized representative, of the intent not to renew.

Notice of intention to not renew a non-tenured faculty member who has been awarded academic rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor) shall be furnished, in writing, according to the following schedule:

1. At least three (3) months before the date of termination of an initial one-year contract;

2. At least six (6) months before the date of termination of a second one-year contract; or,

3. At least nine (9) months before the date of termination of a contract after two or more years of service in the institution.

This schedule of notification does not apply to persons holding temporary, limited-term, or part-time positions, or persons with courtesy appointments such as adjunct appointments. Furthermore, it does not apply to Academic Professional Faculty or to Lecturer Faculty. Renewal notice for Lecturer Faculty is discussed next.

In accordance with Section 8.3.4.3 of The Policy Manual of the Board of Regents:

Lecturers and senior lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary as follows:

1. For lecturers with less than three (3) years of full-time service, institutions are encouraged to provide non-reappointment notice as early as possible, but no specific notice is required.

2. For lecturers with three (3) or more years but less than six (6) years of full-time service, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least
thirty (30) calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester.

3. For senior lecturers or lecturers with six (6) years or more of full-time service, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester.

The current practice of the Robinson College of Business and of Georgia State University is to afford lecturers and senior lecturers notice of intent not to renew in the same fashion and on the same timeline as outlined above for Instructors, Clinical Assistant Professors, Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors.

The Dean’s Office notifies and requests recommendations from Academic Unit Heads for pending reappointment decisions. The Head of the Academic Unit will decide on the type and nature of input to be solicited from the faculty of the Academic Unit in making the recommendation to the Dean for renewal or non-renewal each year.

(B) Needs and Resource Contingencies

All appointments are contingent upon the needs of the Robinson College of Business and the resources of the College and University; therefore, eligibility for renewal of appointment does not guarantee reappointment.

(C) Procedures for Conducting Structured Reviews

Review committee and chair. In the Robinson College of Business, the composition of the faculty committee in the Academic Unit conducting the structured review will follow the model of the faculty committee in the Academic Unit for conducting promotion reviews (specified in Section IV (E) above).

Materials to be reviewed. The structured cumulative review should address accomplishments in the areas of assigned workload. Prior to the cumulative review of a non-tenure track faculty candidate, the Head of the Academic Unit will convey to the review committee the assigned workload of the candidate since the last review. The review will be based on available information. The non-tenure track faculty member will be expected to submit for review at least the following elements of the dossier required for the regular promotion review (see Section IV. D):

1. Resume organized in the sequence shown in Appendix B
2. Materials documenting teaching effectiveness, including copies of Student Evaluation of Instructor Profiles, the report prepared by the College entitled “Overall Teaching Effectiveness of Instructor for All Classes Since Initial
Semester of Employment, Awarding of Tenure, or Last Promotion," and other materials that go beyond the results of student evaluations, such as peer evaluations. The candidate should provide a narrative analysis of his/her teaching effectiveness.

3. Copies of all publications (if applicable) during the review period.

In addition, the non-tenure track faculty member may submit a concise summary of accomplishments (not to exceed two pages in length) during the review period and a one-page outline of projected goals for the next review period.

Review committee report and subsequent review and comment. The review committee report must include an evaluation of teaching, research, and/or service as relevant to the faculty member’s workload. It should be signed by all committee members and, in the event of a split decision, should include both minority and majority opinions. The review committee report is forwarded to the Head of the Academic Unit who will provide the faculty member with a copy of the report; the candidate will have five (5) business days to forward written comments to the Academic Unit Head, if desired. The Head will prepare a memorandum to the Dean for review by the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee, containing an evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and/or service as relevant to the faculty member’s workload; comments on the committee report; and recommendations regarding reappointment of the faculty member. The Head of the Academic Unit will provide the candidate with a copy of the Unit Head’s evaluation, and the candidate will have five (5) business days to forward written comments to the College, if desired. The College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee will evaluate the faculty member and make a recommendation to the Dean. The memorandum must include an evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and/or service as relevant to the faculty member’s workload. The Dean will provide the faculty member with a copy of the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee’s report, and the candidate will have five (5) business days to forward written comments to the Dean, if desired. In turn, the Dean will evaluate the faculty member’s teaching, research and/or service as relevant to the faculty member’s workload and will provide comments to the faculty member and the Academic Unit Head. The final report will be retained in the faculty member’s file in the Dean’s office and in the Academic Unit.

VII. OTHER PROVISIONS

(A) Differences in Promotion Review Process for Candidate Serving as Head of Academic Unit

The Dean will conduct most of the steps involving the promotion review process that require an action on the part of the Head of the Academic Unit (see Section IV) when
the candidate for promotion is a non-tenure track faculty member who serves as Head of the Academic Unit. Otherwise, the candidate would be placed in the position of recommending himself/herself to the Dean and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Accordingly, the review procedure applicable to all faculty are modified as stated below when the candidate is serving as Head of an Academic Unit.

Notification and declaration of consideration for promotion. The Dean will notify the faculty member of eligibility with respect to time requirements and will determine whether or not the faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion during the coming academic year.

Review process by Academic Unit and recommendations from the Academic Unit. The candidate will submit, directly to the Dean, the list of external reviewers. In turn, the Dean will consult with faculty in the Academic Unit to finalize the list of external reviewers that will be solicited. Once a candidate has completed the dossier, it will be submitted directly to the Dean, who will ask the Unit review committee to complete its review and submit the memorandum of recommendations directly to the Dean and the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee.

(B) Retention of Materials Stemming from Promotion Reviews

For promotion recommendations which are positively reviewed at the Unit, College and Provost levels and approved by the President, the copies of the candidate's dossier will be returned to the candidate upon notification of approval by the President.

For promotion candidates who are not recommended at the College or University level, both copies of the candidate’s dossier will be returned to the candidate after the final University-level review.

The dossiers returned to the candidate will exclude the recommendation letters from the Unit and the College as well as the external review letters, which will be retained in the Dean's Office for four years.

(C) Orientation Sessions

To facilitate communications and improved understanding among the parties involved in the College's promotion and tenure processes, the Chair of the RCB Promotion and Tenure Committee will hold an annual orientation session for faculty to review the College's promotion and tenure policies and procedures and to answer any questions concerning the process. This orientation session will be held during spring semester prior to the start of the annual promotion and tenure cycle in early-May; the session will be open to all interested faculty members in the College. The Chair of the RCB Promotion and Tenure Committee will also hold orientation sessions, as deemed appropriate, for the members of the RCB Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Heads of Academic Units. Academic Unit Heads and senior non-tenure track and
tenured faculty are expected to mentor and advise all new NTT faculty members. In particular, Unit Heads shall inform new NTT faculty members of all promotion requirements. To this end, they shall provide the new NTT faculty members with copies of the appropriate College and University promotion policies and explain the contents of these documents to them.

(D) Approval of this Document and Subsequent Revisions

This document originates with the Robinson College of Business (RCB) Faculty Affairs Committee. After review and approval by the RCB Faculty Affairs Committee and RCB Executive Committee, it is to be approved by the RCB faculty and the Provost. Subsequent revisions must be approved by the RCB Faculty Affairs Committee, the Executive Committee and the Provost. However, the proposed revisions will be submitted to the RCB faculty for approval only if the Faculty Affairs Committee is of the opinion that the proposed revisions constitute major changes. Three years from the date this manual goes into effect, the Senate Executive Committee shall review the effectiveness of the NTT promotion policies and procedures outlined in this manual, and, if necessary, revise the manual.

Revisions approved by the RCB Faculty Affairs Committee on behalf of the RCB Faculty, November 4, 2014, after review and approval by RCB Executive Committee.

Further revisions requested by the University NTT Promotion Manual Review Committee approved by the RCB Faculty Affairs Committee on behalf of the RCB Faculty, December 11, 2014, after review and approval by the RCB Executive Committee.
APPENDIX A
SAMPLE EXTERNAL REVIEW SOLICITATION LETTER

Dear Professor______:

Professor NAME of our Department of DEPTNAME holds a non-tenure track position in our college, and her assigned workload consists primarily of teaching. Professor NAME is eligible for promotion, and the criteria for promotion to Clinical Professor (non-tenure track) are excellence in teaching and a national reputation in the scholarship of teaching and learning (pedagogical research) and/or research related to practice. As a part of our review process, we seek evaluations of the candidate's contributions to pedagogical research and research related to practice. Accomplishments in disciplinary scholarly research and securing grants from extramural sources can complement accomplishments in pedagogical research and research related to practice. It is my understanding that the Chair of Professor NAME’s department has contacted you, and you have indicated your willingness to serve as a reviewer. We greatly appreciate your willingness to serve in this capacity.

Professor NAME’s resume and copies of her most significant publications are enclosed for your evaluation (except for any lengthy books and monographs for which a copy of the title page and table of contents are enclosed). We are requesting your assessment of Professor NAME’s contribution to pedagogical research and research related to practice. Specifically, we would appreciate your assessment of the significance of Professor NAME’s contributions to research, especially to pedagogical research and research related to practice. Your letter should state the nature of your relationship, if any, with Professor NAME.

Your evaluation will become part of the candidate’s dossier and will be available to faculty in the department and the college as well as university administrators who are involved in the promotion and tenure review process. Please be aware that the Georgia Open Records Law may result in your review becoming public. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia maintains that letters of evaluation are exempt from the Georgia Open Records Law.

We would like to receive your evaluation, sent to my attention, as soon as possible, but no later than [date]. If you encounter problems meeting this deadline, please call me as soon as possible at (404) 413-7009. Thank you for your contributions to this very important decision.

Sincerely yours,

Richard D. Phillips
Dean
APPENDIX B

OUTLINE OF RESUME TO BE USED FOR
PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS

The resume should be organized in the following sequence, with headings corresponding to the following. Items listed under a heading should be in descending chronological sequence (most recent date first). Publication citations should be complete, following standard citation format including order of authorship, page numbers and other specifics. Include notation of journal convention regarding order of authorship if other than contribution, such as (Journal convention: Alphabetical authorship), (Journal convention: Authorship by grant seniority), etc.

Name

Education

List degree, major, institution and year received (for each degree).

Fellowship and Awards

Work Experience

List relevant business-related work experience (including internships) and faculty and other positions held.

Publications: Refereed Pedagogical

Publications: Refereed Professional/Practitioner

Publications: Refereed Scholarly

Publications: Books and Monographs

Include chapters in books, case studies, instructor’s manuals and other supplemental materials for textbooks, and books edited.

Publications: Refereed Conference Proceedings

Publications: Non-Refereed and Other

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

Include papers in process but not yet published; clearly indicate each paper's stage and target outlet (for example, resubmitted for second-round review at Academy of Management Learning and Education, revise and resubmit requested at MIS Quarterly, targeted for submission to Journal of Financial Education, etc.).

Externally-Funded Research Projects

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

Papers Presented at Professional Meetings

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

Supervision of Doctoral Dissertations

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

Continuing Education Activities in the Past Five Years

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

Service Activities Internal to the University

Include service on departmental, college or university committees by listing name of committee, time period served, and whether service was as a member or chair. Also include other assignments and responsibilities (e.g., MBA core course coordinator) at the departmental, college or university level.

Service Activities in Academic and Professional Organizations

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

Service to the Community

Only include activities which utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member in activities in the community which are directly related to being a faculty member.