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Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences

These tenure criteria apply to assistant professors who will undergo the pre-tenure review after August 2017 and to all tenure-track faculty joining Emory College of Arts and Sciences after May, 2017. These criteria also apply to all associate professors undergoing review for promotion to full professor.

Research, teaching, and service encompass the primary activities of the faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences. Since each of these is essential to the College, each is weighed carefully in all considerations involving appointment, reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure. To be eligible for tenure and promotion to both associate and full professor, faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellent achievement and promise in research and teaching, in addition to appropriate service within their rank. Candidates for appointment or promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must also demonstrate promise as leaders who will impact their fields as their careers progress. Candidates for appointment or promotion to Professor must show scholarly excellence and be established, nationally and internationally, as among the most distinctive and recognized voices in their disciplines, consistently examining and addressing pressing questions in their fields of inquiry.

Emory aims for a faculty of demonstrated excellence in both research and teaching. The awarding of tenure recognizes a faculty member’s superior achievements relative to academic peers, their influence on the broader scholarly community, and the promise of continuing success. Research is defined as inquiry undertaken that establishes facts, develops principles, or illuminates or answers questions within an area of intellectual pursuit and can be subjected to replication, verification, or critical evaluation by persons other than the original researcher. Research excellence is measured by such recognition as peer reviewed publications, competitive external funding for research, high-impact public scholarship, and/or publically displayed/performed artistic work that is well recognized by senior scholars. Research will be evaluated primarily by the quality and impact of the faculty member’s work that has been published or formally accepted for publication. When a faculty member’s scholarship is in the areas of creative or performing arts, original works and performances will be evaluated as equivalent to research.

Teaching is defined as any activity undertaken by a faculty member within the academic programs of Emory University that contributes to the efforts of Emory students to acquire intellectual skills, to extend knowledge and understanding, or to develop attitudes and habits that foster continuing intellectual growth. Excellence in teaching draws continuously upon the teacher’s ability as a scholar in the discipline. Teaching excellence is measured broadly to include instruction that is effective, imaginative, conscientious, and meets a high standard of expectation, and includes advising, mentoring, and academic engagement outside the formal classroom. The College recognizes that teaching is both a skill and an art, and that an excellent teacher may not be equally effective in instructing, advising and mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows in every class size or format.

Service is defined as contributions and activities that promote the general welfare of a department, the College, or the University. Activities that contribute to the development of a professional discipline, a professional society, or an
outside agency or community also will be weighed. But service will be evaluated primarily by a faculty member's contribution to committee work and administrative duties within the department, College, or University. The idea of “service” includes displaying a collegial spirit of cooperation and avoidance of disruptive behavior.

The principles stated above outline the general requirements for eligibility for appointment, promotion, and tenure. But since all appointments are contingent upon the College's needs and the University's resources, eligibility does not guarantee appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

These principles for appointment, promotion, and tenure are in conformity with the Affirmative Action Program, Emory University, which was established on 15 July 1976 and has been updated annually, and with the University Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships.

Specific guidelines and procedures for recommending faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure are published below in the “Guidelines for Appointments, Reviews, and Promotions in Emory College.”

**Guidelines for Appointments, Reviews, and Promotions**

1. **Preamble**

   A. The general criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences are set forth above in the “Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences.”

   B. The guidelines here set forth are in conformity with the Affirmative Action Program, Emory University, which was established on 15 July 1976 and has been updated annually, and with the University Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships.

   C. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee is established by these guidelines to advise the Dean of Emory College on matters pertaining to appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure. This committee shall consist of nine members, three from each of the three divisions of the Faculty of Emory College (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences/Mathematics). Members shall be elected from among the tenured full professors on the faculty as described in Section 7 of these guidelines. The Committee will not have alternate members. The Dean may appoint alternates, however, when members are unable or ineligible to serve.

2. **Appointments**

   A. Every recommendation for appointment shall be initiated by one of the several departments of the College. For regular appointments, the department shall collect pertinent information on a candidate's promise and achievement in teaching, research, and service and then convene to consider its recommendation. Following this meeting, the chair of the department shall formulate the department's recommendation, including any substantial reservations expressed by the department's members, and shall forward this recommendation and accompanying material to the Dean of the College. For visiting, adjunct, and part-time appointments, the chair of the department shall consult with members of the faculty within the department prior to formulating the department's recommendation. The chair shall then forward this recommendation to the Dean of the College.

   B. For all visiting, adjunct, and part-time appointments, and for all regular appointments at the ranks of instructor and assistant professor for a specified limited term, the Dean of the College shall in turn formulate his or her decision; if he or she wishes, the Dean of the College may also confer with representatives of the department or may request additional information from the department. After formulating his or her decision, the Dean shall inform the department of his or her decision to appoint or not to appoint the candidate.

   C. For all appointments at the rank of associate professor and professor and for all appointments carrying tenure, the Dean shall forward the department's recommendation and the material accompanying it to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee, which shall, in turn, review both the department's recommendation and the accompanying material. Departments shall ensure that documentation includes material on the candidate's teaching
and service at the prior institution, and normally six (6) statements on research by appropriate referees identified by the department in addition to letters from referees identified by the candidate. Strong documentation is especially important on candidates who seek a promotion or first-time tenure as part of their move to Emory College.

Following its review, the Committee shall send all material submitted to it and its recommendation to the Dean. If he or she wishes, the Dean of the College may also confer with representatives of the Department or with the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Having formulated his or her recommendation to make an appointment, the Dean shall inform both the Committee and the department of the recommendation and shall forward it, together with the material and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the Committee, through the Provost to the President.

3. **Departmental Reviews of Assistant and Associate Professors**

   **A. Departmental Review Procedures**

   Each department shall follow specific procedures for reviewing the research, teaching, and service of its members, who shall be informed in writing of the results of this review. These procedures shall include deadlines for completion of the file by the candidate and, where appropriate, for completion of a list of outside reviewers as specified by College guidelines. These procedures shall also include a list of the types of material desired by the department for inclusion in the file by the candidate. A candidate may introduce any materials he or she wishes so long as these materials are clearly pertinent to the criteria established by the College as appropriate for promotion and tenure. It is strongly recommended that candidates consider the “Guidelines for Submitting Promotion and Tenure Materials to the College” (Appendix A) and the “Memorandum to Emory College Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios” (Appendix B). Where appropriate, faculty should also consult the “Memorandum Regarding Evaluation of Performance Activity for Promotion and Tenure” (Appendix C) and the Memorandum Regarding the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship (Appendix D).

   Once introduced, these materials shall remain part of the file throughout the evaluation process. The departmental procedures shall be written and they shall be made available to members of the department, to the Dean of the College, to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and to the office of the Provost. All reviews shall begin in the fall term and shall conform to the guidelines set forth in this document.

   **B. Annual Review of Assistant Professors**

   Early in the fall term, chairs in each of the departments of the College shall convene the appropriate members of the department to review the progress of the department's untenured assistant and associate professors on regular appointment and to recommend to the Dean of the College whether to renew or not to renew each appointment. The sections that follow set forth procedures for evaluating the performance of all such untenured regular faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. However, since all appointments are contingent upon the needs of the department and the College and the resources of the University, eligibility for renewal of appointment does not guarantee reappointment.

   1. For assistant professors (and in rare instances where faculty have been appointed associate professor without tenure) this review shall be conducted by all tenured members of the department. For untenured faculty, beginning in their second year and continuing each year going forward, the review shall include a thorough evaluation by the department of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service. At the conclusion of this review, the chair shall summarize the department's review and state the department's recommendation for renewal or non-renewal of the faculty member's appointment. The recommendation shall be sent to the Dean of Emory College, and a copy or an accurate summary of the substance of the recommendation and evaluation shall be sent to the faculty member under review. Should the department decide to provide a summary rather than a copy of the recommendation and evaluation to the faculty member under review, it shall inform the candidate that the document is a summary and shall forward a copy of the summary to the Dean.

   2. The Pre-Tenure Assistant Professor Review: For untenured faculty beginning either their third or fourth year, but not later than the fourth year, a department's review of teaching, research, and service shall be more searching than the second and third year reviews. In evaluating research, the department shall normally seek
evaluations from faculty outside the department. There should be two such evaluations, preferably sought by the department and the Dean from qualified and objective scholars outside Emory University. In certain cases it may be appropriate to solicit faculty members from other departments or divisions of Emory. The candidate shall normally submit all materials pertinent to an outside review to the department and the Dean by 15 August. Following the departmental meeting in which a third- or fourth-year faculty member is reviewed, the chair shall write both a recommendation for renewal or non-renewal of the candidate's appointment and a detailed letter summarizing the department's evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure in the areas of research, teaching, and service. All appropriately ranked, tenured faculty in the candidate’s department are expected to participate in the department’s decision and to contribute a vote. The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member’s vote, including abstentions, must be included in the department’s letter to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Both the recommendation and the evaluation shall be forwarded to the Dean with a copy or an accurate summary of the substance of the recommendation and evaluation forwarded to the candidate, usually not later than 1 January. Should the department decide to provide a summary rather than a copy of the recommendation and evaluation to the faculty member under review, it shall inform the candidate that the document is a summary and shall forward a copy of the summary to the Dean.

3. In consultation with the Chair of his or her Department, an Assistant Professor may elect to have his or her major Pre-Tenure Assistant Professor Review (as described in B.2, above) earlier than their fourth-year of their appointment. However, unless assistant professors have held faculty positions elsewhere, such reviews usually should not take place before the third year of an Emory appointment. Regardless, any assistant professor who elects to undergo the Mid-Tenure Assistant Review before the fourth year of their appointment must notify his or her Department Chair and the Office of the Dean no later than April 1 of the previous academic year.

4. In calculating the years of service, the College shall exclude those years when the tenure clock has been formally stopped, as provided for in the “Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships.”

The Dean shall forward to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee all recommendations for renewal of appointment following pre-tenure reviews. The Committee shall in each case review the recommendation and accompanying materials and advise the Dean of its conclusions. The Dean shall inform both the department and the candidate of his or her decision. Upon receipt of a departmental recommendation not to renew an untenured faculty member's appointment, the Dean shall inform the candidate of the right to appeal as described in section VI. If a candidate elects not to appeal a department's negative recommendation, the Dean shall inform the candidate in writing of his or her decision. Candidates who are not renewed will be eligible for a final year of appointment, as provided for in the “Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships,” unless they are informed of their non-renewal prior to 31 October.

C. Review of Associate Professors

Once a year, usually in the spring semester, the tenured full professors of each department shall convene, usually under the leadership of the chair and otherwise under the leadership of an alternate designated by the Dean, to discuss the progress of all tenured associate professors. If an associate professor is judged to merit serious consideration for promotion, a thorough review of teaching, research, and service shall be conducted.

Every tenured associate professor shall be evaluated by the department at least once every five years. This evaluation should be more than cursory and should include an examination by the tenured full professors of teaching, research, and service. Outside evaluations should be solicited only if the individual is considered to be a serious candidate for promotion. Copies of the evaluation or an accurate summary of the evaluation should be given to the faculty member in question.

Both the annual review and five-year evaluation described in this section should be considered preliminary to the more thorough review required for promotion to tenured full professor. These processes, in fact, should be conducted so as to provide associate professors the best advice possible for the steps necessary for them to undergo the promotion review, as well as the appropriate timing for the promotion review. The promotion review process is described below, in Section 4B.
4. **Reviews for Promotion of Faculty on Regular Appointment**

A. **Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Assistant professors may be considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure at any time during their pre-tenure service to the College. However, the maximum length of service to the College prior to this decision shall be determined by the guidelines set forth in the Principles Determining Length of Service of Faculty Members to Establish Eligibility for Continuous Appointment. In most cases this decision will occur in a candidate's sixth year of service as an assistant professor, and in no case may it be deferred beyond that point. Candidates in their sixth year of service must either be recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure or for non-renewal. In calculating the years of service, the College shall exclude those years when the tenure clock has been formally stopped, as provided for in the “Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships.”

Candidates who are to be considered by their departments for promotion to associate professor with tenure shall submit all materials pertinent to the review to the department and the Dean no later than 15 August. Prior to formulating a recommendation either for or against promotion, furthermore, the tenured faculty shall conduct a thorough review of the candidate's teaching, research, and service as these are defined in the “Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College” above.

In evaluating teaching, the department shall consider a portfolio of materials assembled by the candidate. This portfolio should follow the “Memorandum to Emory College Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios” (Appendix B), and normally includes a candidate's statement about teaching, classroom evaluations, peer observations of teaching, and other evidence of teaching, advising, and mentoring effectiveness. The Department is encouraged to provide comparative data showing the evaluation scores of comparable courses, and may also solicit letters from current and former students.

In evaluating research, the department shall consider a portfolio of materials assembled by the candidate. This portfolio should follow the “Guidelines for Submitting Promotion and Tenure Materials” (Appendix A), and include a statement of no more than five pages describing both the research to date and future research plans, work that has been published or accepted for publication, and examples of work-in-progress. Evaluations by outside reviewers, generally six in number, will also be considered. In every case, the scholars from whom these reviews are solicited shall be selected by the Dean, in consultation with the department, from a list of approximately 15 scholars suggested by the candidate. The department may then add two names (together with alternates for these two names) to the list, and the Dean may, if he or she wishes, add up to two names to the list as well. The list shall consist of the names of scholars best qualified as authoritative, disinterested judges of the candidate's work. All letters soliciting these reviews shall be written by the Dean and all responses shall be addressed to the Dean. They shall indicate neither the department's nor the Dean's disposition toward the candidate, and they shall request candid, detailed, disinterested appraisals of the candidate's scholarly achievement and promise. Having received these letters, the Dean shall then make copies of them available to the department in advance of the departmental recommendation.

In evaluating service, the department shall consider work on departmental, College, and University committees, participation in student advising, performance and administrative duties, and other activities essential to the life of the College and the University. The candidate's contribution to his or her discipline, to outside agencies, and to the larger community may also be included. In evaluating service, two letters shall be solicited from committee chairs and other appropriate persons. The department chair and the candidate shall each suggest at least one individual adjudged best able to appraise the candidate's contribution in the area of service. All letters soliciting these evaluations of service shall be written by the Dean and all responses shall be addressed to the Dean, who shall then make them available to the department in advance of the departmental decision.

After these evaluations of the candidate's research, teaching and service have been compiled the tenured members of the department shall meet to consider its action. Following this meeting, the chair shall write a detailed letter summarizing and justifying the department's decision for or against the candidate's promotion. All appropriately ranked, tenured faculty in the candidate's department are expected to participate in the department’s decision and to contribute a vote. The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member’s vote,
including abstentions, must be included in the department’s letter to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. When a departmental decision is negative, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate's appointment not be renewed (or if the negative decision concerns promotion prior to the sixth year of service, the department may elect to recommend annual renewal).

When a departmental decision is positive, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate be promoted. A copy of the recommendation and evaluation, or an accurate written summary of the substance of the recommendation and evaluation, whether positive or negative, shall also be forwarded to the candidate. Should the department decide to provide a summary rather than a copy of the recommendation and evaluation to the faculty member under review, it shall inform the candidate that the document is a summary and shall forward a copy of the summary to the Dean. When a decision is not unanimous, the department must, in its letter to the Dean, record and explain dissenting opinions. Having reviewed the recommendation prepared by the chair on behalf of the department, each individual faculty member participating in the decision shall either sign the department's recommendation or prepare a separate letter stating his or her own recommendation. As early as feasible, usually by 31 January, the chair shall forward the department's recommendation and all material pertinent to the recommendation to the Dean.

The Dean shall inform each candidate in writing when the departmental recommendation is negative and shall advise the candidate of the right to appeal this recommendation as described in Section 6 of these guidelines. The Dean shall forward to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee all recommendations for promotion. The Committee shall then review the recommendation and accompanying materials. In each case, the Committee shall schedule meetings with the chair of the candidate's department to discuss the recommendation. In addition, each candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the Emory College Faculty, to appear before the Committee to discuss the candidate's qualifications. The Committee is empowered to gather additional information as it sees fit from the department, the candidate, and/or from appropriate persons inside or outside Emory University.

Following its review, but usually not later than 1 April, the Committee shall send both the material submitted to it and its recommendation to the Dean. The Dean shall then formulate his or her decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies; if he or she wishes, the Dean of the College may also confer with representatives of the department or with the Committee. Having formulated his or her decision, usually by 15 April, the Dean shall inform in writing the candidate and the chair of the department of his or her decision. A decision by the Dean to promote an assistant professor to associate professor with tenure shall be forwarded as a recommendation, together with the materials and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the Committee, through the Provost to the President.

B. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

In evaluating candidates judged to merit serious consideration for promotion from associate professor to professor, the tenured full professors of the department shall conduct a review evaluating the associate professor's teaching, research, and service, prior to the formulation of its recommendation. The review shall follow in thoroughness and procedure the review of assistant professors who are being considered for promotion to associate professor, its purpose being to determine whether a candidate's continuing development in research, teaching and service merits promotion. Promotion to full professor is a recognition of accomplishment in research, usually a second thrust beyond the body of work on which tenure was based, with an appropriate body of scholarly publication and with clear establishment of a national and/or international scholarly reputation in a recognized field of inquiry. Promotion to full professor is also recognition of growth and/or continuing excellence in teaching and significant contributions in service.

Following this review, the full professors shall meet to consider the department's recommendation. The chair or designated alternative shall then write a detailed letter summarizing and justifying the department's recommendation with regard to the candidate's promotion. All appropriately ranked, tenured faculty in the candidate’s department are expected to participate in the department’s decision and to contribute a vote. The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member’s vote, including abstentions, must be included in the department’s letter to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. When decisions are not unanimous, the department's recommendation shall record and explain dissenting votes. Having reviewed the
recommendation prepared by the chair on behalf of the department, each individual faculty member participating in the decision shall either sign the department's recommendation or prepare a separate letter stating his or her opinion with regard to the promotion of the candidate. As early as feasible and usually by 31 January, the chair shall forward all recommendations for promotion and all material pertinent to such recommendations to the Dean. A copy of the recommendation and evaluation or an accurate written summary of the substance of the recommendation and evaluation, whether positive or negative, shall also be forwarded to the candidate. Should the department decide to provide a summary rather than a copy of the recommendation and evaluation to the faculty member under review, it shall inform the candidate that the document is a summary and shall forward a copy of the summary to the Dean.

Having received both the department's recommendation and the material accompanying it, the Dean shall forward both the recommendation and the material accompanying it to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Committee shall in turn review both the recommendation and the accompanying material. In each case, the Committee shall schedule meetings with the chair of the candidate's department to discuss the recommendation. In addition, the candidate may choose an advocate to appear before the Committee to discuss the candidate's qualifications. Following its review, but usually not later than 1 April, the Committee shall send all the material submitted to it, together with its recommendation, to the Dean. The Dean shall then formulate his or her decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies. If he or she wishes, the Dean may also confer further with the department and the Committee. Having formulated his or her decision, usually by 15 April, the Dean shall inform the candidate, the Committee, and the chair of the department of the decision.

A decision by the Dean to promote an associate professor to full professor shall be forwarded as a recommendation, together with the material and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the Committee, through the Provost to the President.

C. Promotion of Long-Term Associate Professors

Longevity is not a sufficient basis for promotion in Emory College. Exceptional cases may exist, however, of faculty who have performed with sustained excellence in both teaching and service over a period of not less than fifteen years in the rank of associate professor and who may thereby be considered for promotion to full professor. Such a candidate's record should be strongly documented by incontestably excellent teaching evaluations, a collection of detailed letters from present and former students and from knowledgeable colleagues, and teaching awards or similar tangible evidence of distinction. The service record should show sustained, genuinely significant contributions at department and higher levels including some external professional or community involvement. With respect to research or scholarship, the record should show continuing intellectual involvement of the candidate in his or her discipline and a quality level of at least "good" on work that has been published. In consultation with the candidate's department, the Office of the Dean will secure letters from six external reviewers. At least three of these letters should address the candidate's research and scholarship; the other three may assess other professional and/or pedagogical accomplishments of the candidate. The goal of the portfolio of external letters is to assemble a full assessment of the scholarly and professional contributions of the candidate, including those that are not usually defined as research.

5. Additional Provisions and Procedures

A. A department may in principle initiate a promotion and tenure review at any time it deems appropriate. Only under unusual circumstances, however, should departments initiate reviews for assistant professors prior to their sixth year of service, or any promotion or tenure review at any time other than very early in the fall semester.

B. A candidate may in principle initiate a review for promotion or tenure at any time he or she wishes to do so. Only in the most unusual and compelling circumstances, however, should a review for promotion to full professor be initiated (a) at any time other than very early in the fall semester, or (b) more than once in any three-year period.

C. A candidate for renewal of appointment, promotion, or tenure shall be informed of the departmental recommendation and the reason or reasons for that recommendation in writing by the chair or other alternate designated by the Dean. But the contents of a department's deliberations and of all materials accompanying its
recommendation shall remain strictly confidential except as they are conveyed to the Dean of Emory College, the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee, other members of the faculty and administration whose duties require knowledge of the information, and the Board of Trustees.

D. Although the contents of a department’s deliberations should be kept strictly confidential, the department’s recommendation on a candidate must be arrived at by open voice or hand vote. Secret voting, while perhaps making the process more comfortable for the voters, undermines fairness and transparency and is unacceptable in Emory College. All appropriately ranked, tenured faculty in the candidate’s department are expected to participate in the department’s decision and to contribute a vote. The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member’s vote, including abstentions, must be included in the department’s letter to the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

E. A tie vote at the department level does not constitute a positive recommendation, but such a vote shall go forward automatically for review by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee without necessity of candidate appeal.

F. Those in a department who vote in a tenure or promotion case will be all those tenured faculty who hold appropriate rank, i.e., rank not less than that for which the candidate is being considered. This group must be at least five (5) in number. If necessary, an ad hoc promotion committee of five will be formed from the candidate’s department plus faculty of appropriate rank drawn from other departments. The candidate and/or department chair may make suggestions as to the committee appointments, but it is finally the prerogative of the Dean of the College to select the non-department membership the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate.

G. In promotion or tenure cases involving joint appointment, one department shall be clearly designated as primary locus or “tenure home.” Both departments (or department and program), however, shall conduct promotion and/or tenure reviews. The reviews shall be independent, except that both units will use the same external research evaluation letters and work together on an equitable basis in the process of selecting external evaluators. Each unit should send to the other a copy of its final written report on the candidate. Both chairs should appear at the Tenure and Promotion Committee meeting on the case. Similar separate procedures should be followed with respect to annual and fourth-year reviews of junior faculty on joint appointment.

On joint appointments with other schools or divisions of the University, some ad hoc adjustments will no doubt have to be made. But if a College department is the candidate’s tenure home, that department shall do all in its power to ensure that the other school/division participates in a timely way in selecting external evaluators and in reporting the result of its review, and that its review is recognized as full and valid within that school/division’s own system.

On joint-appointment promotion/tenure cases where the tenure home department does not have five tenured members of appropriate rank, i.e., rank not less than that for which the candidate is being considered, a single promotion committee of five shall be formed from the tenure home department plus faculty of appropriate rank drawn from other departments. The department or program constituting the non-tenure home part of the joint appointment shall be represented on the committee, and the candidate and chairs of both units may suggest appointments. But it is finally the prerogative of the Dean of the College to select the non-tenure home membership that the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate.

H. The Dean of the College is ultimately responsible for the implementation of these guidelines, and the Dean may therefore do whatever he or she deems necessary at any point in the review process to ensure that a candidate receives adequate consideration and that the candidate’s academic freedom is not violated.

I. When an appointment or promotion involves tenure, the President shall send his or her recommendation and all pertinent materials through the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees to the Board of Trustees for final action. Only positive recommendations shall be forwarded by the President to the Board of Trustees.

J. A candidate for promotion or tenure may withdraw his or her name from consideration at any point in the evaluation process.
6. Appeal Procedures

The purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that every candidate for renewal, promotion, or tenure shall receive a fair and thorough review. The appeal procedure described below offers an additional protection in the exceptional circumstances of a candidate who believes that an adverse recommendation either constitutes an infringement of his or her academic freedom or is based upon inadequate documentation and/or consideration of the evidence.

It is therefore expected that appeals will be made only in exceptional circumstances, and it is understood that the appeal procedures set forth below shall not impede or preclude other kinds of communication between faculty and administrators concerning cases of renewal, promotion, or tenure.

A. Appeal of Departmental Recommendation

1. The Dean shall notify a candidate in writing that he or she has not been recommended by the department for renewal of term appointment or promotion or tenure in his or her department and shall advise the candidate of the right to appeal such recommendation.

2. A candidate who believes that the departmental recommendation either involves an infringement of his or her academic freedom or is based upon inadequate documentation and/or consideration of the evidence and who wishes to appeal shall appeal the recommendation to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee. Such an appeal shall be made in writing not later than three (3) weeks from receipt of notice from the Dean and shall state whether it is based on an alleged infringement of his or her academic freedom or an alleged inadequate documentation and/or consideration. Within the same three-week period, following receipt of notice from the Dean, the candidate may also submit, with the written appeal document, supplemental materials relevant to the appeal. The candidate's written appeal and all supplementary materials shall be made available to the chair and/or other appropriate members of the department who may, if they choose, submit a response within one week of receipt of these materials. The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall then convene to review all materials pertinent to the issue of the appeal. As in other review hearings, the Committee meeting shall include discussion with the department chair and with the candidate's advocate, if the candidate chooses one. The Committee is empowered to gather additional information regarding the appeal from the department, the candidate, and/or from appropriate scholars inside or outside Emory University.

3. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall respond to the appeal in one of two ways:
   (a) Having found insufficient evidence to support the appeal, the Committee may recommend to the Dean that the department's recommendation be upheld.
   (b) Having concluded that the department may have failed adequately to consider or document the evidence or may have violated the candidate's academic freedom, the Committee may either (1) request that the department reconsider the credentials of the candidate and render a second recommendation to the Committee prior to the Committee's final recommendation to the Dean, or (2) move directly to make a recommendation to the Dean based on the Committee's judgment of the merits of the candidate's case.

4. In all appeal cases the Committee shall forward its final recommendation to the Dean in writing. The recommendation shall be accompanied by a written explanation of the recommendation.

5. After conferring with the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies, the Dean of the College will decide what appropriate action is to be taken and will inform the candidate, the Committee, and the Department of that action.

B. Appeal of Dean's Decision or Recommendation

After the Dean has notified a candidate and the appropriate department in writing that the candidate is not to be renewed for term appointment, or is not to be recommended through the Provost to the President for promotion to a tenured position or to full professor, the candidate may within three (3) weeks of receiving the Dean's notification appeal the Dean's decision or recommendation in writing to the Provost in accordance with procedures established by the Provost.
7. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee

A. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall consist of nine members who shall all be tenured and, if possible, all full professors. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be elected by the Committee's members for a one-year term.

B. Members of the Committee shall be elected by faculty vote to serve three-year staggered terms. The College Nominating Committee, acting in close consultation with the Dean, shall nominate three faculty members from the appropriate division for each of the annual vacancies. Constitution of divisions shall be understood as follows:

Division I (Humanities)
- African American Studies
- Art History
- Classics
- Comparative Literature
- English
- Film and Media Studies
- French and Italian
- German Studies
- Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies
- Music
- Philosophy
- Religion
- Russian and East Asian Languages & Cultures
- Spanish & Portuguese
- Theater and Dance

Division II (Social Sciences)
- Anthropology
- Economics
- History
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Division III (Natural Sciences and Mathematics)
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Environmental Sciences
- Mathematics and Computer Science
- Physics

C. No one shall serve on the Committee when the Committee is evaluating a member of his or her department. Committee membership should normally not include more than a single person from any one department.

D. The Dean may appoint alternates when members are unable to serve or, under paragraph C, are ineligible to serve.

E. For voting purposes a quorum shall be understood as constituted of at least six Committee members. The Chair shall be a voting member.

F. The names and terms of office of all Committee members shall be made public.

G. An associate dean designated by the Dean of Emory College shall serve as an ex officio (non-voting) member and secretary to the Committee.

H. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee may advise the Dean on a wide range of matters pertaining to the College, but it shall review all appointments and promotions at the rank of associate professor and professor, all recommendations for reappointment following fourth-year reviews, and all appointments involving tenure.

I. As provided for in the Bylaws of Emory College of Arts and Sciences (Article III, Sections 3-4), faculty may choose to stand for election in a division different from those outlined above.
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TENURE AND PROMOTION TIMELINE
Appendix A

Attached you will find instructions for the Tenure and Promotion process in the College of Arts and Sciences. The earlier materials are submitted to the college office, the smoother the review process will proceed. Materials should be electronically submitted to the College Office of Faculty (Dean_of_Faculty@emory.edu) as PDFs.

Spring Semester (May 1)
1) A list of potential external reviewers.
2) A list of four names of possible service reviewers.
3) A current C.V. that is dated
4) A one-page single-spaced summary of research/discipline in 12-point typeface.

Before Fall Semester (summer submission is preferable – August 15 at the latest)
1) The research statement.
2) The scholarly materials in either electronic or print form (six copies if in print, or on a flash drive or CD
3) A current C.V. that is dated.

End of Fall Semester (December 1)
1) Research dossier
2) The complete teaching portfolio.
3) The service statement and any supporting materials.
4) A current, dated C.V.
5) Scholarly materials in electronic form (for the T & P committee review).
6) *a. One-page C.V.
   *b. Five-page Personal Statement

Mid-Fall Semester to Early-Spring Semester
1) Departmental Letter (submitted by department).
2) External letters (submitted by department/college office).
3) Service Letters (submitted by department/college office).
4) One-page list of external reviewers who submitted letters to the College (submitted by department)
5) A current CV/updated (be sure that this is dated)

*These are requirements from the Provost’s Office for PAC (Presidential Advisory Committee) review and final review by the Provost’s office and Emory University Board of Trustees.
Candidate Guidelines for gathering and submitting Tenure and Promotion materials

SECTION ONE
Below are the instructions for the Tenure and Promotion process in the College of Arts and Sciences. Candidates are responsible for assembling complete dossiers. All materials are to be electronically submitted to the College Office of Faculty (Dean_of_Faculty@emory.edu).

1. **External Reviewers.**
   For tenure and promotion, gather and submit to your department chair a list of fifteen (15) names of potential external reviewers who can provide an impartial and objective review of your work. The chair and the department committee will vet the list. The department may add two additional names to the list as well as two alternatives. For tenure and promotion to Full Professor, they should be full professors.

   For pre-tenure review, gather and submit to your department chair a list of six (6) names of potential external reviewers who can provide an impartial and objective review of your work.

   For each, include the following information:
   1. Name and Academic rank/title of External Reviewer
   2. Name of Institution
   3. Email address
   4. Mailing address (no P.O. Box)
   5. Telephone and fax numbers
   6. a) brief paragraph commenting on each reviewer’s appropriateness as evaluator of your work.
       b) a statement describing any personal or professional contact you have had with them. **Co-authors, co-editors, collaborators and former advisors are not eligible.** The relationship between you and the external reviewer should be written in neutral language and not from the perspective of “I” or “me”.

   *The final list of external reviewer names will be vetted and ranked by the College Office.*

2. **Service reviewers. (not required for pre-tenure reviews)**
   Identify four potential evaluators of your service work to the University, College and or field. Include the following information:
   1. Name and title
   2. Name of Institution
   3. Email address and telephone number

3. **Complete, current, and dated C.V.**
   This document should be submitted in both a Word and PDF format.

4. **One-page single spaced layperson’s summary of your research/discipline.**

5. **Research statement of four to five pages.**

6. **Electronic version of your scholarly/research materials.**

7. **Complete teaching portfolio.**

8. **You are responsible for writing a two to three-page service statement. (not required for pre-tenure reviews)**

9. **Five-page personal statement that combines research, teaching and service. It may not exceed five pages. (not required for pre-tenure reviews)**
10. One-page Curriculum Vitae. (not required for pre-tenure reviews)
CANDIDATE PORTFOLIO GUIDELINES

SECTION TWO

PART I RESEARCH PORTFOLIO

1. Curriculum Vitae
   As you prepare your C.V. for review, please remember that it will be reviewed by a diverse committee that includes non-specialists. It is essential that the C.V. be in a format that allows easy interpretation of your scholarship and its importance within your discipline. In addition to standard biographic information, your C.V. should include a current date and information on scholarly and teaching activities, organized as follows:
   
   Scholarship
   - Please separate peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications.
   - Within peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed sections, please separate journal articles, chapters in edited volumes, reviews, edited volumes, books, and other publication types, with each section clearly delineated.
   - For co-authored publications where you are not first or senior author, please include a key or a brief sentence that indicates the nature of your specific contribution to the work. More details may also be included in the Research Section of your application.
   - Complete citations for all print publications should include page numbers.
   - Include approximate word counts for online publications without page numbers.
   - Clearly indicate the current status of work that has not yet appeared in press or is not yet accepted for publication.
   - Please include any information that may be used to indicate the importance of the work within your discipline. This may include citation information (e.g., h-index or numbers of citations for published articles), awards, etc.
   - For major articles and books not yet published or in page proofs, provide a letter or email from the editor indicating the status of the project. For example, in the case of books, confirmation that the manuscript is in production without further changes, with an expected publication date.
   - Please delineate among public presentations, invited talks, presentations selected from submitted abstracts, etc.
   - Include any funding applied for and received that is relevant to your discipline.

   Teaching
   - Include a list of courses taught and the year(s) in which they were taught. Cross-listed courses should be noted and combined into single entries
   - Indicate any courses that were co- or team-taught.
   - Separate undergraduate from graduate courses, and indicate if you developed the course.
   - List any nominations or awards related to teaching or mentorship.
   - Number or list students you have mentored in a substantial fashion (e.g., honors theses students), separating undergraduate and graduate advisees. This list should not include PACE advising and will rarely include departmental/program academic advisees.
   - Provide the number or list of Honors and Graduate committees on which you have served.

   Note that your teaching information will be more fully detailed in the Teaching Portfolio, but its inclusion in your CV will allow external reviewers to consider your teaching and mentoring efforts as part of their overall evaluation of your portfolio.

2. Layperson’s Summary Statement
   A one-page single-spaced (no more than 300 words in 12 point typeface) summary to be written in
layperson’s terms about your research. This summary will be used ONLY by the Tenure and Promotion Committee to assist them in understanding your specific area. The Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of three members from each Division in the College (Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences). For example, a committee member who is in the Humanities might not be conversant with research in Physics.

3. Research Statement (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words in 12 point typeface)
   This statement is for the external reviewers. It should include discussion of your completed research, discussion of the impact of completed research, and plans for your future research. For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference the Goldsmith memo.

4. A one-page list of the External Review Letter Writers who submitted letters to the College (prepared and submitted by the Department)
   This list should include biographical information about each reviewer and a statement about the candidate’s relationship to each reviewer.

PART II TEACHING PORTFOLIO

1) Teaching Statement (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words in 12 point typeface). This statement is for the Tenure and Promotion Committee. It should include information about your teaching philosophy and methods, and explanations of course development, curricular innovations and major contributions.

2) Summary Template
   A cover sheet that provides a summation of the data from a candidate’s teaching evaluations as provided in the sample table below. While the department can assist in creating this document, you are responsible for providing all the information. This should include all cross-listed classes and co-taught classes with total enrollment numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor Name</th>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>Proposed Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Forms Returned</th>
<th>Course Score – weighted mean</th>
<th>Instructor Score – weighted mean</th>
<th>Overall weighted mean</th>
<th>Departmental Average of courses of this size and type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Biol 250</td>
<td>Cell Biology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) One complete set of teaching evaluations. Tenure portfolios should provide all course evaluations from date of hire. Promotion portfolios need only provide the most recent 5 years.
   - Copies of all College course evaluation summary sheets.
   - Copies of structured written qualitative and quantitative evaluations from both undergraduate and graduate courses

4) Sample syllabi

5) Teaching observation letters (prepared and submitted by the Department)
These are letters from senior or peer colleagues who have observed your teaching with the purpose of commenting on the quality of teaching and noting areas for improvement and areas of excellence.

6) Student support letters (prepared and submitted by the Department)
These letters may be solicited from the department from students with whom you have done substantial work. You may give your chair a list for the department to contact. You may not contact them. Do not include “thank you” notes/letters from students.

7) List of thesis supervisions and committees. (PhD, MA, Honors).

8) Description of mentoring and advising activities and number of advisees.

9) Any other teaching related materials.

There are numerous specific ways to document excellence in teaching, including teaching awards; evidence of student and mentee achievements such as talks, grants, and publications; documentation of number of students mentored; details regarding diverse forms of mentorship; involvement in supervising teaching assistants; activities related to course and/or curriculum development; evidence of efforts to improve teaching; and/or participation in professional development for teaching.

PART III SERVICE (optional for pre-tenure reviews)

   1) Service Statement
A two to three-page statement (in 12 point typeface) that explains your service to your department, the College, the University, and to the profession at large.

   2) Service letters (submitted by the Department/College Office)

   3) Any other service related materials
You may include other materials that you would like the Tenure and Promotion Committee to consider. You may include materials from within the Emory community or to your discipline.

PART IV SCHOLARLY MATERIALS

   1) Six copies of all scholarly/research materials (flash drives, printed monographs and books).
   Note: Scholarly material for external reviewers may be submitted electronically and/or in print. All candidates for tenure and promotion must also submit a full electronic research dossier for the PAC/Provost review.

   2) Any other material the candidate would like the Tenure and Promotion Committee to consider.
Memorandum to Emory College Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios and the Evaluation of Teaching used for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure
Appendix B

Gary Laderman, chair of Tenure and Promotion Committee, on behalf of T & P

September 25, 2016

The 2016 ECAS Strategic Plan, endorsed by the Faculty Senate and forwarded to the Provost, established an expectation of teaching excellence for all faculty. The revised “Statement of Principles” defines teaching and outlines how teaching excellence is to be evaluated:

Teaching is defined as any activity undertaken by a faculty member within the formal academic programs of Emory University that contributes to the efforts of Emory students to acquire intellectual skills, to extend knowledge and understanding, or to develop attitudes and habits that foster continuing growth. Excellence in teaching draws continuously upon the teacher's ability as a scholar in the discipline. Teaching excellence is measured broadly to include instruction that is effective, imaginative, conscientious, impactful and at a high standard of expectation, and includes advising and mentoring and academic engagement outside the formal classroom. The College recognizes that teaching is both a skill and an art, and that an excellent teacher may not be equally effective in instructing, advising and mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows in every class size or format.

The quality of teaching and a candidate’s potential as a teacher are major factors affecting the decision to grant tenure and promotion. Teaching involves various contexts and pedagogical forms, including seminars, lecture halls, laboratory settings, independent study, supervising student theses and research, and advising. The mentoring of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows, when relevant, can be a highly significant part of teaching since it involves the training of a new generation of intellectual leaders.

The College recognizes that an excellent teacher may be stronger in some areas of instruction than others. Typically, excellent teachers have high standards, are conscientious, imaginative, communicate complex ideas clearly, and are aware of major pedagogical developments in their field. In helping candidates prepare teaching portfolios, chairs and mentors should encourage their colleagues to follow closely the “Candidate Portfolio Guidelines.” In tenure cases especially, chairs should encourage candidates to describe their pedagogical goals and approaches, and how their teaching has changed over the course of their probationary period.

In the department’s evaluation of teaching, the chair should communicate to the Tenure and Promotion Committee their unit’s (typically a department) disciplinary and, when appropriate, interdisciplinary teaching approaches and expectations, and the candidate’s role(s) in the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate programs. The department should provide documentation that demonstrates the full breadth of a candidate’s teaching contributions; departments should avoid over reliance on student course evaluations. There are numerous other ways to document excellence in teaching, including but not limited to: candidate teaching statements; teaching awards; peer teaching observation letters; letters from students; evidence of student and mentee achievements such as talks, grants, and publications; documentation of number of students mentored; details regarding diverse forms of mentorship; involvement in supervising teaching assistants; activities related to course and/or curriculum development; evidence of efforts to improve teaching; and/or participation in professional development for teaching.

The evaluation of teaching places an important burden on faculty and especially on chairs. Throughout the process it is important to provide thorough and fair evaluation of teaching according to the College’s “Statement of Principles.”
Memorandum to Dean Robert Paul Regarding Evaluation of Performance Activity for Promotion and Tenure David Goldsmith
May 20, 2002
Appendix C

The following is a statement of guidelines for the evaluation of performance as a research activity in the consideration of tenure and promotion. It was drafted by the Department of Music, the Department of Theater Studies, and by the program in Dance, and revised following discussion by the committee that you requested me to chair. The guidelines are intended to assist the Faculty Council in its consideration of promotion and tenure in these areas.

In addition to using these guidelines the Faculty Council will also require in such cases a statement from the department or program a statement regarding the “peer institutions” from which outside evaluations are to be solicited. The justification for the choice of evaluator and institution should be an integral part of the candidate's dossier. The committee did not attempt an evaluation of programs at other institutions at this time. That should normally be done on a case-by-case basis as candidates for tenure and/or promotion are put forward.

Promotion and Tenure Review
Artistic Research in the Performing Arts

For faculty members teaching performing arts, the performative, creative and critical pursuits are widely understood as principal activities for intellectual investigation and significant contribution to the discipline. The following tables categorize these activities and are intended to serve as guides for evaluating their relative importance in promotion and tenure decisions. Just as critical scholars and researchers use a range of literary documents to present their research findings (monographs, articles, reviews, papers), the categories of these tables organize the activities of a performing artist in a general ranking of importance. Because of the many different types of pursuits these individuals undertake we suggest that these guidelines be interpreted with sufficient flexibility in order to ascertain the relative importance of a particular activity.

These activities are organized in three ranked categories of evaluation based on one or more of the following four criteria: a) breadth of inquiry, b) length of research period, c) significance of contribution to the discipline, and d) qualitative recognition. An explanation of how each research activity meets these criteria will be provided.

Category A. Research activities recognized by the field that represent the most significant contribution to the discipline and require a substantial history of professional activity to complete. (analogous to a series of articles for the biological sciences or monographs and edited volumes for the humanities)

Category B. Research activities representing a significant contribution to the discipline with more narrowly defined scopes of inquiry and research method. (analogous to single articles for humanities and sciences)

Category C. Research activities limited in scope including initial investigations and contributions within a narrowly defined community. (analogous to short reviews and papers at academic venues)
Memorandum from the Emory College Humanities Council Regarding the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship

Adopted November 2013

Appendix D

The Humanities Council – comprised of chairs and directors of departments and programs in the humanities – recognizes the significance of digital scholarship in the humanities, and affirms the importance of assessing this scholarship fairly and carefully in decisions of faculty tenure and promotion. The precise questions asked in any tenure and promotion process are specific both to the candidate and to his or her field. However, the Humanities Council believes that the following general principles should prevail during the review process:

As in all cases with the evaluation of research, the most significant criterion in the evaluation of digital scholarship should be the contribution that the scholarship makes to its field of research. Does the scholarship advance an original research question or approach? Will it have a significant impact on a community (or communities) of scholars? These questions pertain regardless of the form or method of scholarship.

In the case of digital scholarship, the Humanities Council understands the necessity of evaluating works in their native formats; it also understands the importance of receiving evaluations from scholars who can produce informed judgments about the contributions of the scholarship. This may require that the College secure, in consultation with the department and the candidate, some external reviewers who are not located in the same department as the candidate.

In cases where digital scholarship is the result of extensive collaboration, departments will work with candidates to understand the extent and nature of the collaboration, and may invite research collaborators to write letters about the history of collaboration for the review file.

In evaluating digital scholarship, departments will attempt to ascertain the relationship between design, content, and medium. Departments will ask appropriate scholars about the compatibility of the work with prevailing technical standards, about the accessibility of the scholarship, and about the viability of long-term preservation. The nature of these questions may depend on the extent to which the scholarship has an online publishing and/or archival dimension. Departments will also seek evidence about the sustainability of the research program.

Emory College has a history of evaluating new, emerging, and interdisciplinary forms of scholarship with both rigor and fairness, and the Humanities Council believes that that College’s existing practices of review can accommodate new forms of digital scholarship as well. Thus, this memo does not supersede or in any way change the standards or practices articulated in the Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences.