

Principles and Procedures for Teaching-Track Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in Emory College of Arts and Sciences

Approved by the Board of Trustees March 14, 1996. Revised June 6, 2002. Further revised March 2007, June 2010, July 2012, May 2018, September 2018, January 2021, October 2023.

Table of Contents

1. [Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in Emory College of Arts and Sciences](#)
2. [Ranks, Searches, Qualifications for Appointment, and Terms of Appointment](#)
3. [Rights and Responsibilities of Teaching-Track Faculty](#)
4. [Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation \(FAME\) and Progress Review](#)
5. [Reappointment in Rank \(Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor\)](#)
6. [Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor](#)
7. [Promotion to Teaching Professor](#)
8. [Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#)
9. [Appeal Procedure – Reappointments and Promotions](#)
10. [Termination of Contract](#)
11. [Appendices](#)

1. Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in Emory College of Arts and Sciences

Emory College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS) has a strong group of regular faculty of which there are two subsets, namely tenure-track faculty and teaching-track faculty; both are distinct from faculty on temporary appointments. Tenure-track faculty and teaching-track faculty are full partners in advancing the vision of Emory as an institution that combines the opportunities of a tier-one research university with a strong liberal arts college experience, which makes possible the inquiry-driven, ethically responsible practice of engaged citizenship to which we aspire for ourselves and for our students. In ECAS, teaching-track faculty at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor are and should be highly valued as contributors to and leaders of the pedagogical mission, with full rights and responsibilities in faculty governance. ECAS can and should lead its peer institutions on the issue of how best to integrate regular faculty members who are, by both individual and institutional choice, in positions that offer no possibility for tenure.

The responsibilities of teaching-track faculty differ in emphasis from those of their tenure-track colleagues: they are based primarily on teaching, program administration, and service. ECAS places value on the complementary relationship between teaching and scholarly activity. Teaching-track faculty play an important role in defining that complementary relationship. Teaching-track faculty may conduct both disciplinary scholarship and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Although teaching-track faculty are under less pressure to conduct research and

publish findings in top venues, engagement with the current scholarship in one's field is an important component of teaching, as well as program administration and/or service. ECAS acknowledges the important role of teaching-track faculty in teaching, and also acknowledges the integration of scholarly activities that many bring to that role. ECAS also values institutional and individual faculty efforts dedicated to the goals of inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism. Teaching-track candidates for reappointment and promotion are invited (but not required) to share how their teaching and service (and research if applicable) activities contribute to these goals.

For tenure-track faculty, expectations for promotion, and specified evaluation procedures and schedules for such appointments, are set forth in "Principles and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences." The following document sets out similar procedures for teaching-track faculty. This document refers only to faculty appointed to full-time, multi-year positions that are not on the tenure-track. It does not refer to part-time appointments, adjunct appointments, visiting appointments, or appointments intended to be for one year only.

These principles for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and merit review are in conformity with Emory University's Affirmative Action Program, which was established on July 15, 1976 and has been updated annually. It is also in alignment with the Emory University "Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships."

2. Ranks, Searches, Qualifications for Appointment, and Terms of Appointment

2.1. Ranks and Searches

2.1.1. Ranks

The primary ranks of appointment for teaching-track faculty are Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor. Alternatively, faculty may choose the titles of Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice. All references in this document to Assistant Teaching Professor may be taken to also mean Assistant Professor of Practice. All references to Associate Teaching Professor may be taken to also mean Associate Professor of Practice. All references to Teaching Professor may be taken to also mean Professor of Practice.

2.1.2. Teaching-Track Faculty Hiring and Searches

Procedures for teaching-track faculty hiring and searches for all teaching-track appointments will be the same as for tenure-track recruitments (i.e., they will normally be national in scope).

2.1.3. Qualifications for Appointment

2.1.3.1. Appointments may take place at any rank, contingent on experience. The most important qualification is teaching ability, including classroom presence, knowledge of the subject, and familiarity with current instructional methods.

2.1.3.2. Candidates for teaching-track appointment should present the appropriate terminal degree for their field. In special cases, equivalent credentials may be approved by the department or program in consultation with the Dean of ECAS.

2.1.3.3. Candidates for appointment at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor should have experience equivalent to at least six continuous years of full-time teaching or a commensurate background in program administration.

2.1.3.4. Candidates for appointment at the rank of Teaching Professor should have substantially more teaching and administrative experience than a candidate for Associate Teaching Professor. In addition, candidates should have demonstrated teaching, service, and scholarship at levels commensurate with the criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor at ECAS.

2.2. Terms of Appointment

2.2.1. Initial Appointment

New appointments at all ranks are made for an initial probationary period, normally for three years. During the initial appointment, teaching-track faculty are reviewed annually by their chairs/directors (see [Section 4.1 Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation](#)). Additionally, in the second year of their initial appointment, teaching-track faculty are reviewed by a faculty committee (see [Section 4.2. Progress Review](#), and as specified in [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#)). Unsatisfactory performance may lead to non-reappointment following the first, second or third year of this probationary period. After the initial appointment, the term of the appointment and the timing of review will depend on rank.

2.2.2. In-Rank Terms of Appointment

After the initial appointment, the term of appointments will be determined by rank.

2.2.2.1. Appointments at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor may be up to, and will normally be, three years.

2.2.2.2. Appointments at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor may be up to, and will normally be, five years.

2.2.2.3. Appointments at the rank of Teaching Professor may be up to, and will normally be, seven years.

2.2.3. Reappointment

Appointments for all teaching-track ranks are normally renewable if performance and other circumstances warrant it. Reappointment depends not only on meritorious teaching and service, but also on continued programmatic need for the position and/or faculty member's services. Unsatisfactory annual evaluations and repeated evaluations calling for significant improvement may be grounds for a probationary year with a provisional reappointment, or for a non-reappointment.

2.2.4. Terminal Appointments

Teaching-track faculty can be reappointed for a terminal period less than a normal, in-rank appointment when the department/program and ECAS have determined that the need for the position and/or services will end.

3. Rights and Responsibilities of Teaching-Track Faculty

3.1. Teaching

As teaching and mentoring are primary elements of all teaching-track faculty appointments, teaching-track faculty will usually teach one to two courses per year above the normal teaching load of tenure-track faculty in their respective fields and disciplines. Teaching load may be partially offset by other responsibilities that affect teaching (e.g., directing undergraduate programs, directing centers or programs, or directing externally funded initiatives).

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 undergraduate and graduate students to acquire intellectual skills, to extend knowledge and understanding, or to develop attitudes and habits that foster continuing intellectual growth (see also Sections [5.1.2](#), [6.1.2](#), and [7.1.2](#) regarding department/program criteria). Excellence in teaching draws continuously upon the teacher's knowledge of the disciplinary scholarship and engagement with current research. Teaching excellence is measured broadly to include instruction that is effective, imaginative, conscientious, and meets a high standard of expectation. Teaching includes advising, mentoring, and academic engagement outside the formal classroom. Teaching excellence also includes curricular development, including work that makes the curriculum more accessible and inclusive; many teaching-track faculty have a role in developing classes and curricular materials and in teaching other faculty both at Emory and beyond. ECAS 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.

3.2. Service

Teaching-track faculty are expected to contribute through faculty committees and other

forms of academic collaboration and service. Service is defined as contributions and activities that promote the general welfare of a department/program, ECAS, or Emory University, including student advising, committee work, and administrative duties (see also Sections [5.1.2](#), [6.1.2](#), and [7.1.2](#) regarding department/program criteria). Activities that contribute to the development of a professional discipline, a professional society, or an outside agency or community also will be weighed. The idea of “service” includes displaying a collegial spirit of cooperation and collaboration and avoidance of disruptive behavior. Teaching-track faculty are eligible to serve on ECAS and Emory University faculty committees.

3.3. Scholarship

While scholarship figures differently in the responsibilities of teaching-track faculty than it does with tenure-track faculty, teaching-track faculty are encouraged to contribute to their scholarly disciplines and to the scholarship of teaching. Teaching-track faculty often contribute to the teaching mission through their work in the performing arts and fine arts, or through their experience as expert practitioners of a field. Scholarship is therefore understood broadly as including performance and practice, as well as research. Teaching-track faculty are encouraged to disseminate their scholarship in publications, performances, and presentations at national and regional conferences, or local campus and departmental forums. Teaching-track faculty at all ranks are expected to stay current in fields relevant to their teaching or administrative responsibilities.

Publication of original scholarship is not a criterion for reappointment for Assistant Teaching Professors or Associate Teaching Professors, nor is it a requirement for promotion from Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor.

Promotion to Teaching Professor demands a scholarly portfolio demonstrating national or international impact and recognition. Scholarship supporting promotion can focus either on the scholarship of teaching and learning or on disciplinary scholarship (or both), and it may include performance or other creative productions. The candidate should document how that scholarship has influenced the teaching-track teaching and service mission.

3.4. Voting

Teaching-track faculty participate as citizens of the department/program, ECAS, and Emory University in ways commensurate with their experience and responsibilities. Teaching-track faculty are eligible to vote at the ECAS-level as determined by the ECAS by-laws and at the ECAS department- or program-level as determined by the department or program by-laws. Teaching-track faculty do not vote on issues of tenure. Teaching-track faculty vote on ECAS reappointment or promotion of teaching-track faculty as determined by their rank (see [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#)). In some cases of faculty hiring, once the department/program has voted and made the recommendation for the finalist to the Dean’s Office, the Dean of ECAS reviews and may ask the department chair/program director for additional information before making a final approval.

3.5. Operating Support and Proposals and Grants

3.5.1. Operating Support

Teaching-track faculty will have appropriate office space and computer equipment, and access to the same support for their teaching and service role as tenure-track faculty. Teaching-track faculty are eligible for department, program, or center travel and professional development funds.

3.5.2. Proposals and Grants

Teaching-track faculty are eligible to apply for internal support for pedagogy and scholarship on the same basis as tenure-track faculty. Teaching-track faculty may submit proposals for external grants for both pedagogical and scholarly purposes.

4. Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation (FAME) and Progress Review

4.1. Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation (FAME)

Teaching-track faculty, like all instructional staff including tenure-track faculty, must be evaluated annually by their chair/director, or other supervisor as determined by the Dean of ECAS. Evaluations will be kept on file as a partial basis for decisions about reappointment and promotion. The chair/director will promptly report the results of each annual evaluation to the faculty member under review.

Unsatisfactory annual evaluations and repeated evaluations calling for significant improvement may be grounds for a probationary year with a provisional reappointment, or for a non-reappointment.

4.2. Progress Review During Initial Appointment

Starting in the first year of an initial appointment, a newly hired teaching-track faculty will undergo the regular Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation (see [Section 4.1 Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation](#)). No additional Progress Review is required in the first year. Either in the fall or spring term of the second year of a faculty member's initial three-year appointment, the chair or director shall convene a review committee for a Progress Review. Composition of this committee is determined by [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#). The review committee will consider the faculty member's teaching and service, and in the case of a Teaching Professor, scholarship.

5. Reappointment in Rank (Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor)

5.1. Reappointment Process and Timeline

5.1.1. Reappointment Process

For reappointments at any rank, the faculty member submits their reappointment dossier early in the fall semester during the last academic year of their current appointment. The review of the faculty member's dossier begins in the fall and proceeds over the academic year, concluding by the spring semester of the appointment's final year.

5.1.2. Criteria

To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS requires departments and programs to develop specific written criteria for reappointment that outline teaching and service expectations and where applicable, scholarship expectations. The department or program will revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in department or program evaluations of candidates.

5.1.3. Timeline

Timeline for Reappointment in Rank	
Chair/director certifies the continuation of the position	May 1
Candidate submits reappointment dossier	September 15
Department/program recommendation due	November 15

5.1.4. Certify the Continuation of the Position

Since all teaching-track appointments are contingent upon the needs and resources of the department/program and ECAS, eligibility for reappointment does not guarantee reappointment. A teaching-track position may be discontinued because of changes to the academic personnel needs of the department or program.

In the spring semester prior to the reappointment review, the department or program will determine whether the position should continue to be supported and make a recommendation to the Dean of ECAS via an online form distributed by the ECAS Office of Faculty. If ECAS plans to continue supporting the position, the candidate will be informed and the reappointment process will continue. If the position is not continued, ECAS will notify the faculty member by June 1, prior to the final year of their appointment.

5.1.5. Submit Reappointment Dossier

Candidates must upload materials to their reappointment case in the Interfolio RPT system (<http://www.emory.edu/facet>) by September 15. Guidelines for materials for the reappointment dossier may be found in [Appendix A](#) “Guidelines for Teaching-Track Reappointment and Promotion Dossiers.”

5.1.6. Letters of Evaluation

- Number of potential reviewers = 5
- Letters of evaluation from reviewers are solicited by the chair.
- The final number of reviewer letters needed = 2

The reappointment dossier will include two letters of evaluation from Emory faculty. In some cases, it is also acceptable to have an ECAS or university administrator write a letter in the context of service. The letters will be solicited by the chair/director from a list of five faculty members that includes at least one proposed by the candidate. Except for during a candidate’s first reappointment review, at least one of the two evaluators must be from a department or program different than the candidate’s. The chair or director must ensure that at least one of the faculty evaluators has previously observed the candidate’s teaching and that they will address teaching in their letter. The other evaluator must be able to address mentoring and service contributions (both letters may refer to teaching, mentoring, and service). The faculty rank guidelines for voting on cases also apply for writing letters of evaluation (see [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#)).

5.2. Recommendation by the Department/Program Reappointment Committee

The chair/director will form a department/program reappointment committee appropriate to the rank of the candidate, as specified in [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#). All appropriately ranked faculty in the candidate’s department/program are expected to participate in the department’s or program’s recommendation and to contribute a vote. No abstentions are permitted unless a faculty member cannot attend the meeting for compelling and unusual reasons (i.e. health reasons). The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member’s vote must be included in the department/program letter. The group of faculty who vote on reappointment or promotion must be at least five in number. If necessary, an ad hoc reappointment committee of five will be formed from the candidate’s department/program plus faculty of appropriate rank drawn from other departments/programs. The candidate and/or department chair or program director may make suggestions as to the committee appointments, but the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty has the final prerogative in selecting the non-department/program membership.

The reappointment committee will review the candidate’s teaching, service, and (when appropriate) scholarship. There will be one vote regarding whether the candidate’s teaching meets the criteria for reappointment, one vote regarding whether the candidate’s service meets the criteria for reappointment, one vote on whether the candidate’s scholarship meets the criteria for reappointment (if applicable), and an overall vote on reappointment. A

recommendation in support of reappointment requires affirmative votes on teaching, service, and scholarship (if applicable). The chair/director will write a letter summarizing the reappointment committee's recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment. By November 15, the chair/director will upload the letter, addressed to the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty and signed by the chair/director, to the candidate's reappointment case in Interfolio RPT.

The chair/director will also provide a redacted copy (that does not include any identifying information regarding the names of reviewers, students, etc.) or an accurate summary of the recommendation to the faculty member under review. Should the department/program decide to provide a summary rather than a redacted 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 ECAS Office of Faculty. Upon receipt of a departmental recommendation not to renew a faculty member's appointment, the Dean shall inform the candidate of the recommendation and of the candidate's right to appeal as described in [Section 9, Appeal Procedure – Reappointments and Promotions](#).

5.3. Decision by the Dean

The Dean of ECAS makes the final decision on the reappointment. The ECAS Office of Faculty informs the candidate of the decision, and this constitutes the final step in the review process.

5.4. Appeal

Non-reappointment recommendations from the department/program may be appealed. [Section 9, Appeal Procedure – Reappointments and Promotions](#) defines the scope and process for appeal.

6. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

6.1. Promotion Process and Timeline

6.1.1. Eligibility

Assistant Teaching Professors are eligible for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor after at least six years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor. However, they can wait until a later time to initiate the promotion process. Typically, promotion cases happen in the same year that the candidate is due for a reappointment review. In special cases, an Assistant Teaching Professor with an equivalent appointment at a previous institution may be considered for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor before this six-year period.

6.1.2. Criteria

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will be based on noteworthy teaching and service in ECAS, Emory University, or within the profession. Noteworthy performance is teaching that meets the criteria of excellence expected of an Assistant Teaching Professor ready to assume the responsibilities and contributions expected of an Associate Teaching Professor and service that meets the criteria for satisfactory department/program citizenship expected of an Assistant Teaching Professor ready to assume the responsibilities and contributions expected of an Associate Teaching Professor. While not required, candidates applying for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor may include evidence of scholarship and professional development.

To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS requires departments and programs to develop specific written criteria for promotion that outline teaching and service expectations. The department or program will revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in department or program evaluations of candidates.

6.1.3. Timeline

Timeline for Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor	
Notification of intent	May 1
Chair/director certifies the continuation of the position (if applicable)	May 1
Candidate submits promotion dossier	September 15
Department/program recommendation due	November 15
Teaching-Track Promotion Committee recommendation due	By the following spring semester

6.1.4. Notification

The candidate must notify their chair or director that they intend to be considered for promotion. The chair/director informs the ECAS Office of Faculty of the candidate's plans to be considered for promotion by May 1. The candidate and the chair/director should confer on the best way to represent the candidate's teaching and service record.

6.1.5. Certify the Continuation of the Position

If (and only if) a review for promotion coincides with a reappointment review, the continuation of the position must be certified. In such conditions, the department or program will determine whether the position should continue to be supported and make a recommendation to the Dean of ECAS via an online form distributed by the ECAS Office of

Faculty. If ECAS plans to continue supporting the position, the candidate will be informed and the reappointment and promotion process will continue. If the position is not continued, ECAS will notify the faculty member by June 1, prior to the final year of their appointment.

6.1.6. Submit Promotion Dossier

Candidates must upload materials to their promotion case in the Interfolio RPT system (<http://www.emory.edu/facet>) by September 15. Guidelines for materials for the promotion dossier may be found in [Appendix A](#) “Guidelines for Teaching-Track Reappointment and Promotion Dossiers.”

6.1.7. Letters of Evaluation

- Number of potential reviewers = 5
- Letters of evaluation from reviewers are solicited by the chair.
- The final number of reviewer letters needed = 3

The promotion to associate teaching professor dossier will include three letters of evaluation (covering teaching, mentoring and service) from Emory faculty. In some cases, it is also acceptable to have an ECAS or university administrator write a letter in the context of service. The letters will be solicited by the chair/director from a list of faculty members chosen in consultation with the candidate. While not all of the evaluators need to be chosen by the candidate, when possible, one of the three letters in the dossier should be from someone proposed by the candidate. At least one of the three evaluators must be from a department or program different than the candidate's. The chair or director must ensure that at least one of the faculty evaluators has previously observed the candidate's teaching and that they will address teaching in their letter. The other evaluators must be able to address mentoring and service contributions (multiple letters may refer to teaching, mentoring, and service). The faculty rank guidelines for voting on cases also apply for writing letters of evaluation (see [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#)).

6.2. Recommendation by the Department/Program Promotion Committee

The chair/director will form a department/program promotion committee appropriate to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, as specified in [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#). All appropriately ranked faculty in the candidate's department/program are expected to participate in the department's or program's recommendation and to contribute a vote. No abstentions are permitted unless a faculty member cannot attend the meeting for compelling and unusual reasons (i.e. health reasons). The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member's vote must be included in the department/program letter. The group of faculty who vote on reappointment or promotion must be at least five in number. If necessary, an ad hoc promotion committee of five will be formed from the candidate's department/program plus faculty of appropriate rank drawn from other departments/programs. The candidate and/or department chair or program director may make suggestions as to the committee appointments, but the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty has the final prerogative in selecting the non-department/program membership.

This promotion committee will review the candidates' teaching, service, and (when appropriate) scholarship. At the end of its review of the candidate's dossier, the promotion review committee must conduct a vote. There will be one vote regarding whether the candidate's teaching meets the criteria for promotion, one vote regarding whether the candidate's service meets the criteria for promotion, and an overall vote on promotion. A recommendation in support of promotion requires affirmative votes on both teaching and service. A report on the final vote tallies, along with a summary of the review committee's assessment of the candidate's teaching, mentorship, service, and (when appropriate) scholarship, and its recommendation for promotion or non-promotion should be provided in a chair/director letter. The chair/director's letter should be signed by all faculty eligible to participate in the review. By November 15, the chair/director will upload the recommendation, addressed to the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty, to the candidate's promotion case in Interfolio RPT.

The chair/director will also provide a redacted copy (that does not include any identifying information regarding the names of reviewers, students, etc.) or an accurate summary of the recommendation to the faculty member under review. Should the department/program decide to provide a summary rather than a copy of the redacted 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 ECAS Office of Faculty.

6.3. Recommendation by the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee

The Teaching-Track Promotion Committee reviews the candidate's dossier, the letters, and the department/program recommendation. The Committee may also review the candidate's annual evaluations. The Committee will routinely invite the department chair or program director to its meeting if required to answer any questions concerning the case for promotion. In addition, the candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the ECAS faculty, to appear before the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee to discuss the candidate's qualifications. The Teaching-Track Promotion Committee casts one vote regarding whether the candidate's teaching meets the criteria for promotion, one vote regarding whether the candidate's service meets the criteria for promotion, and an overall vote on promotion. A recommendation in support of promotion requires affirmative votes on both teaching and service. The Teaching-Track Promotion Committee forwards its recommendation to the Dean of ECAS.

6.4. Decision by the Dean

The Dean of ECAS makes the final decision on the promotion. The ECAS Office of Faculty informs the candidate of the decision, and this constitutes the final step in the review process.

6.5. Denial of Promotion

Candidates who are denied promotion may be reappointed at their current rank. Except in unusual circumstances, candidates who are denied promotion must wait for three years before another application for promotion.

6.6. Appeal

Denial of promotion may be appealed. [Section 9, Appeal Procedure – Reappointments and Promotions](#) defines the scope and process for appeal.

7. Promotion to Teaching Professor

7.1. Promotion Process and Timeline

7.1.1. Eligibility

To be eligible for promotion to Teaching Professor, an Associate Teaching Professor must have completed five years of service in rank. However, they can wait until a later time to initiate the promotion process. Typically, promotion cases happen in the same year that the candidate is due for a reappointment review. In special cases, an Associate Teaching Professor with an equivalent appointment at a previous institution may be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor before this five-year period.

7.1.2. Criteria

The rank of Teaching Professor is the highest academic rank for teaching-track faculty in ECAS. It signifies a level of excellence beyond that of the rank of Associate Teaching Professor and the normal requirements of classroom teaching, mentorship, and advising.

Promotion to Teaching Professor is based on noteworthy scholarship as well as significant and sustained teaching and service contributions. Noteworthy scholarship should have national and/or international impact and recognition, and can focus either on the scholarship of teaching and learning or on disciplinary scholarship (or both), and it may include performance or other creative productions (refer to [Appendix B](#), “Memorandum Regarding Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases in the Creative and Performing Arts”). The file may include public scholarship and other contributions to the pedagogical aspect of one’s field. It is expected that the candidate’s courses or teaching philosophy should benefit from their disciplinary scholarship. The candidate should document how that scholarship has influenced the teaching-track teaching and service mission.

To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS requires departments and programs to develop specific written criteria for promotion that outline scholarship, teaching, and service expectations. The department or program will revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in department or program evaluations of candidates.

7.1.3. Timeline

Timeline for Promotion to Teaching Professor	
Notification of intent	January 15
Chair/director certifies the continuation of the position (if applicable)	February 1
Candidate submits promotion dossier and list of potential evaluators	March 15
Department/program uploads vetted evaluator lists	April 1
Department/program recommendation due	November 15
Teaching-Track Promotion Committee recommendation due	By the following spring semester

7.1.4. Notification

The candidate must notify their chair or director that they intend to be considered for promotion. The chair/director informs the ECAS Office of Faculty of the candidate's plans to be considered for promotion by January 15. The candidate and the chair/director should confer on the best way to represent the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service record.

7.1.5. Certify the Continuation of the Position

If (and only if) a review for promotion coincides with a reappointment review, the continuation of the position must be certified. In such a condition, the department or program will determine whether the position should continue to be supported and make a recommendation to the Dean of ECAS via an online form distributed by the ECAS Office of Faculty. If ECAS plans to continue supporting the position, the candidate will be informed and the reappointment and promotion process will continue. If the position is not continued, ECAS will notify the faculty member by March 1.

7.1.6. Submit Promotion Dossier

Candidates must upload materials to their promotion case in the Interfolio RPT system (<http://www.emory.edu/facet>) by March 15. Guidelines for materials for the promotion dossier may be found in [Appendix A](#) "Guidelines for Teaching-Track Reappointment and Promotion Dossiers."

7.1.7. Letters of Evaluation

- Number of potential reviewers = 8 external to Emory; 4 internal to Emory
- Letters of evaluation from reviewers are solicited by the ECAS Office of Faculty
- The final number of reviewer letters needed = 2 external to Emory; 2 internal to

Emory

The dossier for promotion to Teaching Professor requires four letters of evaluation: two letters from faculty outside of Emory, and two letters from Emory faculty. By March 15, the candidate should submit:

7.1.7.1. A list of eight senior faculty reviewers external to Emory, preferably from peer institutions, who can provide an impartial and objective review of the scholarly portfolio, teaching materials (teaching statement, sample syllabi), and service statement. The ECAS Office of Faculty will solicit two letters from this list.

For each, include the following information:

- Name and academic rank/title of external reviewer
- Name of institution
- Email address
- Brief paragraph commenting on each reviewer's appropriateness as an evaluator of the candidate's work
- Statement describing any personal or professional contact the candidate has had with the reviewer. Co-authors, co-editors, collaborators, former advisors, and former and current department/program colleagues are not eligible. The relationship between the candidate and the external reviewer should be written in neutral language (i.e. The candidate has never cowritten an article or collaborated on a grant with this reviewer).

7.1.7.2. A list of four senior Emory faculty evaluators of the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service from which ECAS Office of Faculty will solicit two letters. In some cases, it is also acceptable to have an ECAS or university administrator write a letter in the context of service. For each, include the following information:

- Name and title
- Name of department/program
- Email address
- A brief paragraph commenting on each reviewer's appropriateness as an evaluator of the candidate's work.

7.1.7.3. The chair or director must ensure that at least one of the potential Emory faculty evaluators has previously observed the candidate's teaching; this should be clearly noted on the list. Other evaluators must be able to address mentoring and service contributions (multiple letters may refer to teaching, mentoring, and service). The faculty rank guidelines for voting on cases also apply for writing letters of evaluation (see [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#)).

7.1.7.4. The department or program reviews and approves the list of external reviewers and the list of Emory faculty evaluators and posts them in the candidate's promotion case in Interfolio RPT by April 1. The ECAS Office of Faculty then solicits two external letters of evaluation and two internal letters.

7.3. Recommendation by the Department/Program Promotion Committee

The chair/director will form a department/program promotion committee appropriate to the rank of Teaching Professor, as specified in [Section 8, Voting on Reappointment and Promotion](#). All appropriately ranked faculty in the candidate's department/program are expected to participate in the department's or program's recommendation and to contribute a vote. No abstentions are permitted unless a faculty member cannot attend the meeting for compelling and unusual reasons (i.e. health reasons). The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member's vote must be included in the department/program letter. The group of faculty who vote on reappointment or promotion must be at least five in number. If necessary, an ad hoc promotion committee of five will be formed from the candidate's department/program plus faculty of appropriate rank drawn from other departments/programs. The candidate and/or department chair or program director may make suggestions as to the committee appointments, but the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty has the final prerogative in selecting the non-department/program membership.

This promotion committee will review the candidates' teaching, service, and scholarship. In the fall, ECAS will deliver to the department/program the letters from the external and internal reviewers. At the end of its review of the candidate's dossier, the review committee must conduct a vote. There will be one vote regarding whether the candidate's teaching meets the criteria for promotion, one vote regarding whether the candidate's service meets the criteria for promotion, one vote regarding whether the candidate's scholarship meets the criteria for promotion, and an overall vote on promotion. A recommendation in support of promotion requires affirmative votes on teaching, service, and scholarship. A report on the final vote tallies, along with a summary of the review committee's assessment of the candidate's teaching, mentorship, service, and scholarship, and its recommendation for promotion or non-promotion should be provided in a chair/director letter. The chair/director's letter should be signed by all faculty eligible to participate in the review. By November 15, the chair/director will upload the recommendation, addressed to the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty, to the candidate's promotion case in Interfolio RPT.

The chair/director will also provide a redacted copy (that does not include any identifying information regarding the names or the institutions of reviewers, students, etc.) or an accurate summary of the recommendation to the faculty member under review. Should the department/program decide to provide a summary rather than a redacted 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 ECAS Office of Faculty.

7.4. Recommendation by the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee

The Teaching-Track Promotion Committee reviews the candidate's dossier, the internal and external letters, and the recommendation of the department/program. The Committee will routinely invite the department chair or program director to its meeting if required to answer any questions concerning the case for promotion. In addition, the candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the ECAS faculty, to appear before the Teaching-Track

Promotion Committee to discuss the candidate's qualifications. The Teaching-Track Promotion Committee casts one vote regarding whether the candidate's teaching meets the criteria for promotion, one vote regarding whether the candidate's service meets the criteria for promotion, one vote regarding whether the candidate's scholarship meets the criteria for promotion, and an overall vote on promotion. A recommendation in support of promotion requires affirmative votes on teaching, service, and scholarship. The Teaching-Track Promotion Committee forwards its recommendation to the Dean of ECAS.

7.5. Decision by the Dean

The Dean of ECAS makes the final decision on the promotion. The ECAS Office of Faculty informs the candidate of the decision, and this constitutes the final step in the review process.

7.6. Denial of Promotion

Candidates who are denied promotion may be reappointed at their current rank. Except in unusual circumstances, candidates who are denied promotion must wait for three years before another application for promotion.

7.7. Appeal

Denial of promotion may be appealed. [Section 9, Appeal Procedure – Reappointments and Promotions](#) defines the scope and process for appeal.

8. Voting on Reappointment and Promotion

8.1. Constitution of the Department/Program Reappointment/Promotion Committee

Departments and programs will vote on reappointment and promotion as a committee of the whole with the following provisions based on faculty rank:

For the reappointment of Assistant Teaching Professors and for the promotion of Assistant Teaching Professors to Associate Teaching Professors, all department/program faculty at the rank of Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor will participate in the review and voting process.

For the reappointment of Associate Teaching Professors, all department/program faculty at the rank of Teaching Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor will participate in the review and voting process.

For the promotion of Associate Teaching Professors to Teaching Professor, and for the reappointment of Teaching Professor, all department/program faculty at the rank of Teaching Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor will participate in the review and voting process.

All appropriately ranked faculty in the candidate's department/program are expected to participate in the department's or program's recommendation and to contribute a vote. No abstentions are permitted unless a faculty member cannot attend the meeting for compelling and unusual reasons (i.e. health reasons). The explicit reason(s) for the absence of any appropriately ranked faculty member's vote must be included in the department/program letter.

8.2. Quorum

The group of faculty who vote on reappointment or promotion must be at least five in number. If necessary, an ad hoc promotion committee of five will be formed from the candidate's department/program plus faculty of appropriate rank drawn from other departments/programs. The candidate and/or department chair or program director may make suggestions as to the committee appointments, but the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty has the final prerogative in selecting the non-department/program membership.

If there are no Associate Teaching Professors or Teaching Professors in the department or program at the time of the review who are eligible to vote on the reappointment or promotion, one from within the same division will be appointed by the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty to serve on the department/program committee.

9. Appeal Procedure – Reappointments and Promotions

The purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that every candidate for reappointment and promotion 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 their 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.

9.1. Notification

In positive reappointment/promotion cases, the candidate will be informed by the Dean of ECAS of their reappointment or promotion.

For negative reappointment cases, the Dean of ECAS shall notify a candidate in writing if they have not been recommended for reappointment by the department/program or by the Dean. For negative promotion cases, the Dean of ECAS shall notify a candidate in writing if they have not been recommended for promotion by the department/program, the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee, or by the Dean. The Dean's Office will advise the candidate of the right to appeal.

9.2. Grounds for Appeal

For reappointment and promotion cases in which the Dean has decided not to support a candidate, there is no mode of appeal. In reappointment and promotion cases where the negative recommendation comes from the department/program and/or the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee, a candidate may appeal this recommendation for one or more of the following reasons:

- The recommendation involves an infringement of academic freedom.
- The evidence in the submitted dossier was not properly considered in reference to the criteria for reappointment or promotion.
- Procedural errors led to the negative outcome.

9.3. Submission of Appeal

An appeal of a reappointment and/or promotion recommendation must be made in writing to the ECAS Teaching-Track Promotion Committee not later than three weeks from receipt of notice from the Dean of ECAS. The appeal document shall state which of the grounds in [9.2. Grounds for Appeal](#) is the basis for the appeal and present the argument. 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/director and other appropriate members of the department or program who may, if they choose, submit a response within one week of receipt of these materials.

9.4. Advocate

The candidate may choose a faculty advocate from ECAS to appear before the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee (see [9.5.1.](#) and [9.5.2](#)) to discuss the candidate's case.

9.5. Formation of the Appeal Committee

9.5.1. Appeal of Non-Reappointment

When a non-reappointment recommendation is appealed, the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee shall convene to review all materials pertinent to the issues of the appeal.

9.5.2. Appeal of Non-Promotion

When a non-promotion recommendation at the department/program level is appealed, the appeal shall be considered by the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee. When a non-promotion recommendation by the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee is appealed, the appeal will be considered by the Dean.

9.5.3. Deliberation

The appeal committee shall meet with the candidate's chair and advocate, if the candidate chooses one. The appeal committee is empowered to gather additional information regarding the appeal from the department/program, the candidate, ECAS administration, and/or from appropriate scholars inside or outside Emory University.

9.5.4. Response

The appeal committee shall respond to the appeal in one of two ways:

- Having found insufficient evidence to support the appeal, the appeal committee may recommend to the Dean of ECAS that the earlier recommendation be upheld.
- Having concluded that the appeal has merit, the appeal committee may either (1) request that the department/program reconsider the credentials of the candidate and render a second recommendation to the appeal committee prior to the committee's final recommendation to the Dean of ECAS, or (2) move directly to make a recommendation to the Dean of ECAS based on the appeal committee's judgment of the merits of the candidate's case.

9.5.5. Recommendation to the Dean

In all appeal cases the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee shall forward its final recommendation and an explanation of the recommendation to the Dean of ECAS in writing.

9.6. Decision by the Dean

Final decisions on appeals rest with the Dean of ECAS.

If the appeal process leads to a probationary period, and if after the probationary period it is found that no reappointment will be granted, there will be no further process for appeal.

10. Termination of Contract

10.1. Grounds

The Dean of ECAS, after consultation with the department chair or program director, may terminate an appointment before its completion on the following basis:

- Due to significant reorganization, reduction, or elimination of a program
- Where specifically authorized by the Board of Trustees

In rare cases, as with tenure-track faculty, it may be necessary to terminate the appointment of a teaching-track faculty during the contract term. Examples of such circumstances include, but are not limited to moral delinquency, neglect of academic duty, incompetence, or permanent physical or mental incapacity for which there is no reasonable accommodation.

10.2. Notification

Notice of such termination will be given as promptly as possible under the circumstances.

10.3. Appeal

Termination of a position on the grounds specified in [10.1. Grounds](#) cannot be appealed.

11. Appendices

[Appendix A](#): Guidelines for Teaching-Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Dossiers

[Appendix B](#): Memorandum Regarding Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases in the Creative and Performing Arts

Appendix A: Guidelines for Teaching-Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Dossiers

Developed by the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee and approved by the Dean of Emory College and the Provost of Emory University, January 22, 2009. Revised, May 2010. Further revised, May 2018, November 2022, March 2023.

Introduction

Reappointment and promotion are important occasions for all faculty and are based on the candidate's teaching, service, and (where appropriate) scholarship. It is a moment when accomplishments can be recognized and acknowledged. Departments and programs are required to develop their own criteria for noteworthy teaching (and scholarship where applicable) and satisfactory service in the context of both reappointment and promotion.

The dossier is the primary source of information available to all of those called upon to evaluate a candidate's performance. These dossier guidelines have been developed by the Teaching-Track Promotion Committee to aid candidates and their chairs or directors in determining how best to make the case for reappointment or promotion. It is essential, then, that the dossier documents the candidate's accomplishments and presents a narrative that communicates the candidate's teaching, service, and (where appropriate) scholarship in an accurate, complete, and clear way. Materials in each of these areas should be introduced by a statement in which the candidate synthesizes and explains the significance of the specific elements in their dossier. The statements should work together to make the case for reappointment or promotion. Dossiers for reappointment without promotion may be less comprehensive, but candidates and chairs/directors should bear in mind the importance of documenting the grounds for reappointment.

Candidates are responsible for assembling complete dossiers. On time or early submission of documents leads to a smoother review process. Materials should be submitted electronically through the Interfolio RPT system (<http://www.emory.edu/facet>).

	REAPPOINTMENT	PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR	PROMOTION TO TEACHING PROFESSOR
Candidate Dossier			
DUE DATE	September 15	September 15	March 15
CV	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Teaching Statement	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Sample Syllabi	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Mentoring Statement	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Other Teaching Materials	Optional for all ranks	Optional	Optional
Service Statement	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Other Service Materials	Optional for all ranks	Optional	Optional
Scholarship Statement	Required for Teaching Professor, optional for other ranks	Optional	Required
Scholarly Materials	Required for Teaching Professor, optional for other ranks	Optional	Required
COVID-19 Statement	Optional for all ranks	Optional	Optional
COVID-19 Statement Form	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
DEI Statement	Optional for all ranks	Optional	Optional
DEI Statement Form	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Teaching Evaluations			
DUE DATE	Prior to department/ program case review	Prior to department/program case review	Prior to department/ program case review
Summary Teaching Template	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Teaching Evaluations	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Other Items Uploaded by Department/Program			
DUE DATE	Prior to department/ program case review	Prior to department/program case review	Prior to department/ program case review
Teaching Observation Letters	Required for all ranks	Required	Required
Student Review Letters	Optional for all ranks	Required	Required
Letters of Evaluation			
DUE DATE	Prior to department/ program case review	Prior to department/program case review	Approved reviewer lists due April 1
Letters of Evaluation	Two letters, solicited by chair/director	Three letters, solicited by chair/director	Four letters, solicited by ECAS Office of Faculty

Candidate Dossier

Curriculum Vitae

Because the CV is the primary form of professional representation, a minimal dossier must include a CV. Candidates for promotion should remember that the CV will be reviewed by a diverse committee that includes non-specialists. It is essential that the CV be in a format that allows easy interpretation of the candidate's teaching, service, and scholarship and its importance within the candidate's discipline.

In addition to standard biographic information, the CV should include a current date and information on scholarly, teaching, and service activities, organized as follows:

Name and contact information

Education

Academic appointments/employment

Teaching

- Awards or Honors
 - List any nominations or awards related to teaching or mentorship.
- Professional Development (QEP, Piedmont Project, CFDE training, etc.)
- Courses Taught
 - 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 the candidate developed the course.
- Online Teaching Resources
- Student Supervision
 - List students the candidate has mentored in a substantial fashion (e.g., honors theses students), separating undergraduate and graduate advisees. This list should not include first-year student mentoring and will rarely include department/program academic advisees.
 - List the honors and graduate committees on which the candidate has served (i.e., Postdoctoral Advising, PhD Supervision, Masters Supervision, Undergraduate Honors Thesis Supervision). Create separate subsections to delineate between role as chair or committee member.

Service

- Committee service
 - Create separate subsections to delineate among department/program, ECAS, and university-level committees.
- Faculty advising for student groups

- Editorial roles, roles with national and international organizations
- Service as an external department/program reviewer, tenure or promotion reviewer, manuscript reviewer
- Community outreach
- Professional memberships

Scholarship (Publications, Grants, Fellowships and Awards, Presentations, Conferences)

- Publications
 - Separate peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications.
 - Within peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed sections, separate journal articles, chapters in edited volumes, reviews, edited volumes, books, and other publication types, with each section clearly delineated. (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 with no further changes*, with an expected publication date. Please upload project status updates to the case in Interfolio as they are received from your editor.)
 - For co-authored publications, include a brief sentence that indicates the nature of the candidate's specific contribution to the work. More details may also be included in the scholarship section of the candidate's dossier.
 - Complete citations for all print publications should include dates of publication and 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 (submitted, under review, revise and resubmit, etc.).
 - Include any information that may be used to indicate the importance of the work within the candidate's discipline. This may include citation information (e.g., h-index or numbers of citations for published articles), awards, book prizes, number of times the publication has been reviewed, etc.
- Grants
 - Include grants with funding amounts, dates, total awards, and number served as PI or Co-PI, etc.
- Fellowships and Awards
- Presentations
 - Create separate subsections to delineate among keynotes, invited talks, conference presentations, public scholarship such as media interviews, presentations selected from submitted abstracts, campus talks, etc.

Teaching Statement

Not more than 2,500 words in 12 point typeface. The statement should articulate the pedagogical dimensions of the candidate's contribution to their field and its pedagogy. It should synthesize and explain their pedagogical contributions, including teaching philosophy and methods, explanations of course development, curricular and pedagogical innovations, and other major contributions to teaching.

Sample Syllabi

- 3-5 syllabi recommended

Mentoring Statement and List

List and describe participation on honors committees, research supervision, and other mentoring and advising activity.

Other Teaching Materials

There are numerous ways to document excellence in teaching. Example of topics in this section include:

- Teaching awards
- Evidence of student and mentee achievements such as talks, grants, and publications
- Involvement in supervising teaching assistants
- Activities related to courses and/or curriculum development
- Teaching activities related to public scholarship

Service Statement

Not more than 1,500 words in 12 point typeface. The statement should articulate the service dimensions of the candidate's contribution to their field and its pedagogy. It should synthesize and explain their service contributions to their department, program, or center; ECAS; Emory University; and to the profession at large. The statement may also discuss service to the community and/or public sphere, which may encompass such activities as the organization of conferences, panels, speaker series; service to professional organizations; policy and strategic studies; inter-institutional committees; activities related to accreditation; community partnerships; public advocacy; and service to the community through engagement in economic or cultural development, public education, etc.

Other Service Materials

- Examples include community outreach and K-12 mentoring.

Scholarly Portfolio for Teaching Professor Promotion and Reappointment

The scholarly portfolio encompasses scholarship of teaching and learning, disciplinary scholarship, work in the performing arts and fine arts, and/or experience as expert practitioner of a field. Scholarship to be included should specifically inform pedagogy, practice, or performance through an enrichment of the candidate's teaching and professional development and a direct connection with the central teaching-track mission of teaching, mentorship, and advising.

A scholarly portfolio is required for Associate Teaching Professors seeking promotion to Teaching Professor. Reappointment reviews for Teaching Professors should also document continuing

excellence in scholarship. It is not required for other reviews or promotions, but it may be included at the discretion of the candidate.

Scholarship Statement

Not more than 2,500 words in 12 point typeface. The statement should articulate the scholarly dimensions of the candidate's contribution to their field and its pedagogy. It should synthesize and explain the significance of the candidate's work, including discussion of their completed research, discussion of the impact of completed research, planned trajectory, and the contributions of their scholarship to the pedagogical mission.

Scholarly Materials

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor must include any scholarly materials produced since promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.

For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference [Appendix B](#), "Memorandum Regarding Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases in the Creative and Performing Arts."

The types of evidence related to scholarly work include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Publication (print and electronic): book chapters, textbooks, articles in peer-reviewed journals, book reviews, opinion articles, software, training guidelines or manuals, reviews of artistic performances, etc.
- Scholarly Presentation: papers presented at professional meetings, invited presentations both at Emory and elsewhere, etc.
- Performance: invited artistic performances, juried exhibitions or composition, master classes, residencies as a guest artist, etc.
- Practice and Pedagogy: development of new practice models, work on outcome assessment, the articulation of practice standards, other contributions to standards in the candidate's field, etc.
- Public Engagement Pedagogy: development of new forms of public pedagogy, such as workshops and curricula that are open to non-academic communities (evidence that shows an active contribution that goes beyond simple participation is particularly valuable)

COVID-19 Statement (optional)

Not more than 1,500 words in 12 point typeface. The ECAS and Office of the Provost guidelines for the optional COVID-19 statement are available online:

<http://college.emory.edu/faculty/documents/faculty/ecas-guidelines-for-covid-19-statement.pdf>.

COVID-19 Statement Permission Form

The candidate will use this form to indicate if they would like their COVID-19 statement shared with external reviewers (outside of Emory) and internal reviewers (inside of Emory) for promotion to Teaching Professor cases, with faculty review committee members and administrators (inside of Emory) for all types of cases, or to note that they did not upload a COVID-19 statement.

DEI Statement (optional)

Not more than 1,500 words in 12 point typeface. Resources include the ECAS DEI website (<https://diversity.college.emory.edu/>) as well as the “Institutional DEI Strategic Planning Communities Report to the President” available online:

https://equityandinclusion.emory.edu/includes/documents/site-wide/2021-odei-strategic-planning-report_final-draft.pdf

DEI Statement Permission Form

The candidate will use this form to indicate if they would like their DEI statement shared with external reviewers (outside of Emory) and internal reviewers (inside of Emory) for promotion to Teaching Professor cases, with faculty review committee members and administrators (inside of Emory) for all types of cases, or to note that they did not upload a DEI statement.

Teaching Evaluations

Summary Teaching Template

A cover sheet that provides a summation of the data from a candidate’s teaching evaluations as provided in the sample table below. This should include all cross-listed classes and co-taught classes with total enrollment numbers (sample below). While the department/program creates and submits this document in Interfolio RPT, the candidate may be involved in its preparation and may verify the information.

Professor Name, Department/Program Name, Proposed Rank

Academic Year	Semester	Course Number	Course Name	Total Enrollment	Number of Forms Returned	Course Score-weighted mean	Instructor Score – weighted mean	Overall weighted mean	Department/Program Average of courses of this size and type
2015-16	Fall	Biol 250	Cell Biology	25	23	7.42	7.73	8.05	

Teaching Evaluations

- One complete set of teaching evaluations for the most recent 5 years
 - Copies of all ECAS course evaluation summary sheets

- Copies of structured written qualitative and quantitative evaluations from both undergraduate and graduate courses

Other Items Uploaded by the Department/Program

Teaching Observation Letters

- Letters from senior colleagues who have observed and evaluated the candidate's teaching
- Letters will comment on the quality of teaching and note areas for improvement and areas of excellence.
- Three or more letters are recommended.

Student Review Letters

Letters from students should be solicited by the chair or director of the department/program from former and/or current students with whom the candidate has done substantial work. The candidate may give their chair or director a list for the department/program to contact. The candidate may not contact them. Do not include "thank you" notes/letters from students.

Letters of Evaluation

Details about required letters of evaluation are in the Principles and Procedures for Teaching-Track Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in Emory College of Arts and Sciences. For reappointment reviews, see [5.1.6. Letters of Evaluation](#). For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor reviews, see [6.1.7. Letters of Evaluation](#). For promotion to Teaching Professor reviews, see [7.1.7. Letters of Evaluation](#).

Appendix B: Memorandum Regarding Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases in the Creative and Performing Arts

Kevin C. Karnes, Associate Dean for the Arts, Emory College of Arts and Sciences
Matthew H. Bernstein, Goodrich C. White Professor, Department of Film and Media
Stephen A. Crist, Chair, Department of Music
Lisa Paulsen, Chair, Department of Theater Studies
Sally Radell, Director, Dance and Movement Studies Program

NOTE: This memorandum was added to the ECAS Principles and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure on June 30, 2022. Teaching-track faculty engaged in research and scholarship, and those intending to submit their candidacy for promotion to Teaching Professor, may use this memo as a reference guide.

Research in the Creative and Performing Arts

Research in the creative and performing arts can look quite different from research in other fields. While some artists write and may even publish in peer-reviewed journals or books, the products of research for most artists consist of artistic works themselves: for example, choreography; productions on stage or screen; newly created works of music, theater, or dance recorded or performed in physical or online venues; newly created paintings, sculptures, or multimedia works exhibited physically or online; newly created screenplays, television episodes, short- or feature- length films; and exhibitions produced, directed, or curated by the artist.

While the products of arts-based research may look different from the products of research in other disciplines, however, the quality and significance of arts-based research is registered and assessed through comparable mechanisms, most importantly peer review. This memo outlines some of the ways in which peer review operates within artistic disciplines. It also outlines the special ways in which collaborative work takes place across the arts; it explains the engagement by ECAS of external peer reviewers for evidence of the effectiveness of works that cannot be recorded or transported; it suggests some ways of assessing the relative significance of awards, performances, and venues in the arts; and it explains the possible selection of peer reviewers who may not teach at Emory's traditional peer institutions.

Peer Review

Peer review in the arts takes many forms, and the department chair will explain in their letter accompanying the dossier how it operates in the candidate's subdiscipline. A non-exhaustive list of examples of peer review in the arts includes:

- Dramatic roles and other invitations to perform are typically awarded through competitive auditions, where a panel of experts – producers, directors, choreographers and/or fellow actors or performers – assesses the merits of each performer's application or audition against those of all other applicants, with their decision reflecting the expert panel's assessment of the quality of

- the applicant's work. This process is typically unblinded for actors and dancers, and double-blinded (via the use of opaque screens shielding the performer from the judges) for musicians.
- Performances of new musical works or choreography, museum-based exhibitions of work in the visual arts, and films presented at festivals or other non-commercial venues are typically invited through a juried selection process, in which an artist applies to have their works performed or exhibited. A panel of experts (the "jury") selects artists for participation by measuring the quality and significance of their work against that of all other applicants. This process may be unblinded, single-blinded, or double-blinded.
 - In some cases, invitations to perform, create, screen, or exhibit works are extended without a formal application process. Such invitations may, however, still result from a juried selection process, where a museum, theater, or concert-giving organization forms a panel of experts to advise the institution on artists to engage in an upcoming season. These invitations can be very prestigious, especially if extended by a highly reputable organization, signaling broad recognition of the quality and significance of an artist's work within their field. The department chair's letter will explain the context and significance of such invitations.
 - Commissions of new musical, choreographic, or dramatic works, and of new works in the visual arts, are often awarded through a juried selection process along the lines described above. The department chair's letter will indicate whether the award of a commission was made through a juried process.
 - Grants, awards (including those given at festivals), and fellowships (often called "residencies") in support or recognition of artistic work are awarded through a process of peer review (single- or double-blind) of applications, just as they are in most other academic disciplines.

Collaborative Work

As in many other fields of research, some subdisciplines in the creative and performing arts are intensely collaborative: an oboist performing with a highly regarded orchestra may be one of over a hundred musicians creating a work together onstage; a director's project consists in shaping the contributions of numerous actors, designers, and technicians into a compelling rendition of a play; a choreographer may invite dancers to be integrally involved in the creative process of researching movement; and a visual artist may be one of several exhibiting together in gallery. As in all other fields where collaboration is a cornerstone of research, it is incumbent upon the applicant and their department chair to explain clearly in the dossier and the accompanying chair's letter the precise nature and significance of the applicant's individual contribution to every collaborative project.

External Assessments of Non-recordable/Non-transportable Works

While many artworks and performances may be accessible online or in other archived formats, other works – some performances, and most exhibitions – will not be. (For instance, the Actors' Equity Association, the principal actors' union in the US, generally prohibits the recording or photographing of stage productions in which their members participate; an installation of sculpture or an immersive exhibition cannot be experienced fully via photographs.) For this reason, ECAS will engage outside

experts to attend performances or exhibitions where the event takes place, and to record their assessments of the quality and significance of such projects in letters submitted to the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty. The attendance of the experts is not announced to the candidate, and the candidate has no access to their assessment. These letters should be considered alongside other attestations to the quality or significance of works in the dossier. Each pre-tenured faculty member will have one such assessment at some point before their pre-tenure review. Department chairs are responsible for organizing the external assessment(s) in collaboration with the Office of Faculty.

Assessing Relative Significance

As in all other fields of research, it can be hard for those outside of an artistic subdiscipline to assess the relative significance of institutions, venues, awards, and performance engagements. While Netflix and the New York Philharmonic are household names, assessing the relative significance of venues beyond the most famous can seem beyond the capacity of any reader of a dossier. In all cases, it is incumbent upon the applicant and the department chair to elucidate the relative significance of venues and engagements within the applicant's subdiscipline. Did an engagement arise through a process of peer review? Is the engagement one that hundreds apply for, or is it one that few potential applicants will even know exists? Did the engagement garner significant attention, helping shape discourse within the applicant's field? These are questions that should be addressed in the candidate's dossier and the department chair's letter.

As in other fields, it is expected that applicants for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure will have established a research program that is widely recognized as shaping disciplinary discourse at the national level. Applicants for promotion to the rank of full professor should have established a program that is shaping such discourse at the international level. In the arts as elsewhere, the outside reviewers of the candidate's dossier will provide the most reliable assessment of the relative significance of the candidate's projects, and the depth and scope of the impact of their research.

Selection of Outside Reviewers

In the creative and performing arts, the most qualified outside reviewers sometimes teach at institutions that are not generally considered to be close peers of Emory. For example, many state institutions have distinguished and highly esteemed programs in the arts. It is the responsibility of department chairs to articulate clearly the reasons for recommending a specific external reviewer to the Office of Faculty, including describing the stature of the relevant department or program at the suggested reviewer's home institution.