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Emory hires faculty we intend to tenure and promote to full professor.
How do we aim to achieve this goal?

- create clarity and transparency around T&P expectations (research, teaching, service/citizenship)
- support faculty development
- offer mentorship opportunities within department, mentorship clusters outside department
- T&P office hours with Dean Roy
- provide frequent feedback via annual reviews, Faculty 180 merit review, input from chair, and other mentors
Faculty member Christina E. Crawford and her students have preserved the history of Atlanta’s University Homes and Techwood Homes housing projects. In two ceremonies on Oct. 11, 2022, Crawford spoke publicly to mark the moment as Georgia Historical Society markers were unveiled.
Tenure-track faculty (Tenure and Promotion)

**Tenure and Pre-Tenure Review**

- **April 1, 2023**: Department chairs confirm with Office of Faculty lists of faculty who plan to undergo reviews.
- **May 1, 2023**: Vetted list of potential reviewers uploaded by departments to Interfolio.
- **June 15, 2023**: Scholarly materials and full research statement uploaded by candidate to Interfolio.
- **December 1, 2023**: Remaining required materials uploaded by candidate to Interfolio.
- **Early Spring 2024**: Departments review cases and uploaded departmental letters to Interfolio.
- **Spring 2024**: ECAS T&P Committee reviews cases.
- **TPAC reviews ECAS cases (university-level review).**
- **Board of Trustees reviews cases.**
Tenure-track Faculty (Tenure and Promotion)

• Principles and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, & Tenure: 
  http://college.emory.edu/faculty/faculty/promotion-tenure-track.html

• document includes “Guidelines for Submitting Materials”

• decanal document

• updated version clarifies procedures, more user friendly was presented to ECAS Faculty Senate in January 2022 and implemented June 2022 (no changes to standards for T&P)

• recent additional updates
Recent Updates to “Principles and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure”

• clarify procedures for acting associate and acting full professor tenure reviews

• implement Provost’s office requirement that department committees suggest names of potential external reviewers (6 for tenure and promotion to full professor reviews, 3 for pre-tenure reviews); reduce required number of potential reviewers suggested by the candidate

• note that candidates can list potential reviewers whom they do not want contacted

• specify 12 point font for one-page CV and personal statement, word limits for optional COVID-19 and DEI statements
TENURE CLOCK EXTENSION

The Office of the Provost is keenly aware that COVID-19 has had significant and differential impacts on faculty success and professional progress. The Emory University Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees has approved a blanket one-year tenure clock extension to all pre-tenure faculty on the tenure track.

This extension recognizes the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on faculty research and teaching and applies to all pre-tenure faculty in Emory College of Arts and Sciences who joined Emory before or in January 2021. It is an opt-out approach whereby we will work with those faculty who would prefer not to receive the extension. This extension will in no way limit faculty from being granted further extensions for other reasons consistent with our current policies. If you have any further questions about this extension or its implications for your particular trajectory, please contact Dean of Faculty Deboleena Roy, dean_of_faculty@emory.edu.

More information about tenure clock extension policies and tenure clock examples can be found here. 
Tenure Clock

• pre-tenure review
  • 3rd/4th year – can now go up in the 5th year with the extension

• tenure review
  • 6th year – can now go up in the 7th year with the extension

• promotion to full professor (generally 6-8 years after tenure)

• COVID-related tenure clock extension will in no way limit faculty from being granted further extensions for other reasons consistent with our current policies
Tenure Clock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Years on Tenure Clock</th>
<th>Review Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>Annual Progress Review &amp; Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>Annual Progress Review &amp; Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2024</td>
<td>Annual Progress Review &amp; Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-2025</td>
<td><strong>Pre-Tenure Review &amp; Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2026</td>
<td>Annual Progress Review &amp; Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2027</td>
<td><strong>Tenure Review &amp; Faculty Activity and Merit Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Review Letters

As a general rule, all reviewers should be full professors from peer institutions. In some pre-tenure cases, an associate professor who is a leading scholar in the field may be included.

- pre-tenure
  - 3 potential reviewers suggested by the candidate
  - 3 potential reviewers suggested independently by the department committee
  - Dean of Faculty solicits 2 letters

- tenure & promotion to full professor
  - 10 potential reviewers suggested by the candidate
  - 6 potential reviewers suggested independently by the department committee
  - Dean of Faculty solicits 6 letters

- reviewer biographies and conflict of interest
  - title & rank, clear description of expertise
  - explicit disclosure of the nature of relationship between candidate & reviewer
  - no collaborators, co-authors, former teachers, former students, etc.
External Review Letters (continued)

• Dean may add names to the list of potential reviewers as well
• list can include generalists as well as sub-field experts
• in cases of interdisciplinary scholarship, clustering groups of external reviewer names by sub-field/discipline is helpful
• earlier these lists are submitted, the better success in yielding best reviewers for the candidate (February for promotion to full; May for tenure/pre-tenure)
• candidate may also submit a list of 1-2 potential reviewers whom they do not want to be contacted
External Review Letters (continued)

• for the benefit of external reviewers, candidates should list, with full citations, their most important scholarly articles, publications, or other works
  • pre-tenure review: top 3-5
  • tenure review: top 5
  • promotion to full professor review: top 5 published since tenure

• this document is also helpful for the ECAS T&P Committee
Teaching Observations and Student Review Letters

The ECAS Faculty Senate Working Group on Practices, Policies for Evaluation of Teaching (PPET) has reviewed this process and Office of Faculty has now established the PPET Implementation Committee.

In the meantime:

• one teaching observation letter per semester is recommended
• chair should continue to solicit letters from:
  • all students in 2 undergraduate classes of different levels (such as introductory and advanced)
  • students in two graduate seminars, if applicable
  • all of the candidate’s honors, directed research, and graduate advisees
• candidate may not contact students to request these letters
Service Opportunities from OUE

http://college.emory.edu/oue/documents/Faculty-Service-Opportunities-Updated-Aug-2021.pdf
Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

• all tenured faculty members participate in pre-tenure and tenure reviews; for promotion to full professor, all full professors participate in review.

• research & teaching
  • departments should establish clear expectations and criteria for excellence

• service
  • satisfactory/unsatisfactory; some service beyond the department for tenure, and more substantial (college, university, profession) for full

• voting process; summary letter encapsulating the outside letters, the discussion, and the vote; templates are available for department chairs on the Office of Faculty site
ECAS Tenure and Promotion Committee

• 3 full professors from each division (natural sciences, social sciences, humanities)

• department chair and advocate (if requested by candidate)

• designated representative presents the case and coordinates the letter writing
  • committee reviews the full file (research, teaching, service), department letter, and external letters
  • candidate statements on research and teaching are read very closely; it is recommended that candidates get feedback from the chair/mentor before submitting this document
  • committee votes
  • committee’s vote and recommendation is presented in summary letter to Dean of ECAS
Role of ECAS Tenure and Promotion Committee

- the committee represents the faculty
- it does not have its own criteria
- it applies the criteria set by the department
- please, clearly state your criteria in the department letter
- please, clearly apply those criteria to the specifics of the case
- if there are multiple criteria, only some of which must be met, please identify which were met and how well
Strengthening Cases

• directly address ambiguities and weaknesses in the case
  • recurring, negative themes in student evaluations
  • trouble spots in teaching, say with introductory vs. upper division courses
  • gaps in productivity that are not connected to leaves
  • the reputation of a given press (or journal)
  • the standing and contribution of public scholarship
  • the prestige of venues for creative work
  • modest citations (in fields where that is relevant)
  • citation rates inflated by articles in which the author's contribution was modest or the piece was co-authored with a former advisor or post-doctoral supervisor
  • critical or vague comments in external evaluations
Strengthening Cases

- address the publication record
  - clearly explain the candidate’s role in and contribution to multiple-author publications
  - while joint publication is now the rule rather than the exception in many disciplines, knowing that doesn't tell us what a particular faculty member has accomplished in a particular publication
  - what did they bring to the project?
  - how important was it to the project?
- this should be articulated in the research statement and possibly in the CV if contributions are similar across publications
Strengthening Cases

• clarify scholarly effort
  • candidates and departments should clearly articulate the scholarly contribution/significance of the research
  • people used to think A, but I have made a case for B or A&B
  • we used to understand A in terms of three variables, but I have shown that a fourth variable is also relevant
  • if someone explores an understudied author or phenomenon, explain what has been gained by exploring it
Role of Department Chairs and Advocates

- the T&P Committee meets with Chairs and Advocates for added clarity and depth
- we want our recommendation to fully register the strengths of the case and where there seem to be weaknesses, we want to fairly assess their significance
- we often ask to meet even when the case is strong
- please be ready to discuss the case in a detailed fashion, including the status of work that is under review or even in progress
Final Steps in the Tenure and Promotion Process

• Dean of Emory College of Arts and Sciences reviews the full candidate file, recommendation of the T&P Committee, department letter, and external review letters

• when the case is favorable, the Dean writes a letter recommending tenure/promotion to the Provost; the case then goes to the Tenure & Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC)

• the case moves forward to the President and Board of Trustees for review
Key Questions at the Pre-tenure level

• is this candidate on track for tenure?

• how has this candidate moved beyond the dissertation, and if relevant, their dissertation advisor?

• is there evidence of a solid scholarly trajectory?

• are they making a significant contribution to teaching and mentoring?

• are they engaged in service activities that are appropriate to their rank?
Key Questions at the Tenure level

• is this scholar advancing their field in new ways, and having a profound impact on the discipline/interdisciplinary arena (publications, grants, invited lectures, awards, citation indices, etc.)?

• is there clear evidence of scholarship that goes beyond the first major project (publication, grant, etc.)?

• is this candidate contributing teaching excellence to the department and/or to ECAS?

• is this candidate contributing to the service and citizenship of the department/ECAS/university/profession in a way that is appropriate to their rank?
Key Questions for Promotion to Full Professor

• is this scholar a leading figure in their field or subfield nationally/internationally?

• is this faculty member an excellent pedagogue, advancing the teaching mission of their respective field(s) and actively mentoring and advising graduate and undergraduate students in ECAS/Emory University?

• is this faculty member contributing substantial leadership to the profession both within and beyond Emory?
# Key Dates

For cases to be reviewed during AY 2023-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor Review</th>
<th>Tenure Review</th>
<th>Pre-Tenure Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Plans</td>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Documents</td>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>June 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Service</td>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>