

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

Revised, September 2003
Further revised, September 2011
Further revised, May 2016
Further revised, November 6, 2016
Further revised, January 24, 2018
Further revised, April 19, 2018
Further revised, June 8, 2018
Further revised, January 3, 2019
Further revised, September 12, 2019
Further revised, June 30, 2022
Further revised, December 13, 2022

Table of Contents

1. [Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences](#)
2. [Guidelines for Appointments, Reviews, and Promotions in Emory College of Arts and Sciences](#)
 - 2.1. [Preamble](#)
 - 2.2. [Appointments](#)
 - 2.3. [Annual Faculty Progress Review \(Assistant and Associate Professors\)](#)
 - 2.4. [Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Review of Faculty on Regular Appointment](#)
 - 2.5. [Additional Provisions and Procedures](#)
 - 2.6. [Appeal Procedures](#)
 - 2.7. [ECAS Tenure and Promotion Committee](#)
3. [Appendices](#)

1. 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 (ECAS) 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 ECAS. Since each of these is essential to ECAS, 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. ECAS also values institutional and individual faculty efforts dedicated to the goals of inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism. Candidates for tenure and promotion are invited (but not required) to share how their research, teaching, and/or service activities contribute to these goals. 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 full 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 their 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 publicly 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 undergraduate and graduate 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. Teaching excellence also includes curricular development, including work that makes the curriculum more accessible and inclusive. 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.

Service is defined as contributions and activities that promote the general welfare of a department, ECAS, or Emory 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, ECAS, or Emory 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 ECAS's needs and Emory 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 July 15, 1976 and has been updated annually, and with the Emory 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 of Arts and Sciences.”

2. Guidelines for Appointments, Reviews, and Promotions in Emory College of Arts and Sciences

2.1. Preamble

2.1.1. 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.”

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

2.1.3. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee (ECAS T&P Committee) is established by these guidelines to advise the Dean of ECAS 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 ECAS (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences). Members shall be elected from among the tenured full professors on the faculty as described in [section 2.7](#) (ECAS Tenure and Promotion Committee) of these guidelines. The committee will not have alternate members. The Dean may appoint alternates, however, when members are unable or ineligible to serve.

2.1.4. Stages of Review: A decision by the Dean to appoint or promote a faculty member to the rank of associate or full professor and/or with tenure shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Provost, together with the materials and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the ECAS T&P Committee, to the university-wide Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC), through to the Provost and to the President.

2.2. Appointments

2.2.1 Every recommendation for appointment shall be initiated by one of the several departments of ECAS. For regular appointments, the department shall collect pertinent

information on a candidate's promise and achievement in research, teaching, and service and then convene the faculty 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 materials to the ECAS Office of Faculty. 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 ECAS Office of Faculty.

2.2.2. 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 ECAS shall in turn formulate their decision; if they wish, the Dean of ECAS may also confer with representatives of the department or may request additional information from the department. After formulating their decision, the ECAS Office of Faculty shall inform the department of the Dean's decision to appoint or not to appoint the candidate.

2.2.3. Faculty appointed at the rank of acting associate professor or acting full professor will undergo a tenure review. The ECAS Office of Faculty shall forward the department's recommendation and the materials accompanying it to the ECAS T&P Committee, which shall, in turn, review both the department's recommendation and the accompanying materials. Departments shall ensure that documentation includes materials on the candidate's teaching and service at the prior institution. 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 ten scholars suggested by the candidate. The candidate has the option of submitting an additional list of potential reviewers whom they do not wish to be contacted. The chair and the department committee will vet the names submitted by the candidate. The department committee must independently add six additional names to the list of potential reviewers for all cases. These additional names must be independently chosen by the department and not shared in any way with the candidate. The Dean may, if they wish, add additional 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 ECAS Office of Faculty 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 ECAS Office of Faculty shall then make these available to the department in advance of the departmental recommendation. Strong documentation is especially important on candidates who seek a promotion or first-time tenure as part of their move to ECAS.

2.2.4. Those in a department who vote on a tenure case for an acting associate professor or an acting full professor 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 in number. If necessary, an ad hoc review 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 ad hoc committee appointments, but

it is finally the prerogative of the Dean of ECAS to select the non-department membership that the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate. Prior to formulating a recommendation for whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” for tenure, the tenured faculty shall conduct a thorough review of the candidate's research, teaching, and service as these are defined in the “Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences” above. To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS urges departments to develop written criteria for excellence in research and teaching and satisfactory service, and to revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in departmental evaluations of candidates.

2.2.5. Following its review, the ECAS T&P Committee shall send all materials submitted to it and its recommendation to the ECAS Office of Faculty. The ECAS Office of Faculty will inform the department chair of the ECAS T&P Committee’s recommendation. The Dean shall then formulate their decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies. If they wish, the Dean of ECAS may also confer with representatives of the department or with the ECAS T&P Committee. Having formulated their decision, the ECAS Office of Faculty shall inform the department chair of the Dean’s decision. A decision by the Dean to appoint a faculty member at the rank of associate or full professor and/or with tenure shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Provost, together with the materials and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the ECAS T&P Committee, to the university-wide Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC), through to the Provost and to the President.

2.3. Annual Faculty Progress Review (Assistant and Associate Professors)

Faculty at Emory College of Arts and Sciences undergo multiple forms of review. For tenure-track faculty, this includes the annual progress review of assistant and associate professors, the yearly faculty activity and merit evaluation (FAME), and pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion to full professor reviews. The portfolio of materials for faculty promotion and/or tenure is distinct from information provided for the annual progress review of assistant and associate professors and from the faculty activity and merit evaluation that all faculty undergo each year.

This section discusses the annual progress reviews of assistant and associate professors.

2.3.1. Departmental Review Procedures

Each department shall follow specific procedures for reviewing the research, teaching, and service of its assistant professors and associate professors, 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. These procedures shall also include a list of the types of materials desired by the department for inclusion in the file by the candidate. A candidate may introduce any materials they wish so long as these materials are clearly pertinent to the criteria established by ECAS as appropriate for promotion and tenure. It is strongly recommended that candidates consider the “Guidelines for Submitting Promotion and Tenure Materials to the ECAS Office of Faculty” ([Appendix A](#)) and the “Memorandum to ECAS

Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios” ([Appendix B](#)). Where appropriate, faculty should also consult the “Memorandum Regarding Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases in the Creative and Performing Arts” ([Appendix C](#)) and the “Memorandum Regarding the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship” ([Appendix D](#)).

The departmental procedures shall be written and they shall be made available to members of the department, to the Dean of ECAS, to the ECAS T&P Committee, and to the office of the Provost.

2.3.2. Annual Review of Assistant Professors

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

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 research, teaching, 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 ECAS Office of Faculty, 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 ECAS Office of Faculty.

2.3.3. Review of Associate Professors

Either in the fall or spring term, 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 research, teaching, 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 research, teaching, and service. The evaluation shall be sent to the ECAS Office of Faculty, and a copy or an accurate summary of the substance of the evaluation shall be sent to the faculty member under review. Should the department decide to

provide a summary rather than a copy of the 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.

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 2.4.3](#) (Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor).

2.4. Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Review of Faculty on Regular Appointment

2.4.1. The Pre-Tenure Assistant Professor Review

2.4.1.1. For untenured faculty beginning either their third or fourth year, but not later than the fourth year, a department's review of research, teaching, and service shall be more searching than the second and third year reviews. In consultation with the chair of their department, an assistant professor may elect to have their major Pre-Tenure Assistant Professor Review earlier than the 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 pre-tenure review before the fourth year of their appointment must notify their department chair and the ECAS Office of Faculty no later than April 1 of the previous academic year. In calculating the years of service, ECAS shall exclude those years when the tenure clock has been formally stopped, as provided for in the "Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships."

2.4.1.2. In evaluating research, evaluations by outside reviewers, generally two in number, will 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 three scholars suggested by the candidate. The candidate has the option of submitting an additional list of potential reviewers whom they do not wish to be contacted. The chair and the department committee will vet the names submitted by the candidate. The department committee must independently add three additional names to the list of potential reviewers for all cases. These additional names must be independently chosen by the department and not shared in any way with the candidate. The Dean may, if they wish, add additional 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 ECAS Office of Faculty 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 ECAS Office of Faculty shall then make these available to the department in advance of the departmental recommendation.

2.4.1.3. Those in a department who vote in a pre-tenure, 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 in number. If necessary, an ad hoc review 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 ad hoc committee appointments, but it is finally the prerogative of the Dean of ECAS to select the non-department membership that the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate. Prior to formulating a recommendation for whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” for renewal, the tenured faculty shall conduct a thorough review of the candidate's research, teaching, and service as these are defined in the “Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences” above. To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS urges departments to develop written criteria for progress toward excellence in research and teaching and satisfactory service, and to revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in departmental evaluations of candidates.

2.4.1.4. Following the departmental meeting at which a pre-tenure candidate is reviewed, the chair shall write one letter that includes the department’s overall vote recommending renewal or non-renewal of the candidate’s appointment, and that summarizes the department’s evaluation of the candidate’s progress toward tenure in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The department will vote on whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” for renewal of appointment. All appropriately ranked, tenured faculty in the candidate’s department are expected to participate in the department’s decision 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’s letter to the ECAS T&P Committee. When a departmental recommendation is positive, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate’s appointment be renewed. When a departmental recommendation is negative, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate's appointment not be renewed.

When decisions are not unanimous, the department's recommendation letter shall record and explain all dissenting votes within this letter. Individual faculty are discouraged from submitting separate dissenting vote letters. When the votes are not unanimous but there is a majority of votes in favor of recommending renewal, this is considered a positive vote and the case will be forwarded directly to the ECAS T&P Committee. When the votes are not unanimous and there is a majority of votes not in favor of recommending renewal, this is considered a negative vote. Having reviewed the recommendation prepared by the chair on behalf of the department, each individual faculty member participating in the decision shall sign the department's letter.

2.4.1.5. Both the recommendation and the evaluation shall be forwarded to the ECAS Office of Faculty. A redacted copy (that does not include any identifying information

regarding the names or the institutions of external reviewers, students, etc.) 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 ECAS Office of Faculty.

2.4.1.6. The ECAS Office of Faculty shall forward to the ECAS T&P Committee all recommendations for renewal of appointment following pre-tenure reviews. The ECAS T&P Committee shall then review the recommendation and accompanying materials. In each case, the ECAS T&P Committee may schedule a meeting with the chair of the candidate's department to discuss the recommendation. In addition, the candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the ECAS faculty, to appear before the ECAS T&P 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.

2.4.1.7. Following its review, the ECAS T&P Committee shall send all the materials submitted to it and its recommendation to the Dean. The ECAS Office of Faculty will inform the department chair of the ECAS T&P Committee's recommendation. The Dean shall then formulate their decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies. If they wish, the Dean of ECAS may also confer with representatives of the department or with the ECAS T&P Committee. Having formulated their decision, the ECAS Office of Faculty will inform the department chair of the Dean's decision. This constitutes the conclusion of the pre-tenure review process, which is finalized in ECAS and not forwarded on for further review.

2.4.1.8. Upon receipt of a departmental recommendation not to renew an untenured faculty member's appointment or if the Dean decides not to renew an untenured faculty member's appointment, the Dean shall inform the candidate of the right to appeal as described in [section 2.6](#) (Appeal Procedures). 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 October 31.

2.4.2. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure

2.4.2.1. Assistant professors may be considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure at any time during their pre-tenure service to ECAS. However, the maximum length of service to ECAS prior to this decision shall be determined by the guidelines set forth in the "Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships." 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, ECAS shall exclude those years when the

tenure clock has been formally stopped, as provided for in the “Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships.”

2.4.2.2. 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 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 ad hoc committee appointments, but it is finally the prerogative of the Dean of ECAS to select the non-department membership that the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate. Prior to formulating a recommendation for whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” for tenure and promotion, the tenured faculty shall conduct a thorough review of the candidate's research, teaching, and service as these are defined in the “Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences” above. To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS urges departments to develop written criteria for excellence in research and teaching and satisfactory service, and to revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in departmental evaluations of candidates.

2.4.2.3. 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 to the ECAS Office of Faculty” ([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. Arts faculty should refer to the “Memorandum Regarding Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases in the Creative and Performing Arts” ([Appendix C](#)). 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 ten scholars suggested by the candidate. The candidate has the option of submitting an additional list of potential reviewers whom they do not wish to be contacted. The chair and the department committee will vet the names submitted by the candidate. The department committee must independently add six additional names to the list of potential reviewers for all cases. These additional names must be independently chosen by the department and not shared in any way with the candidate. The Dean may, if they wish, add additional 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 ECAS Office of Faculty 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 ECAS Office of Faculty shall then make these available to the department in advance of the departmental recommendation.

2.4.2.4. In evaluating teaching, the department shall consider a portfolio of materials assembled by the candidate. This portfolio should follow the “Memorandum to ECAS 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 required to provide comparative data showing the evaluation scores of comparable courses, and should also solicit letters from current and former students.

2.4.2.5. In evaluating service, the department shall consider work on departmental, ECAS, and Emory University committees, participation in student advising, performance of administrative duties, and other activities essential to the life of ECAS and Emory University. The candidate's contribution to their 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 ECAS Office of Faculty and all responses shall be addressed to the Dean, whose office shall then make them available to the department in advance of the departmental decision.

2.4.2.6. 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 and to determine if the candidate meets the departmental criteria for excellence in research and teaching, and satisfactory in service. The department will vote on whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service for tenure and promotion cases, and will also record and submit an overall vote regarding the tenure and promotion of the candidate. Following this meeting, the chair shall write a detailed letter summarizing and justifying the department's recommendation regarding the candidate's tenure and 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. 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's letter to the ECAS T&P Committee. When a departmental recommendation is positive, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate be promoted. When a departmental recommendation is negative, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate's appointment not be renewed.

When decisions are not unanimous, the department's recommendation letter shall record and explain all dissenting votes within this letter. Individual faculty are discouraged from submitting separate dissenting vote letters. When the votes are not unanimous but there is a majority of votes in favor of recommending tenure and promotion, this is considered a positive vote and the case will be forwarded directly to the ECAS T&P Committee. When the votes are not unanimous and there is a majority of votes not in favor of recommending tenure and promotion, this is considered a negative vote. Having reviewed

the recommendation prepared by the chair on behalf of the department, each individual faculty member participating in the decision shall sign the department's letter.

2.4.2.7. As early as feasible, usually in the spring semester, the chair shall forward the department's recommendation and all materials pertinent to the recommendation to the ECAS Office of Faculty. A redacted copy (that does not include any identifying information regarding the names or the institutions of external reviewers, students, etc.) 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 ECAS Office of Faculty.

2.4.2.8. The ECAS Office of Faculty shall forward to the ECAS T&P Committee all recommendations for promotion. The ECAS T&P Committee shall then review the recommendation and accompanying materials. In each case, ECAS T&P Committee may schedule a meeting with the chair of the candidate's department to discuss the recommendation. In addition, the candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the ECAS faculty, to appear before the ECAS T&P 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.

2.4.2.9. Following its review, the ECAS T&P Committee shall send all the materials submitted to it and its recommendation to the Dean. The ECAS Office of Faculty will inform the department chair of the ECAS T&P Committee's recommendation. The Dean shall then formulate their decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies. If they wish, the Dean of ECAS may also confer with representatives of the department or with the ECAS T&P Committee. Having formulated their decision, the ECAS Office of Faculty shall inform the department chair of the Dean's decision. A decision by the Dean to promote an assistant professor to associate professor with tenure shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Provost, together with the materials and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the ECAS T&P Committee, to the university-wide Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC), through to the Provost and to the President.

2.4.2.10. The Dean shall inform each candidate in writing when the departmental recommendation is negative, or if the Dean decides against tenure and promotion, and shall advise the candidate of the right to appeal this recommendation as described in [section 2.6](#) (Appeal Procedures) of these guidelines. Candidates who do not receive tenure 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 October 31.

2.4.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

2.4.3.1. In evaluating candidates judged to merit serious consideration for promotion from associate professor to full professor, the tenured full professors of the department shall conduct a review evaluating the associate professor's research, teaching, and service, prior to the formulation of its recommendation. 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 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 ad hoc committee appointments, but it is finally the prerogative of the Dean of ECAS to select the non-department membership that the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate. 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, based on a new and sustained body of work beyond which tenure and promotion were based. Promotion to full professor is also recognition of growth and/or continuing excellence in teaching and significant contributions in service. Prior to formulating a recommendation for whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” for promotion to full professor, the tenured faculty shall conduct a thorough review of the candidate's research, teaching, and service as these are defined in the “Statement of Principles Used for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Emory College of Arts and Sciences” above. To promote transparency, and to ensure that cases are evaluated consistently and equitably, the Dean of ECAS urges departments to develop written criteria for excellence in research and teaching and satisfactory service, and to revisit those criteria periodically. Such documents should play a role in departmental evaluations of candidates.

2.4.3.2. After evaluations of the candidate's research, teaching, and service have been compiled, the full professors of the department shall meet to consider its action and to determine if the candidate meets the departmental criteria for excellence in research and teaching, and satisfactory in service. The department will vote on whether the candidate “meets criteria” or “does not meet criteria” in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service for promotion to full professor cases, and will also record and submit an overall vote regarding the promotion of the candidate. Following this meeting, the chair or designated alternative shall write a detailed letter summarizing and justifying the department's recommendation regarding 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. 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's letter to the ECAS T&P Committee. When a departmental recommendation is positive, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate be promoted. When a departmental

recommendation is negative, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending against the candidate's promotion.

When decisions are not unanimous, the department's recommendation letter shall record and explain all dissenting votes within this letter. Individual faculty are discouraged from submitting separate dissenting vote letters. When the votes are not unanimous but there is a majority of votes in favor of recommending promotion, this is considered a positive vote and the case will be forwarded directly to the ECAS T&P Committee. When the votes are not unanimous and there is a majority of votes not in favor of recommending promotion, this is considered a negative vote. Having reviewed the recommendation prepared by the chair on behalf of the department, each individual faculty member participating in the decision shall sign the department's letter.

2.4.3.3. As early as feasible and usually in the fall semester, the chair shall forward the department's recommendation and all materials pertinent to the recommendations to the ECAS Office of Faculty. A redacted copy (that does not include any identifying information regarding the names or the institutions of external reviewers, students, etc.) 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 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.

2.4.3.4. The ECAS Office of Faculty shall forward to the ECAS T&P Committee all recommendations for promotion. The ECAS T&P Committee shall then review the recommendation and the accompanying materials. In each case, the ECAS T&P Committee may schedule a meeting with the chair of the candidate's department to discuss the recommendation. In addition, the candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the ECAS faculty, to appear before the ECAS T&P 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.

2.4.3.5. Following its review, the ECAS T&P Committee shall send all the materials submitted to it and its recommendation to the ECAS Office of Faculty. The ECAS Office of Faculty will inform the department chair of the ECAS T&P Committee's recommendation. The Dean shall then formulate their decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies. If they wish, the Dean of ECAS may also confer further with representatives of the department or with the ECAS T&P Committee. Having formulated their decision, the ECAS Office of Faculty shall inform the department chair of the Dean's decision. A decision by the Dean to promote an associate professor to full professor shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Provost, together with the materials and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the ECAS T&P Committee, to the university-wide Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC), through to the Provost and to

the President.

2.4.3.6. The Dean shall inform each candidate in writing when the departmental recommendation is negative, or if the Dean decides against promotion, and shall advise the candidate of the right to appeal this recommendation as described in [section 2.6](#) (Appeal Procedures) of these guidelines.

2.4.4. Promotion of Long-Term Associate Professors

Longevity is not a sufficient basis for promotion in ECAS. 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 their discipline and a quality level of at least “good” on work that has been published. In consultation with the candidate's department, the ECAS Office of Faculty 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.

2.5. Additional Provisions and Procedures

2.5.1. A candidate or a department may in principle initiate a promotion and tenure review in any given year if deemed appropriate. Only under unusual circumstances, however, should departments initiate promotion or tenure reviews for assistant professors prior to their sixth year of service. Additionally, only in the most unusual and compelling circumstances should a review for promotion to full professor be initiated more than once in any three-year period.

2.5.2. A candidate for renewal of appointment, promotion, or tenure shall be informed of the departmental recommendation and the reason for that recommendation in writing by the chair or other alternate designated by the Dean. The contents of a department's deliberations and all materials accompanying its recommendation shall remain strictly confidential except as they are conveyed to the Dean of ECAS, the ECAS T&P Committee, other members of the faculty and administration whose duties require knowledge of the information, and the Board of Trustees.

2.5.3. 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 ECAS. All appropriately ranked and 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 must be included in the department's letter to ECAS T&P Committee.

2.5.4. 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 ECAS T&P Committee without necessity of candidate appeal.

2.5.5. 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 ECAS T&P Committee meeting on the case. Similar separate procedures should be followed with respect to annual and pre-tenure reviews of jointly appointed junior faculty.

For joint appointments with other schools or divisions of Emory University, some ad hoc adjustments will no doubt have to be made. But if an ECAS 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.

For joint-appointment promotion/tenure/review 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 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 of the joint appointment shall be represented on the ad hoc committee, and the candidate and chairs of both units may suggest committee members. It is the final prerogative of the Dean of ECAS to select the non-tenure home membership that the Dean considers best able to appraise the research, teaching, and service of the candidate.

2.5.6. The Dean of ECAS is ultimately responsible for the implementation of these guidelines, and the Dean may therefore do whatever they deem 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.

2.5.7. When an appointment or promotion involves tenure, the President shall send their 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.

2.5.8. A candidate for renewal, promotion, or tenure may withdraw their name from consideration at any point in the evaluation process.

2.6. 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 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 concerning cases of renewal, promotion, or tenure.

2.6.1. Appeal of Departmental Recommendation

2.6.1.1. The Dean shall notify a candidate in writing that they have not been recommended by the department for renewal of term appointment or promotion or tenure in their department and shall advise the candidate of the right to appeal such recommendation.

2.6.1.2. A candidate who believes that the departmental recommendation either involves an infringement of their 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 ECAS T&P Committee. Such an appeal shall be made in writing not later than three weeks from receipt of notice from the Dean and shall state whether it is based on an alleged infringement of their 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 ECAS T&P Committee shall then convene to review all materials pertinent to the issues 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 ECAS T&P Committee is empowered to gather additional information regarding the appeal from the department, the candidate, and/or from appropriate persons inside or outside Emory University.

2.6.1.3. The ECAS T&P Committee shall respond to the appeal in one of two ways:

- Having found insufficient evidence to support the appeal, the committee may recommend to the Dean that the department's recommendation be upheld.

- 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:
 - 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
 - move directly to make a recommendation to the Dean based on the committee's judgment of the merits of the candidate's case.

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

2.6.1.5. After conferring, when appropriate, with the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies, the Dean of ECAS will decide what appropriate action is to be taken and will inform the candidate, the ECAS T&P Committee, and the department of that action.

2.6.2. 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 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. Refer to Part B, Chapter 5.5 Faculty Reviews in the University Faculty Handbook: <https://provost.emory.edu/faculty/policies-guidelines/handbook/index.html>.

2.7. ECAS Tenure and Promotion Committee

2.7.1. The ECAS T&P Committee shall consist of nine members who shall all be tenured full professors. The chair of the ECAS T&P Committee shall be elected by the committee's members for a one-year term.

2.7.2. Members of the ECAS T&P Committee shall be elected by faculty vote to serve three-year staggered terms. The ECAS Faculty Senate 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		Division II – Social Sciences	Division III – Natural Sciences
African American Studies	Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies	Anthropology	Biology
Art History	Music	Economics	Chemistry
Classics	Philosophy	History	Computer Science
Comparative Literature	Religion	Political Science	Environmental Sciences
English	Russian and East Asian Languages and Cultures	Psychology	Mathematics
Film and Media	Spanish and Portuguese	Quantitative Theory and Methods	Physics
French and Italian	Theater and Dance	Sociology	
German Studies		Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	

2.7.3. No one shall serve on the ECAS T&P Committee when the committee is evaluating a member of their department. Committee membership should normally not include more than a single person from any one department.

2.7.4. The Dean may appoint alternates when members are unable to serve or, under [paragraph 2.7.3.](#), are ineligible to serve.

2.7.5. For voting purposes, a quorum shall be understood as constituted of at least six ECAS T&P Committee members. The chair shall be a voting member.

2.7.6. The names and terms of office of all ECAS T&P Committee members shall be made public.

2.7.7. An associate dean designated by the Dean of ECAS shall serve as an ex officio (non-voting) member and secretary to the committee.

2.7.8. The ECAS T&P Committee may advise the Dean on a wide range of matters pertaining to ECAS, but it shall review all appointments and promotions at the rank of associate professor and full professor, all recommendations for reappointment following pre-tenure reviews, and all appointments involving tenure.

2.7.9. As provided for in the Emory College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Bylaws (Article III, Sections 3-4), faculty may choose to stand for election in a division different from those outlined above.

3. Appendices

[Appendix A](#): Guidelines for Submitting Tenure and Promotion Materials to the ECAS Office of Faculty

[Appendix B](#): Memorandum to ECAS Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios

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

[Appendix D](#): Memorandum Regarding the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship

Appendix A: Guidelines for Submitting Tenure and Promotion Materials to the ECAS Office of Faculty

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>).

Tenure and Promotion Dossier Requirements and Timeline by Review Type

Dossier Requirement	Pre-Tenure Review
Confirmation of Plans*	April 1
<u>Part I: Initial Documents</u>	May 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of external reviewers (uploaded by department) • Curriculum vitae • 300-word summary of research 	
<u>Part II: Scholarship Information / Research Portfolio</u>	June 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top scholarly works • Research statement • Scholarly materials • COVID-19 statement (optional) and permission form • DEI statement (optional) and permission form • Updated curriculum vitae (optional) 	
<u>Part III: Teaching Evaluations</u>	December 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental comparison chart • Teaching evaluations (quantitative and qualitative) 	
<u>Part IV: Teaching and Service Portfolio</u> (only teaching required)	December 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching statement • Sample syllabi • Description of mentoring and advising activities and number of advisees • Other teaching-related materials (optional) • Updated curriculum vitae (optional) 	

*For pre-tenure cases, the Office of Faculty confirms candidate lists with departments by April 1.

Part VI: Other Items Uploaded by Department

- [Departmental letter](#)
- [Departmental criteria for excellence in research and teaching, satisfactory service](#)
- [External reviewer biographies \(final two reviewers\)](#)
- [Teaching observation letters](#)
- [Student review letters](#)

Other Items Uploaded by ECAS Office of Faculty:

- External reviewer letters and forms

Dossier Requirement	Tenure Review	Promotion to Full Professor Review
Confirmation of Plans*	April 1	January 15
<u>Part I: Initial Documents</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of external reviewers (uploaded by department) • List of service reviewers (uploaded by department) • Curriculum vitae • 300-word summary of research 	May 1	February 15
<u>Part II: Scholarship Information / Research Portfolio</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top scholarly works • Research statement • Scholarly materials • COVID-19 statement (optional) and permission form • DEI statement (optional) and permission form • Updated curriculum vitae (optional) 	June 15	April 1
<u>Part III: Teaching Evaluations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental comparison chart • Teaching evaluations (quantitative and qualitative) 	December 1	August 1
<u>Part IV: Teaching and Service Portfolio</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching statement • Sample syllabi • Description of mentoring and advising activities and number of advisees • Other teaching-related materials (optional) • Service statement • Other service-related materials (optional) • Updated curriculum vitae (optional) 	December 1	August 1
<u>Part V: Summary Materials</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-page curriculum vitae • Personal statement 	December 1	August 1

*For tenure cases, the Office of Faculty confirms candidate lists with departments by April 1. For promotion to full professor cases, department chairs **must notify** the Office of Faculty of any faculty who plan to be reviewed for promotion to full professor by January 15.

Part VI - Other Items Uploaded by Department

- [Departmental letter](#)
- [Departmental criteria for excellence in research and teaching, satisfactory service](#)
- [External reviewer biographies \(final six reviewers\) and service reviewer biographies \(final two reviewers\)](#)
- [Teaching observation letters](#)
- [Student review letters](#)

Other Items Uploaded by ECAS Office of Faculty:

- External reviewer letters and forms, service review letters

[Return to beginning of Appendix A](#)

PART I: INITIAL DOCUMENTS

List of external reviewers

Pre-tenure review

The candidate must submit a list of three names of potential external reviewers to their department chair. 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. These external reviewers should be able to provide an impartial and objective review of the candidate's work. The candidate has the option of submitting an additional list of potential reviewers whom they do not wish to be contacted. The chair and the department committee will vet the names submitted by the candidate. The department committee must independently add three additional names to the list of potential reviewers for all cases. These additional names must be independently chosen by the department and not shared in any way with the candidate. The department committee will indicate which names have been added by the committee when this list is forwarded to the ECAS Office of Faculty. The final list of external reviewer names will be vetted and ranked by the Office of Faculty. The ECAS Office of Faculty solicits two letters from the reviewers on this list.

Tenure and promotion to full professor review

The candidate must submit a list of ten names of potential external reviewers to their department chair. As a general rule, all reviewers should be full professors. These external reviewers should be able to provide an impartial and objective review of the candidate's work. The candidate has the option of submitting an additional list of potential reviewers whom they do not wish to be contacted. The chair and the department committee will vet the names submitted by the candidate. The department committee must independently add six additional names to the list of potential reviewers for all cases. These additional names must be independently chosen by the department and not shared in any way with the candidate. The department committee will indicate which names have been added by the committee when this list is forwarded to the ECAS Office of Faculty. The final list of external reviewer names will be vetted and ranked by the Office of Faculty. The ECAS Office of Faculty solicits six letters from the reviewers on this list.

Submitting the list of external reviewers

The candidate is responsible for gathering information for each external reviewer nominee. Please refer to the "External Reviewer" template provided on the ECAS Office of Faculty website to organize this information for the department tenure and promotion committee. The following information must be included:

- Name and academic rank or title of external reviewer
- Name of institution
- Email address
- Brief paragraph commenting on each reviewer's appropriateness as evaluator of the candidate's work

- Brief statement describing any personal or professional contact the candidate has had with the external reviewer. Co-authors, co-editors, collaborators, and former advisors are not eligible. The relationship between the candidate and the external reviewer should be written in neutral language and not from the perspective of “I” or “me”.

List of service reviewers (not included for pre-tenure reviews)

The candidate submits to their department chair four potential evaluators adjudged best able to appraise the candidate's contribution in the area of service to Emory University, ECAS and/or the field. The chair will vet and submit the list, adding an additional name if needed. The potential evaluators should be from outside the candidate’s department. Include the following information:

- Name and title of service reviewer
- Name of institution
- Email address
- A brief description of how the candidate worked with each potential reviewer and the nature of the service engagement they would be reviewing

Curriculum vitae

As the candidate prepares their CV for review, please remember that it 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 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

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

The candidate may decide which category they would like to place next (Publications; or Grants; or Fellowships and Awards)

- 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 research 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

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

- 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 departmental/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 departmental, ECAS, and university-level committees.
- Faculty advising for student groups
- Editorial roles, roles with national and international organizations
- Service as an external department reviewer, tenure and promotion reviewer, manuscript reviewer
- Community outreach
- Professional memberships

300-Word summary of research

Not more than 300 words in 12 point typeface. A single-spaced summary **to be written in layperson's terms** about the candidate's research. This summary will be used in initial correspondence between the ECAS Office of Faculty and potential external reviewers. It will also be used by the ECAS Tenure and Promotion Committee (ECAS T&P Committee) to assist them in understanding the candidate's specific area of research. The ECAS T&P 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.

PART II: SCHOLARSHIP INFORMATION / RESEARCH PORTFOLIO

Top scholarly works

Pre-tenure review

Candidates should list, with full citations, their three to five most important scholarly articles, publications, or other works.

Tenure review

Candidates should list, with full citations, their five most important scholarly articles, publications, or other works.

Promotion to full professor review

Candidates should list, with full citations, their five most important scholarly articles, publications, or other works published since they earned tenure.

Research statement

Not more than 2,500 words in 12 point typeface. This statement is for the external reviewers. It should include discussion of the candidate's completed research, discussion of the impact of completed research, and plans for future research. Additionally, external reviewers request that candidates explain their most important scholarly articles, as described above. For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference [Appendix C](#).

Scholarly materials

All scholarly and research materials should be submitted electronically. For books, please submit a source electronic copy, rather than a scanned copy of the book. For edited volumes, only include the chapters or sections that the candidate wrote.

Pre-tenure and tenure review

This includes **all** work that has been published or accepted for publication and examples of work-in-progress (not just the top scholarly works).

Promotion to full professor review

This includes **all** work that has been published or accepted for publication since tenure, and examples of work-in-progress (not just the top scholarly works). Additionally, either a representative body of the candidate's pre-tenure work or all of the candidate's pre-tenure work should be included.

COVID-19 statement (optional)

Not more than 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), with faculty review committee members and administrators (inside of Emory), or to note that they did not upload a COVID-19 statement.

DEI statement (optional)

Not more than 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), with faculty review committee members and administrators (inside of Emory), or to note that they did not upload a DEI statement.

PART III: TEACHING EVALUATIONS

Departmental comparison chart

- Prepared and submitted by the department
- A cover sheet that summarizes the data from a candidate's teaching evaluations as provided in the example summary table below. This should include all cross-listed classes and co-taught classes with total enrollment numbers.
- While the department creates and submits this document in Interfolio RPT, the candidate may be involved in its preparation and may verify the information.

Professor Name, Department Name, Proposed Rank

Academic Year	Semester	Course Number	Course Name	Total Enrollment	Number of Course Forms Returned	Course Score – Weighted Mean	Instructor Score – Weighted Mean	Overall Weighted Mean	Departmental Average for Courses of this Size and Type
2015-16	Fall	Biol 250	Cell Biology	25	23	7.42	7.73	8.5	8.3

Teaching evaluations (quantitative and qualitative)

- This set of quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations can be prepared and submitted by the department or by the candidate.
- Submit a complete set of both quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations for undergraduate and graduate courses (please indicate if no quantitative or qualitative data are available).
- Tenure portfolios should provide all course evaluations from date of hire (pre-tenure portfolios should provide between 5-7 semesters of student course evaluations; tenure and promotion portfolios should provide between 10-12 semesters of student course evaluations; promotion to full portfolios need only provide the most recent 5 years or 10 semesters of student course evaluations).
- If the candidate held a faculty position at another institution before arriving at Emory and does not have a significant number of student evaluations from courses taught at Emory, they should include quantitative and qualitative data from their previous institutions.
- If a candidate is coming up for an early pre-tenure or tenure review and/or has an unusually small number of Emory course evaluations, the candidate's chair should contact dean_of_faculty@emory.edu to discuss.
- The candidate's most recent course evaluations should be added to the case once they are available (i.e. departments should add fall semester evaluations to pre-tenure and tenure reviews even though these evaluations become available after the candidate submits their last set of materials).

PART IV: TEACHING AND SERVICE PORTFOLIO

Teaching statement

Not more than 2,500 words in 12 point typeface. The statement will be reviewed by all tenure and promotion committees internal to Emory University. Examples of topics to discuss include:

- Information about the candidate's teaching philosophy and methods
- Explanations of course development
- Evidence of efforts to improve teaching based on feedback from student evaluations and/or teaching observations from senior faculty
- Curricular innovations, and major pedagogical or curricular contributions
- Participation in professional development for teaching

Sample syllabi

- 3-5 syllabi recommended

Description of mentoring and advising activities and number of advisees

- Discussion of the candidate's mentoring style and approach. Include details regarding diverse forms of mentorship. Distinguish mentoring activities by formal and informal advising; graduate and undergraduate students, etc.
- Examples of topics to discuss include:
 - Creating an inclusive lab environment
 - Mentoring BIPOC students
 - Mentoring women in STEM
 - Supporting students with interdisciplinary trajectories
- Document the number of students mentored/advised

Other teaching-related 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 included for pre-tenure reviews)

Not more than 750 words in 12 point typeface. This statement will be reviewed by all tenure and promotion committees internal to Emory University. This statement provides an opportunity to explain the service the candidate has contributed to their department, ECAS,

Emory University, to the profession at large, and any other materials that they would like the tenure and promotion committees to consider.

Other service-related materials (not included for pre-tenure reviews)

- Examples include community outreach and K-12 mentoring.

PART V: SUMMARY MATERIALS

Not included for pre-tenure reviews

One-page curriculum vitae

- May NOT exceed one page; 12 point typeface

Personal statement

- Five-page statement in 12 point typeface that combines research, teaching, and service. May NOT exceed five pages including citations, etc. This should be written as a standalone document.

PART VI: OTHER ITEMS UPLOADED BY DEPARTMENT

Departmental letter

Due to the ECAS Office of Faculty at least a week before the ECAS T&P Committee reviews the case. Templates are available on the ECAS Office of Faculty website.

Departmental criteria

Departmental criteria for excellence, or progress toward excellence, in research and teaching and for satisfactory service

External reviewer biographies and service reviewer biographies

This document should include biographical information about each of the final two reviewers (pre-tenure reviews) or the final six reviewers (tenure and promotion to full professor reviews), and a statement about the candidate's relationship to each reviewer. Two pages maximum.

Additionally, for tenure and promotion to full professor reviews, departments should create a separate document with biographical information about each of the final two service reviewers. One page maximum.

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

- The chair should solicit letters from ALL students in two undergraduate classes of different levels (such as introductory and advanced). Additionally, the chair should solicit letters from ALL students in two graduate seminars, if applicable. Letters should also be solicited by the chair from all of the candidate's honors, directed research, and graduate advisees. The candidate may not contact students to request these letters. Do not include "thank you" notes/letters from students.
- Templates for soliciting student review letters are available on the ECAS Office of Faculty website.

Appendix B: Memorandum to ECAS Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios and the Evaluation of Teaching used for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

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."

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

January 7, 2022

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

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.

Appendix D: Memorandum from the Emory College Humanities Council Regarding the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship

Adopted November 2013

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.