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

Teaching, research, and service encompass the primary activities of the faculty of Emory College
of Arts and Sciences. Since each of these is essential to the College, each is weighed carefully in
all considerations involving appointment, reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure.
To be eligible for tenure and promotion a faculty member should combine strength in teaching
and research, showing excellent achievement and promise in at least one of these and very good
achievement and promise in the other as well as in service.

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 is a central activity of the faculty, and excellence in it is
couraged and rewarded.

Research is defined as inquiry undertaken that establishes facts, develops principles, or
illuminates or answers questions within an area of intellectual pursuit through the systematic
collection of evidence that can be subjected to replication, verification, or critical evaluation by
persons other than the original researcher. When a faculty member's duties include the teaching of
creative writing, sculpting, painting, dance, choreography, music performance or music
composition, original works and performances will be evaluated as equivalent to research.
Research will be evaluated primarily by the quality of the faculty member's work that has been
published or formally accepted for publication.

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

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

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

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

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

1. **Preamble**

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

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

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

2. **Appointments**

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

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

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

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

3. Departmental Reviews of Assistant and Associate Professors

A. Departmental Review Procedures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. Review of Associate Professors

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

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

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

4. Reviews for Promotion of Faculty on Regular Appointment

A. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

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

After these evaluations of the candidate's teaching, research, and service have been compiled the
tenured members of the department shall meet to consider its action. Following this meeting, the chair shall write a detailed letter summarizing and justifying the department's decision for or against the candidate's promotion. When a departmental decision is negative, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate's appointment not be renewed (or if the negative decision concerns promotion prior to the sixth year of service, the department may elect to recommend annual renewal). When a departmental decision is positive, the chair shall write a letter to the Dean recommending that the candidate be promoted. A copy of the recommendation and evaluation, or an accurate written summary of the substance of the recommendation and evaluation, whether positive or negative, shall also be forwarded to the candidate. Should the department decide to provide a summary rather than a copy of the recommendation and evaluation to the faculty member under review, it shall inform the candidate that the document is a summary and shall forward a copy of the summary to the Dean. When a decision is not unanimous, the department must, in its letter to the Dean, record and explain dissenting opinions. Having reviewed the recommendation prepared by the chair on behalf of the department, each individual faculty member participating in the decision shall either sign the department's recommendation or prepare a separate letter stating his or her own recommendation. As early as feasible, usually by 31 January, the chair shall forward the department's recommendation and all material pertinent to the recommendation to the Dean.

The Dean shall inform each candidate in writing when the departmental recommendation is negative and shall advise the candidate of the right to appeal this recommendation as described in Section 6 of these guidelines. The Dean shall forward to the Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee all recommendations for promotion. The Committee shall then review the recommendation and accompanying materials. In each case, the Committee shall schedule meetings with the chair of the candidate's department to discuss the recommendation. In addition, each candidate may choose an advocate, usually a member of the Emory College Faculty, to appear before the Committee to discuss the candidate's qualifications. The Committee is empowered to gather additional information as it sees fit from the department, the candidate, and/or from appropriate persons inside or outside Emory University. Following its review, but usually not later than 1 April, the Committee shall send both the material submitted to it and its recommendation to the Dean. The Dean shall then formulate his or her decision, having first consulted, when appropriate, the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies; if he or she wishes, the Dean of the College may also confer with representatives of the department or with the Committee. Having formulated his or her decision, usually by 15 April, the Dean shall inform in writing the candidate and the chair of the department of his or her decision. A decision by the Dean to promote an assistant professor to associate professor with tenure shall be forwarded as a recommendation, together with the materials and recommendation submitted by the department and the recommendation of the Committee, through the Provost to the President.

B. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

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

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

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

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

C. Promotion of Long-Term Associate Professors

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

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

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

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

D. Although the contents of a department's deliberations should be kept strictly confidential, the department's recommendation on a candidate must be arrived at by open voice or hand vote. Secret voting, while perhaps making the process more comfortable for the voters, undermines fairness and transparency and is unacceptable in Emory College.

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

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

G. In promotion or tenure cases involving joint appointment, one department shall be clearly designated as primary locus or "tenure home". Both departments (or department and program), however, shall conduct promotion and/or tenure reviews. The reviews shall be independent, except that both units will use the same external research evaluation letters and work together on an equitable basis in the process of selecting external evaluators. Each unit should send to the other a copy of its final written report on the candidate. Both chairs should appear at the Tenure and Promotion Committee meeting on the case. Similar separate procedures should be followed with respect to annual and fourth-year reviews of junior faculty on joint appointment.
On joint appointments with other schools or divisions of the University, some ad hoc adjustments will no doubt have to be made. But if a College department is the candidate's tenure home, that department shall do all in its power to ensure that the other school/division participates in a timely way in selecting external evaluators and in reporting the result of its review, and that its review is recognized as full and valid within that school/division's own system.

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

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

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

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

6. Appeal Procedures

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

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

A. Appeal of Departmental Recommendation

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

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

3. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall respond to the appeal in one of two ways:

(a) Having found insufficient evidence to support the appeal, the Committee may recommend to the Dean that the department's recommendation be upheld.

(b) Having concluded that the department may have failed adequately to consider or document the evidence or may have violated the candidate's academic freedom, the Committee may either (1) request that the department reconsider the credentials of the candidate and render a second recommendation to the Committee prior to the Committee's final recommendation to the Dean, or (2) move directly to make a recommendation to the Dean based on the Committee's judgment of the merits of the candidate's case.

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

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

B. Appeal of Dean's Decision or Recommendation

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

7. The Emory College Tenure and Promotion Committee

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

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

Division I (Humanities)

  African American Studies
  Art History
  Classics
  Comparative Literature
  English
  Film and Media Studies
  French and Italian
  German Studies
  ILA
  Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies
  Music
  Philosophy
  Religion
  Russian and East Asian Languages & Cultures
  Spanish
  Theater and Dance

Division II (Social Sciences)

  Anthropology
  Economics
  Educational Studies
  Health and Physical Education
  History
  Political Science
  Psychology
  Sociology
  Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Division III (Natural Sciences and Mathematics)

  Biology
  Chemistry
Environmental Studies
Mathematics and Computer Science
Physics

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. As provided for in the Bylaws of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, faculty may choose to stand for election in a division different from those outlined above.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A: Guidelines for Submitting Tenure and Promotion Materials to the College Office
Appendix B: Memorandum to Emory College Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios
Appendix C: Memorandum Regarding Evaluation of Performance Activity for Promotion and Tenure
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GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING TENURE AND PROMOTION MATERIALS TO THE COLLEGE OFFICE

(Submit all materials to Dean Carla Freeman’s office—400 Candler Library)

Below you will find instructions for the Tenure and Promotion process in the College of Arts and Sciences. This process is very detailed and lengthy, and our goal is to help you submit a successful portfolio. The earlier materials are submitted, the smoother the review process. The following material should be electronically submitted to Melody Edwards (mnedwa3@emory.edu) in the College office. PACKETS THAT DO NOT CONFORM TO THESE GUIDELINES WILL BE RETURNED.

1. List of Outside Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion Files
The candidate should submit to the department chair a list of fifteen (15) names of potential external reviewers, which will then be vetted by the Department. The department may add two additional names to the list.
This list should include the following:

- Name of External Reviewer
- Academic rank and name of Institution
- Mailing address (no P.O. Box) and email address, telephone and fax numbers
- A brief paragraph commenting on the reviewer’s appropriateness for your review, and a statement disclosing any personal contact you have had with the potential reviewer. Co-authors, co-editors, and collaborators should be avoided. The relationship between you and the external reviewer must be written in neutral language and not from the perspective of “I” or “me”.

The final list of names will be vetted by the College office.

The candidate should also submit a list of four (4) names of possible service reviewers to the Department Chair for review.

Please submit the following documents by May 15:
- a) list of potential external reviewers (this will come from the Department once vetted)
- b) a list of four (4) names of possible service reviewers
- b) a copy of an updated Curriculum Vitae (please provide a Word and PDF version)
- c) a one page single-spaced, (no more than 300 words) brief summary of your area of research/discipline to the College office

2. Scholarly Materials
An electronic copy (zip file, flash drive or CD) of scholarly/research material may be sent to the College office as early as August 1st, but no later than September 1st. If submitting a flash drive or CD, please provide 6 copies. Along with the scholarly/research materials, please include a copy of an updated (if applicable) Curriculum Vitae and a five (5) page Research Statement, inclusive of references. (See a description of this statement under Part 1 – Research).

3. Departmental Review
When the external review letters are received in the College office, they will be forwarded to the Department for their review. The Departmental review will follow the procedures outlined in Principles and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion. These Guidelines can be found on the College website at http://college.emory.edu/home/administration/policy/index.html.

If the Department’s decision is positive, one (1) full set of the candidate’s portfolio will be forwarded to the College office for review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING TENURE AND PROMOTION MATERIALS

Updated: 5/23/2015
CANDIDATE PORTFOLIO

The candidate portfolio will include the following:

Please submit the packet electronically (PDF) in the following order.

PART I  RESEARCH – (electronic: submit as PDF)

A. Letter from the Department (signed by the appropriate ranked faculty who participated in the review)

B. Curriculum Vitae – (As you prepare your CV for review, please remember that it will be reviewed by non-specialists. Please separate peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications. Journal articles, chapters in edited volumes, reviews, edited volumes, books, and other pertinent publication types should be clearly indicated. If appropriate for your discipline, include citation information in a summary form as derived from a citation index specific to your discipline, as well as listing other measures of impact, such as invited talks and awards. All page numbers for all print publications should be clearly numbered. Include approximate word counts for an online publication, clear labeling of which publications are peer-reviewed and which are not, and clear labeling of the status of work that has not yet appeared in press, accepted for publication, etc. For major articles and books not yet appeared or in proofs, also provide a letter or email from the editor indicating that the work has indeed been accepted, and the expected date of publication.)

C. Short Research Statement - Please submit a one-page single-spaced, (no more than 300 words) brief summary of your research/discipline. This brief summary will be used by the Tenure and Promotion Committee ONLY to assist in understanding your specific area of research/discipline. An explanation for this summary follows:

The Tenure and Promotion Committee is compiled of three members from each Division in the College (Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences). If a member of the committee is in the Department of Theater Studies (just an example), he/she might not be well versed on the research from a candidate in the Physics Department. The five-page Research Statement is written to a scholar (external reviewer) in the candidate’s discipline; the brief summary is to be written in layman’s terms.

D. Research Statement (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words). Include discussion of completed research; discussion of the impact of completed research; and plans for future research. For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference the Goldsmith memo.

E. A one-page list of the External Review Letter Writers (prepared and included by department). The list should include biographical information about each reviewer and a statement about the candidate’s relationship to the reviewer. Co-authors, co-editors, and collaborators should be avoided. The relationship between the candidate and the external reviewer must be written in neutral language and not from the perspective of the candidate. (i.e., do not use “I” or “me”).

F. Copies of the external review letters and external review forms (provided by department).

PART II  TEACHING – (electronic: submit as PDF – if more than one file please label Teaching 1, 2 etc.)

A. Teaching Statement (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words).
B. A cover sheet that provides a summation of the candidate’s teaching such as provided in the sample table below. (See the Teaching Summation Template.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Weighted Mean Course Score</th>
<th>Weighted Mean Instructor Score</th>
<th>Overall Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Departmental averages of courses of this size and type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>BUS 145</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **One (1) set of teaching materials.** Candidates and departments have discretion over what should be included in the materials; in most cases, the materials include the following:

- Copies of all College course evaluation summary sheets.
- Written open and closed course evaluations from both undergraduate and graduate courses (*generally, tenure cases should provide all written course evaluations and promotion cases only 4-5 years; however, candidates should exercise their own judgment on what is appropriate.*)
- Peer teaching evaluation/observation letters and/or letters of support from fellow colleagues.
- Student support letters (**solicited by the department not the candidate**). **Do not include “thank you” notes/letters from students.**
- List of thesis supervisions and committees. (PhD, MA, Honors).
- Description of advising activities and name/number of advisees.
- Any other teaching related materials. (e.g. grants, teaching awards, etc.) you would like the Tenure and Promotion Committee to consider.

**PART III SERVICE – (electronic: submit as PDF)**

A. Service Statement (2-3 pages); describe service to the department, to the college, to the University, and to the profession at large.

B. Service letters

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

**PART IV SCHOLARLY MATERIALS**

A. One copy of all scholarly/research materials. **Note: research material can be submitted electronically and in print when sending it to external reviewers.** Six (6) copies of each monograph must be provided to the College Office. However, materials may only be submitted electronically for the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and for the Provost’s office.

B. Any other material the candidate would like the Tenure and Promotion Committee to consider.

**GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING TENURE AND PROMOTION MATERIALS**

Updated: 5/23/2015
### Summary of Deadlines for the Tenure & Promotion Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Items Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 15</strong></td>
<td>1) Curriculum Vitae — <em>(See detailed description in Part I – Research)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Ranked, vetted list of fifteen (15) External Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) List of four (4) service reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Research Summary Statement - One page single-spaced, (no more than 300 words) brief summary of your area of research/discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 1</strong></td>
<td>1) Electronic copy of scholarly/research materials (zip file, flash drive or CD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) List of four (4) Service Reviewers to your Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Research Statement — (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words). <em>Include discussion of completed research; discussion of the impact completed research; and plans for future research.</em> For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference the attached Goldsmith memo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-October - March</strong></td>
<td>Once all six (6) external review letters and both service letters have been received and the Department reviews the file and votes (varies between mid-October and March), the following is sent to the College office:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Part I - Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Part II - Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Part III - Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Part IV - Scholarly Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March - April</strong></td>
<td>Following a positive review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Dean Forman, the candidate will submit to the College office:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) One-page Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Five-page “Personal Statement”. This is a combination of Research, Teaching and Service statements. <em>The Personal Statement is a requirement from the Provost’s Office for PAC (Presidential Advisory Committee) review and final review by the Provost’s office and Emory University Board of Trustees.</em> The Personal Statement can be no longer than five (5) pages. This is a requirement of the Provost’s office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum to Emory College Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios
Rick Rubinson, Chair of the College Faculty Council
February 26, 2002

In his November 1, 1999 memo to Chairs, George Jones, writing for the Faculty Council, outlined eight recommended components for inclusion in the teaching portfolio for candidates being considered for tenure and promotion. The present Council would like to draw your attention to two of these components, written peer reviews and comparative teaching data, because they require actions by the department, not just the candidate, to complete.

Written peer reviews are important for supplementing student course evaluations. They can be used to provide not only a faculty perspective on the candidate’s classroom teaching, but also to detail aspects of a course that students are not able to judge, such as whether the course covers the expected topics, the readings are current, the level of difficulty is appropriate, and the like. These peer reviews are especially helpful for candidates who have limited teaching time at Emory because they have recently come from other schools.

Many departments do have a system of routine, annual peer review for their assistant and associate professors. We encourage those departments that do not have such a system to develop one. The Faculty Council is willing to advise departments in this task.

Comparative teaching data is also useful in judging a candidates’ teaching. Some departments now provide some combination of the following: a comparison of the candidate’s course evaluation scores with other scores for the same course, with other courses at the same level, with other courses of similar size, with overall department averages, and the like. This comparative data helps place the candidate’s teaching in relation to the teaching in his or her own department.

Therefore, the Faculty Council encourages departments to develop a routine system for calculating such teaching data and updating it each semester so that these comparisons are readily available as each candidate comes up for review. Again, the Council is willing to advise in this task.

Though these recommendations do entail some additional work for the faculty, they will help provide a thorough and fair evaluation of teaching. Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Memorandum to Emory College Chairs Regarding Teaching Portfolios
George H. Jones, Chair of the College Faculty Council
November 1, 1999

You may be aware that the Provost has recently promulgated a set of University Guidelines for Candidate Files for use in the preparation of promotion and tenure dossiers. Those guidelines recommend that “The folder should include the teaching portfolio of the candidate. The contents of this portfolio will be determined by departmental and school requirements.” The College Faculty Council has discussed this recommendation and we propose below a set of elements that might reasonably comprise the teaching portfolios of College faculty. We realize that not all the components listed below will be relevant to every department, program or faculty member. We are also aware that it may not be possible to compile dossiers consisting of all the elements listed below in time for the upcoming round of promotion and tenure hearings. We urge you to include as much of the information requested below as is reasonably possible.

1. A written commentary for the chair – Elements of this commentary could, for example, be derived from annual reviews. The commentary should include information regarding the nature of the teaching assigned to or elected by the candidate, the reasons for any unusual features of the portfolio, e.g., the absence of graduate teaching, problems encountered by the candidate in his/her teaching and efforts to improve them, teaching innovations implemented by the candidate, contributions to course and/or program design, etc.

2. A statement of the candidate’s teaching philosophy and self-evaluation – This statement should not only recount the candidate’s teaching history, it should also describe the approach to teaching adopted by the candidate and the ways in which his/her thinking about teaching is manifested in the design of courses and in the classroom itself. The Provost’s guidelines indicate that the candidate’s personal statement, including the description of the candidate’s scholarship, should not exceed five typewritten pages.

3. A list of all courses taught by the candidate, by semester, indicating course title and number of students enrolled and a summary of bubble sheet scores for all undergraduate courses.

4. Written commentary from in-class observation of the candidate by appropriate faculty from the academic unit – These commentaries should be as detailed as possible and should, when possible, be based on more than a single classroom visit.

5. An evaluation of the candidate’s teaching in comparison with other faculty in the unit – This information may not be useful in all cases but it is often helpful to the Council to have a sense of the quality of a candidate’s teaching in relation to others. This comparison might be based on bubble sheet scores, perhaps arranged by class level, on written student evaluations, or on other criteria deemed appropriate by the chair.

6. Written student evaluations – In addition to bubble sheet scores and summaries, every effort should be made to include written comments from students (both undergraduate and graduate
students [see further below]) regarding the candidate’s teaching. Summaries of student comments may be provided if necessary.

7. Evaluations of graduate teaching – These evaluations may include written comments from graduate students and quantitative indicators (e.g., the equivalent of bubble sheet scores) as appropriate.

We have almost certainly not exhausted all the possibilities regarding components of the teaching portfolio. Please feel free to supply whatever additional information you may think is relevant.

The Council feels that the kind of information indicated above will meet the spirit and letter of the Provost’s guidelines and that the inclusion of as much of that information as possible in P&T dossiers will greatly facilitate our deliberations. We will then have access to information of a quantity and quality regarding a candidate’s teaching that approximates that already provided to us regarding scholarship.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your cooperation.
Memorandum to Dean Robert Paul
Regarding Evaluation of Performance Activity for Promotion and Tenure
David Goldsmith
May 20, 2002

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

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

Promotion and Tenure Review
Artistic Research in the Performing Arts

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

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

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

Category B. Research activities representing a significant contribution to the discipline with more narrowly defined scopes of inquiry and research method. (analogous to single articles for humanities and sciences)
Category C. Research activities limited in scope including initial investigations and contributions within a narrowly defined community. (analogous to short reviews and papers at academic venues)