

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING TENURE AND PROMOTION
MATERIALS TO THE COLLEGE OFFICE

(Submit all materials to Dean Michael A. Elliott's office—400 Candler Library)

Please note: Where possible, we would appreciate it if the following documents could be submitted to the College office, **electronically** to Beth Kivett, ekivett@emory.edu: Curriculum Vitae and one page single-spaced, (no more than 300 words) brief summary of your area of research/discipline and Curriculum Vitae.

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 outside reviewers which has been vetted by the Department. This list should include:

- a) names
- b) academic ranks
- c) mail and email addresses
- d) telephone and fax numbers
- e) a brief biographical paragraph that comments on the reviewer's appropriateness for this case, and
- f) a statement disclosing any personal contact the candidate has had with this reviewer.

The department may choose to add two additional names to the list. The department should rank the reviewers according to the order of preference.

If you have not already done so, please submit a) list of external reviewers, b) a copy of the candidate's Curriculum Vitae and c) a one page single-spaced, (no more than 300 words) brief summary of candidates' area of research/discipline to the College office as soon as possible (not later than September 15). *The earlier the materials are submitted, the earlier the case will go through the promotion process.*

2. Scholarly Materials

Six (6) sets of scholarly/research materials that include a copy of the Curriculum Vitae should be submitted to the College office **as early in the Fall Semester as possible**, but at least by **September 15**, for the external reviewers. You may also wish to include your Research Statement with these materials. Please avoid putting your materials in large binders - this makes the package more cumbersome to ship. **Please note:** The College office does not retain a copy of your research materials. The six sets received are all mailed out.

3. List of Service Reviewers

By **September 15**, four (4) names of possible service reviewers should be submitted to the College office. At least one of these names should come from the candidate and at least one should come from the Department Chair.

4. Departmental Review

When the external review letters and the service review letters are received in the College office, copies will be forwarded to the Department for use in their review. The Departmental review will follow the procedures outlined in *Principles and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion*. <http://college.emory.edu/home/administration/policy/index.html>

If the Department’s decision is positive, the candidate’s materials will be forwarded to the College for review. At this point, the College will need the following materials:

- a. Letter from the Department
- b. Curriculum Vitae – *(please separate peer reviewed journal articles; reviews, edited volumes, books and other pertinent publication types for the discipline. If appropriate for your discipline, include citation information in a summary form [e.g. as derived from Google Scholar, Web of Science, Publish, Perish or another citation index specific to your discipline], as well as listing other measures of impact, such as invited talks and awards)*
- c. 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 attached Goldsmith memo
- d. One copy of all scholarly/research materials
- e. One page list of reviewers with biographical information and a statement about the candidate’s relationship to the reviewer. (This should be prepared by the Department—not the candidate—from the list of 15 names the candidate provided earlier.) 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. Teaching Statement (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words)
- g. A summation of the candidates teaching as provided in the sample table below:

Professor Name
Department Name
Proposed Rank

Academic Year	Semester	Course Number	Course Name	Total Enrollment	Weighted Mean Course Score	Weighted Mean Instructor Score	Overall Weighted Mean	Departmental average of courses of this size and type
2007-2008	Fall	4905	BUS 459	25	7.42	7.73	8.05	

SAMPLE

*See attached recommendations from the Tenure & Promotion Committee (formerly known as the Faculty Council) about the teaching materials (Rubinson and Jones memos).

- h. Service Statement (2-3 pages)
- i. Any other material you wish the Tenure and Promotion Committee to consider

All materials are to be single-sided. Please do not bind any of the materials submitted to the College office, as these items need to be photocopied and distributed to the Tenure and Promotion Committee

Summary of Deadlines for the Tenure & Promotion Processes

Deadline	Items due
<p><i>Preferably in the spring prior to June 1st</i></p> <p>Final deadline is <u>September 15</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Curriculum Vitae – <i>(please separate peer reviewed journal articles; reviews, edited volumes, books and other pertinent publication types for the discipline. If appropriate for your discipline, include citation information in a summary form [e.g. as derived from Google Scholar, Web of Science, Publish, Perish or another citation index specific to your discipline], as well as listing other measures of impact, such as invited talks and awards)</i> 2) Research Statement (not more than 5 pages or 2,500 words), <i>Include discussion of completed research; discussion of the impact of completed research; and plans for future research.</i> For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference the attached Goldsmith memo 3) Ranked, vetted list of fifteen (15) External Reviewers 4) One page single-spaced, (no more than 300 words) brief summary of candidates’ area of research/discipline
<p align="center">September 15</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Six (6) sets of scholarly/research materials 2) List of four (4) Service Reviewers 3) Research Statement - (no more than 5 pages or 2,500 words) <i>Include discussion of completed research; discussion of the impact of completed research; and plans for future research.</i> For faculty in the area of performing arts, please reference the attached Goldsmith memo
<p>Once all 6 external review letters and both service letters have been received and the Department votes (varies between mid-October and March) the following is sent to the College office: all single-sided, paper copies</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Department letter 2) Updated Curriculum Vitae 3) One (1) set of scholarly/research materials 4) One (1) set of teaching materials 5) Research, Teaching & Service Statements 6) One-page biographical information & disclosure statement for the six (6) external reviewers
<p>Following a positive review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Dean Forman, the candidate will submit to the College office: all single-sided, paper copies</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) One-page Curriculum Vitae 2) Five-page “Personal Statement” that addresses research, teaching and service; addressing both achievements and future plans. <i>This statement should be written in language that the non-specialist can understand.</i> These items are required by the Provost’s Office for PAC review and final review by Emory University Board of Trustees

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)