



**Institute for
Biomedical Sciences**

**Institute for Biomedical Sciences
Georgia State University
Promotion and Tenure Manual
For Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

Approved by the
Institute for Biomedical Sciences Faculty
October 28, 2015

Approved by the
University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee
August 23, 2016

“Your evaluation will become part of the candidate’s dossier and will be available to those faculty in the department and the college as well as university administrators who are involved in the promotion and tenure review process. You should be aware, however, that the Georgia Open Records Law may result in your review becoming public. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia has maintained that letters of evaluation are exempt from the Georgia

Open Records Law, but the issue has yet to be adjudicated.”

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	3
II. Institute for Biomedical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Process	4
<i>A. Overview</i>	4
<i>B. Special Circumstances</i>	5
<i>C. Notification of Eligibility</i>	5
<i>D. External Review Letters</i>	6
<i>E. IBMS Review Process</i>	7
<i>F. University Review Process</i>	9
<i>G. Promotion and Tenure Calendar and Responsibilities</i>	9
III. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	10
<i>A. General Requirements for Promotion and/or Tenure</i>	10
<i>B. Performance Areas</i>	10
<i>C. Tenure Criteria and Time Requirements</i>	13
IV. Guidelines for Preparation of the Promotion and Tenure Dossier	13
<i>A. General Guidelines</i>	14
<i>B. Specific Instructions for Curriculum Vita</i>	14
<i>C. Specific Instructions for Dossier</i>	17
V. Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Review	19
<i>A. Pre-Tenure Review</i>	19
<i>B. Post-Tenure Review</i>	20
Appendices	21
<i>Appendix A: Standard Letter for External Reviewers</i>	21
<i>Appendix B: General Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Process</i>	253
<i>Appendix C: Rating Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review</i>	318
<i>Appendix D: Rating Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review</i>	31
<i>Appendix E: Promotion and Tenure Application Face Sheet</i>	34

I. Introduction

Promotion and tenure decisions are extremely important to the life of the institution. They are the means by which the University retains its most valuable scholars, sustains excellence in its instructional program, and promotes its mission to advance knowledge. Promotion and tenure evaluations are also among the most important events in a faculty member's professional life. Accordingly, it is essential that all faculty members be treated fairly and granted due process in the deliberations that determine tenure and promotion.

The tenure criteria and procedures established by Georgia State University conform to the requirements of the Board of Regents. The most current version of these policies can be found in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents ([http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section 8.3.7](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section%208.3.7)). Each Institute within the University is charged with specifying and making available to its faculty an elaboration of University criteria, processes, and procedures relating to promotion and tenure as they apply to that institute. This document serves that purpose.

All promotion and tenure decisions are made in accordance with and subject to the rules and procedures outlined in Georgia State University's Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty.

The promotion and tenure standards, policies, and procedures outlined in this document require ongoing reassessment to maintain consistency with University and Institute levels. Faculty will be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the Promotion and Tenure manual of the Institute in effect at the time a specific review process is requested.

Excellence in research, teaching, and service is the general standard at Georgia State University against which candidate qualifications are evaluated for promotion and tenure. The Institute for Biomedical Sciences' (IBMS) Mission statement is an interpretation of the University's general standard of excellence within the context of biomedical sciences. As an Institute located in an urban environment, the IBMS believes its mission is best achieved by having faculty who are involved in diverse scholarly and professional activities. These include unique opportunities for application of state of the art information to practice situations as evidenced in research, teaching, and service activities. Faculty development and evaluation processes within IBMS recognize the variety of roles our faculty must assume and acknowledge that there are multiple paths to excellence.

II. Institute for Biomedical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Process

A. Overview

Tenure and Promotion Goals and Standards: The main purposes of tenure are to recognize high quality performance of faculty members, to protect academic freedom, and to enable the University to attract and retain outstanding faculty. The decision to award tenure is based on the merit of the individual faculty member's demonstrated accomplishments in research, teaching, and service, the trajectory of continued accomplishments throughout the faculty member's career, and the mission of IBMS and the University.

The candidate's record will be evaluated according to University and IBMS criteria, and professional standards for conduct in research, teaching, and service. In each area: (1) research; (2) teaching; and (3) service the candidate will be evaluated as either having met or having not met the standards for promotion or tenure. It is necessary to meet the standards in each of the three areas for promotion or tenure.

The candidate compiles a dossier in the format stipulated in Section IV of this manual. The dossier substantiates the applicant's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The dossier submitted by the candidate includes materials prepared by the candidate, substantiating documentation, and space for external review letters and recommendation letters (added during the review process) from the IBMS Promotion and Tenure committee and the Director of the IBMS. The applicant's credentials are evaluated by the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee and the IBMS Director according to the criteria and procedures stipulated in the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures Manual. Committee decisions are determined by a majority vote; written dissent letters by Committee members who disagree with the majority opinion become a part of the dossier.

The recommendations made at each level of review, any dissenting letters resulting from IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee review, and responses by the candidate to any recommendation become part of the dossier and are considered at each successive level of review. All letters of recommendation should include a summary statement of the candidate's accomplishments and justification for the recommendation based on the evidence in the candidate's dossier. Letters of recommendation from the Promotion and Tenure Committee must be signed by all members of the committee in agreement with the recommendation. Any dissent letter(s) must also be signed. The committee members' signatures will not be included in the letters provided to the candidates to preserve confidentiality.

At all levels of review within IBMS, candidates will receive a copy of the letters of recommendation and any dissent letters. Copies are to be sent to the candidate in the most expeditious and confidential manner possible. Candidates have the opportunity to respond in writing to any recommendations within the time frame specified in the University Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures Manual. Candidates have the right to withdraw their application for promotion and/or tenure following any level of review.

Between February 1 and March 15 of each year, IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee will hold an informational meeting to discuss promotion and tenure policies and procedures.

Candidates are encouraged to attend. The meeting is open to all members of IBMS.

B. Special Circumstances

- 1. Tenure after Promotion to Associate Professor:** It is customary for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor to be considered concurrently. The criteria for tenure are the same for faculty hired at the rank of associate professor and faculty up for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Similarly, the criteria for tenure at the rank of professor are the same as those for promotion to the rank of professor with tenure.
- 2. Tenure on Appointment:** The President may approve an outstanding distinguished faculty member for the award of tenure upon the faculty member's initial appointment; such action is otherwise referred to as tenure upon appointment. Candidates for Tenure on Appointment will be appointed to the rank of Associate or Full Professor at Georgia State and will normally have held tenure at a peer or aspirational research institution prior to their appointment at Georgia State. The candidate must meet the current standards for tenure at Georgia State University. Appointment of a faculty member with tenure on appointment will otherwise follow the normal GSU procedure for hiring a senior faculty member, except that the following must also occur. The candidate must, during the course of their recruitment, be interviewed by the Provost or his/her designee. Prior to the Provost office interview, the IBMS Director must have reviewed the credentials of the candidate with the Provost and have received permission to consider the candidate for tenure on appointment. The full candidate application dossier must be forwarded to the Provost's Office, including the candidate's cover letter, CV, current letters of recommendation, evidence of scholarly work, and evidence of successful teaching experience. After the Provost's office interview occurs, the Dean or Director will be informed of the Provost's decision concerning tenure on appointment. At that time, a formal hiring recommendation from the unit (again, including a full tenure dossier) will be forwarded to the Provost's office. The case for tenure on appointment will be formally reviewed by the Provost and then forwarded, along with his/her recommendation, to the President for a final decision. Requests for Tenure on Appointment that do not follow these procedural guidelines are at risk of being delayed and/or returned to the unit.

C. Notification of Eligibility

Every faculty member has a responsibility to be aware of the contents of the IBMS and university promotion and tenure manuals, including deadlines. Faculty members are notified of their upcoming eligibility in writing by the IBMS Director no later than February 1 of the calendar year during which the faculty member could be considered. Notification occurs annually as long as a faculty member remains eligible for promotion and/or tenure. A candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure must respond to the Director's notification in writing by the date specified on the university's Promotion and Tenure Calendar during the year in which the candidate will be considered. The Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee should be copied on this correspondence. It is the candidate's option to use approved prior credit toward tenure. A candidate with probationary credit must also notify the Director by the deadline specified on the university

calendar if s/he will keep or relinquish some or all of the awarded credit.

A maximum of two (2) years suspension of the probationary period may be granted due to a leave of absence based on birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member. Such interruption must be approved by the President.

D. External Review Letters

1. The primary purpose of the external review is to assess the candidate's scholarly achievements and prominence in the field. External reviewers must be able to provide an independent assessment and therefore may not have any personal or professional investment in the career of the candidate. Input from external evaluators will be solicited for any candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure. External review letters will be sought from nationally known scholars in the candidate's field. Reviewers should have rank equivalent to or greater than that being sought by the candidate. Each external reviewer should be from a research-extensive university outside of Georgia with scholarship of a rigor similar to aspirational peer institutions for the candidate's discipline. Reviewers should not be a recent collaborator with the candidate and should not be currently employed by the institution that awarded the candidate's doctorate.
2. The candidate shall submit a list containing at least five (5) names of individuals who are qualified to assess his/her work to the Director of IBMS. The IBMS Director, in consultation with the Chair of IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee, shall also prepare a list of at least five (5) names of individuals who are qualified to serve as external reviewers. The candidate should not contact any of the individuals on the lists of external reviewers concerning a possible request for an evaluation. The candidate should be reminded of the principles of professional ethics associated with external reviews. These principles prohibit reviews that would involve a conflict of interest.
3. The candidate shall provide the following information about potential reviewers:
 - (a) Name, academic credentials, organizational affiliation, and complete mailing address with zip code, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address at the employing institution.
 - (b) Title/rank
 - (c) Areas of expertise
 - (d) A one-paragraph narrative describing the individual's qualifications to serve as an external reviewer (as specified in Section II. C.1. above), including his/her major achievements, standing in the discipline, and nature and extent of any personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate. Additional rationale for inclusion as an external reviewer should include, if applicable:
 - i. Organizational/departmental affiliation – e.g. peer institution, aspirational institution, highly ranked department (discipline)
 - ii. Leading scholar/expert in the candidate's research area and/or discipline
4. The Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Director of IBMS may request additional external reviewer names if the suggested reviewers do not appear to meet

the stated criteria or are unable to evaluate the candidate.

5. The Director of the IBMS will review the lists of names and select three to five (3-5) external reviewers to be contacted from the candidate's list and three to five (3-5) from the list provided by Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Director of IBMS. It is expected that a minimum of five (5) letters will be secured from external reviewers. If after repeated efforts five (5) letters are not obtained, the Director may accept fewer letters (but not less than three (3)) with a memorandum in the dossier summarizing the steps taken to obtain reviewers and the number of people contacted from both lists.
6. The candidate will submit seven (7) packets of materials to the Director of the IBMS for mailing to the external reviewers. The seven (7) packets are required for the following purposes: six (6) for the selected external reviewers, one (1) for IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee file. Materials will include a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita, three examples of scholarly work published or accepted for publication during the time interval under review, and, at the option of the candidate, a two-page narrative statement linking accomplishments in scholarly activity to the criteria for promotion and tenure. Each packet should be placed in an unsealed, unaddressed manila envelope ready for mailing. None of the materials will be returned to the candidate.
7. The Director of the IBMS is responsible for communicating with the external reviewers. The Director sends the packet of materials and a standard letter (Appendix A) to each external reviewer requesting that the reviewer evaluate in writing the quality and level of the candidate's professional development, academic and scholarly achievements, and potential for continuing scholarly contributions to her/his field. In evaluating the candidate in the area of scholarship, the review is not limited to the examples of scholarly work included in the packet. The external reviewer may address the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service if he/she has knowledge related to these areas. It is not necessary to make a specific recommendation regarding the candidate's application for promotion to the rank of Associate/ Professor and/or for tenure. The external reviewer will be asked to send the written (not faxed) evaluation, an electronic copy of the evaluation, along with his/her brief curriculum vita or bio-sketch in electronic form, to the Director of IBMS.
8. All letters from the external reviewers will be treated as confidential and included in the material to be considered by the relevant committees, as well as by any individual or group subsequently involved in the review beyond the initial level. Reviewers will be notified of the Georgia Open Records Law.

E. IBMS Review Process

1. **Guidelines for Review:** The IBMS is expected to have a specific review process that follows the general guidelines provided in the university's Promotion and Tenure Manual. The IBMS may have more rigorous expectations for promotion and tenure, but in no case

may expectations be less than those of the university.

- 2. Completion of Materials:** Candidates submit their Promotion and Tenure dossier to the Director of IBMS who inserts the external reviewer letters in the space provided in the dossier. The Director also inserts the background information about the external reviewers initially provided as part of the potential reviewers list (as specified in Section II. C. 3). The Director then forwards the dossier to the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure committee. All information pertaining to and received from the external reviewers shall be treated in a confidential manner.
- 3. Review by the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee:** The IBMS Promotion and Tenure committee will be composed of tenured faculty with the rank of associate professor or professor for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor and tenured faculty with the rank of professor for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor. No person can serve at more than one level of review. The committee(s) will evaluate the candidate's dossier, outside reviewer letters, and other materials directly relevant to the candidate's dossier. The Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee will appoint a Working Committee to review the candidate's dossier and draft the initial letter for review and consideration by the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee will make recommendations to the Director concerning the promotion and/or tenure of each candidate by the date specified on the Promotion and Tenure Calendar. The recommendation letter must be signed by all members of the committee who are in agreement; a written dissent by committee member(s) who disagree accompanies the majority opinion recommendation letter and becomes a part of the dossier. All members of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee must sign either the IBMS committee recommendation letter or provide a dissenting letter(s). The committee members' signatures will not be included in the letters provided to the candidates to preserve confidentiality. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (met or not met). The Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee inserts the committee's recommendation letter and dissent letter(s), if any, in the candidate's dossier and forwards the dossier to IBMS Director. At the same time, a copy of the recommendation letter and dissent letters, if any, are sent to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to the IBMS Director within 5 working days of the receipt of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure committee recommendation.
- 4. Review of the candidate and recommendation by the IBMS Director:** The IBMS Director reviews the candidate's dossier and accompanying external review letters, the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation and dissent letters, if any, with responses of the candidate to any recommendations, and considers all other pertinent data, such as information regarding present and probable future academic needs of the IBMS. The Director then makes a recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding promotion and/or tenure. The recommendation letter should state areas of agreement and disagreement with the prior evaluation and respond with a specific rationale for the stated opinion. The recommendation letter should address the criteria on which the recommendation is based for teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e.

met, not met).

Once the IBMS Director's decision is made, the recommendation is sent to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Director's recommendation is accompanied by the candidate's dossier, the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation and dissent letters, if any, and any responses of the candidate to the recommendations. At the same time, a copy of the Director's letter is provided to the candidate and the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Candidates who are not recommended by the IBMS Director may appeal the Director's decision to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The appeal must be made in writing no later than 10 working days after receipt of the Director's written decision as specified in the university Promotion and Tenure Manual. Alternatively, the candidate may exercise the right to withdraw the dossier and application for promotion and/or tenure.

F. University Review Process

The university's review and appeals processes are provided in GSU's Promotion and Tenure Manual.

G. Promotion and Tenure Calendar and Responsibilities

These dates/deadlines for the Institute committee and Director must comply with the review schedule provided annually by the Office of the Provost. As such, the dates provided in Appendix B are advisory only and may require adjustments to assure compliance with the Office of the Provost.

III. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

A. General Requirements for Promotion and/or Tenure

All candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor or higher and/or tenure shall hold an earned doctoral degree. Only associate professors and professors are eligible for tenure. Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall not acquire tenure. The award is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments, such as adjunct appointments.

B. Performance Areas

Professional development (research), teaching and service are the primary activities and responsibilities of faculty. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in each of these three areas. Each candidate is expected to summarize his/her accomplishments and to address how his/her accomplishments meet the expectations in each of these areas in the Comprehensive Statement of the Candidate (see Section IV). All review committees and individual reviewers must give full consideration to all materials included in a candidate's dossier, at least five (5) external reviewer letters, and reports or recommendations of previous stages of the promotion and tenure process. In reports on candidates, reviewers should use the criteria given below. Candidates will be evaluated as having met or having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in each of the three areas: professional development, teaching, and service. Additional information about expectations is found in Appendices C and D. The evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and resources of the institute.

1. Evaluation Factors for Scholarship: The candidate must provide evidence of the successful establishment of a nationally (for promotion to associate professor) or internationally (for promotion to professor) recognized research program and of excellence in innovative scholarly research. Evidence submitted should be organized according to the categories of professional development. Types of evidence of achievement in Scholarship include:

- (a) **Publications and Patents:** Scholarship is indicated most clearly by publications in refereed journals or patents. Publications are quality publications in major peer reviewed journals, invited chapters, and/or books appropriate to biomedical sciences. The quality and quantity of citations of the candidate's research publications may also be assessed. It is recognized that each research area will have different expectations in regard to the numbers of publications and the importance of specific journals. The Institute of Biomedical Sciences values collaboration with colleagues both within Georgia State University and at other institutions.
- (b) **Internal and Extramural Grants:** This category includes grants from extramural sources (including industrial sources) sufficient to support substantial research. Internal competitive grants received should also be listed. Funding sources may include the U.S. Department of Education, NSF, NIH, Howard Hughes, or other organizations that support research/science education. Grant support is a significant indication for research productivity. Candidates for Tenure should have

demonstrated ability to attract extramural funding. Funding as Co-PI is of value, but the candidate is expected to have extramural funding as a PI for his/her independent research program. It is recognized that the sources and levels of funding will be a function of the area of research. Efforts to obtain extramural funding should be documented.

- (c) Presentations at Conferences: Invited seminars and presentations are also an indication of scholarship. The prestige of the conference or workshop will be part of the consideration. Secondary indications include contributed presentations and presentations by students and other research associates of the candidate.
- (d) Invitations to Give Talks on Research: This category includes invited speaker at major national and international conferences or at national or international professional meetings and workshops or invited seminar speaker at another university or other institution (e.g., government institution).
- (e) Professional Service: Professional service considered under the Scholarship category includes memberships on editorial boards, peer reviews for scholarly journals, grant reviews for granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, and services as critic, juror, and /or consultant for professional organizations. Other types of professional service should be listed under the service category.

2. Evaluation Factors for Teaching: Teaching communicates the discipline of Biomedical Sciences to students, develops in them an excitement about the processes of the living world around them, and trains them to be skilled, responsible members of a profession. The candidate must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness and of excellence in innovative and/or creative teaching, in providing leadership in development of teaching in the Institute for Biomedical Sciences, university and/or national community and/or in training graduate/undergraduate students and postdoctoral fellows. Types of evidence of achievement in teaching include:

- (a) Mentorship of Student Research and Independent Study Projects: Mentored research and independent studies listed must have course numbers.
- (b) Good Student Perceptions and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, as well as achievements in at least one of the following additional categories (c – h).
- (c) Non-Course Related Training/Mentorship: Chairmanship or membership on student committees (both at GSU and at other institutions), including comprehensive exam, thesis, and dissertation committees are included in this category.
- (d) Development of New Courses
- (e) Teaching Grant Funds: Independent fellowships and/or stipends for students or postdocs that are not part of external research grants are applicable.
- (f) Publications in Teaching Journals
- (g) Teaching Creativity
- (h) Honors or Special Recognitions for Teaching

3. Evaluation Factors for Service: Service is considered an important element of faculty accomplishment. Types of evidence of achievement in teaching include:

- (a) Membership/Chairmanships on Institute for Biomedical Sciences or University Committees are among the service activities reviewed in promotion considerations

- by the Institute for Biomedical Sciences.
- (b) Institute for Biomedical Sciences service includes effective service on Institute for Biomedical Sciences committees, undergraduate and graduate advising (including premed, 1st year graduate student committees, individual and group advising, etc.) and student recruitment efforts.
 - (c) Professional service includes the following: support of local, state, national, or international professional organizations via consultantships and memberships on advisory boards; conference scientific program organization, membership on committees of professional organizations, offices held in professional organizations and convener of symposia/workshops; service to the city, state or national non-professional community based on expertise is also included.
 - (d) Science Education faculty activities that result in research findings and/or teaching publications will not count as service.
 - (e) Other types of service that could be considered are the following: oversight or training of Institute for Biomedical Sciences or university staff; oversight of Institute for Biomedical Sciences or university facilities and equipment; and substantial participation and planning of Institute for Biomedical Sciences, or university or professional events or meetings.

C. Tenure Criteria and Time Requirements

- 1. Tenure Criteria:** Only associate professors and professors who are normally employed full-time by Georgia State University are eligible for tenure.
- 2. Time Requirements:** Normally, a faculty member will apply for tenure in the fifth year of service and be considered in the sixth year of service. In cases of exceptional achievement, a faculty member may apply for tenure in the fourth year of service and be considered for tenure during the fifth year of service. A maximum of two (2) years suspension of the probationary period may be granted due to a leave of absence based on birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member. The President must approve such interruption. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period, the maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above shall be seven (7) years. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure-track positions at other institutions. Such credit for prior service shall be approved in writing by the President at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher. A candidate for promotion and tenure may relinquish some or all probationary credit received, with the approval of the Director. When a candidate with probationary credit is first eligible for consideration for promotion and tenure, he/she must notify the Director if he/she will keep or relinquish some or all of the awarded credit. The IBMS Promotion and Tenure committee will give heavier consideration to the candidate's performance during his/her years of employment at Georgia State University than to earlier years of employment at previous institutions.

IV. Guidelines for Preparation of the Promotion and Tenure Dossier

A. General Guidelines

Materials submitted by candidates must be organized according to the format specified in the following sections. The dossier must be contained in ONE large three ring binder. Additionally, the candidate's curriculum vita should be submitted in an electronic file on media securely enclosed in the front of the binder. Other required electronic files, i.e., external review letters, curriculum vitae of external reviewers, and all internal review letters (unit-level, unit head) will be added to the dossier by the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee as they are submitted.

Each candidate must submit a complete curriculum vitae and a dossier that describes activities completed since arriving at Georgia State University or since the first positive committee recommendation for promotion to current rank at Georgia State University, whichever is relevant. Candidates applying for tenure only or promotion with tenure should submit material related to all work performed since joining Georgia State University as well as material related to all work performed during a period for which probationary credit was given. The complete dossier and the candidate's CV must be received by the Institute Director by the deadline noted on the university's promotion and tenure calendar; the complete dossier and copies of the CV are forwarded by IBMS Director to the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee by the university deadline. Letters of acceptance from journals and notification of publication of books as well as any other supporting material may be submitted up to the latter deadline.

Up-to-date curriculum vitae, candidate evaluation from the Director, candidate evaluation from the IBMS P&T Committee, the external review letters for each P&T candidate, statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of teaching performance, evidence of research/scholarly productivity including external assessment of the candidate's work in the form of citations or book reviews where appropriate and evidence of service activities is electronically forwarded by the Director to the Provost. When the dossier is returned to the Director, external letters of review and all letters of recommendation are removed for filing in the Director's office. The dossier is returned to successful candidate. The dossier is retained by the University if decision is negative and the candidate is in final year.

B. Specific Instructions for Curriculum Vita

- 1.** Do not include publications submitted and/or under review; include only publications in print or in press.
- 2.** Do not double list items.
- 3.** In general, limit professional presentations to the last 5 years.
- 4.** For grants, check with business manager to make sure what you have listed is the same as

what is listed in the GSU's Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

5. The curriculum vitae should be organized in reverse chronological order.
6. Header information should include:
 - (a) Name
 - (b) Rank
 - (c) Department
 - (d) Office Address
 - (e) Education (Academic degrees earned)
 - (f) Professional credentials, certifications, and licensure
7. Publications
 - (a) Journal articles
 - i. Include journals of national circulation; each article should be identified as refereed or invited in parentheses following the citation information.
 - ii. Published articles are to be listed first with the word "published" preceding this group of entries. Articles accepted and in press are to be listed second with the word "accepted" preceding those entries. Provide documentation via letter or email correspondence that the work is accepted and in press.
 - (b) Book chapters
 - i. Include published book chapters
 - ii. Include book chapters in press with documentation that the work is in press
 - (c) Books
 - i. Include published or edited works
 - ii. Include books in press or under contract with documentation that the work is in press or under contract
 - (d) Monographs
 - i. Include published monographs
 - ii. Include monographs in press with documentation that the work is in press
 - (e) Proceedings and Abstracts
 - i. Include only refereed proceedings or abstracts that have been published
 - ii. Include proceedings or abstracts in press with documentation that the work is in press
 - (f) Other significant publications (Do not include publications intended for lay public in this section; include under service.)
8. Grants and Funding (include source and funding for each grant)
 - (a) External
 - i. For funded projects include title of project, your role (PI, Co-PI), funding source, dollar amount, dates of project
 - ii. For projects submitted and pending review include title of project, your role, funding source, dollar amount, and date submitted
 - iii. Other funding, including research foundations or intellectual property funding that are not included as external grants
 - (b) Contracts/Subcontracts: For contracted or subcontracted projects, include title of

project, funding source, dollar amount that comes to Georgia State, and dates of project

- (c) Internal
 - i. For funded projects include title of project, your role (PI, Co-PI), funding source, dollar amount, dates of project
 - ii. For submitted projects include title of project, your role, funding source, dollar amount, and date submitted
 - (d) Grants submitted but not funded: Identify research projects submitted for internal and external funding that have not been funded to show scholarship effort; include: title of project, your role, agency submitted to, and dollar amount
 - (e) Other funding not captured in (a) – (d)
- 9.** Professional Presentations (limit to the latest five years): Presented papers to include title, date, organization, refereed or invited, podium or panel presentation, local, state, regional, national or international. Poster presentations to include title, date, organization, refereed or invited, local, state, regional, national or international
- 10.** Editorial or Reviewer Projects (includes editor of a publication as well as reviewer for scholarly publications). Include those works published or in press, with documentation of in press status.
- 11.** Other Scholarship and Professional Development not captured in 7-10.
- 12.** Professional and Honor Organization Activities (Organizational affiliations, disciplinary and/or professional)
- (a) Membership
 - (b) Offices held (include name of organization, office title, and dates served)
 - (c) Committees (include name of committee and dates served)
 - (d) Other Professional and Honor Organization activities not captured in a-c
- 13.** Honors, Awards, Recognitions: Include name of honor, award or recognition, organization, and date of award, honor, or recognition
- 14.** Instruction
- (a) Teaching
 - i. Include course name and title, semester taught, and number of students
 - ii. Include guest lecturing in other courses (course number and title, lecture title, date)
 - iii. Other teaching not captured in i-ii (Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to: peer evaluations, selected examinations and quizzes, students' passing rates on licensure/certification examinations, a teaching portfolio, new course and/or program development, use of technology for teaching, program accreditation review results, teaching awards received, and student accomplishments.
 - (b) Student Advisement
 - i. Include dissertation, thesis or MS projects (list chaired committee first,

followed by membership on committees; include student's name, home department, title of research project and date of completion or "in progress")

- ii. Include advisement of honors projects
- iii. Other contributions to student accomplishments (such as advisor to student for undergraduate research project)
- iv. Other student advisement not captured in i-iii (Examples such as student research funding directed by faculty, student awards sponsored by faculty or directed activity, student exit projects or honors project committee membership)

15. Service

- (a) Administrative service (such as program director, unit head, internship director)
- (b) Include service to the University System, University, College, and Academic Unit with title of committee, your role (chair or committee member) and dates of service
- (c) Include service to the professional disciplines if not captured in section IV
- (d) Include service to the community as related to professional discipline
- (e) Publications in local newspapers, magazines, newsletters, or websites
- (f) Media presentations (television, radio, webcasts)
- (g) Additional significant service activities not captured in a-f

C. Specific Instructions for Dossier

1. The first section will eventually include letters of recommendation from the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Director and the external review letters with the CVs of the external reviewers. This section will also include any dissenting letters and responses of the candidate to any recommendations.
2. The second section consists of materials submitted by the candidate, including the CV and the candidate's comprehensive statement. The comprehensive narrative statement provides the candidate an opportunity to link his/her accomplishments to the criteria for promotion and tenure. Each narrative statement is to be no longer than two single spaced pages, double-spaced between paragraphs.
 - (a) Summary and self-evaluation of teaching activities
 - (b) Summary and self-evaluation of scholarly activities and professional development
 - (c) Summary and self-evaluation of service activities
3. The third section includes documentation of scholarship and teaching effectiveness.
 - (a) Copies of all journal publications or other evidence of scholarly work, with a brief notation of the candidate's contribution to the work.
 - (b) Documentation of teaching effectiveness including all computer- summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations, course syllabi (if a course was taught more than once, include only the most recent syllabus), and a list of teaching assignments and number of students in each course.
 - (c) Individual annual reports
 - (d) Annual evaluations
 - (e) Candidates applying for promotion only should submit materials limited to the

past 5 years (documentation of teaching effectiveness, individual annual reports, and annual evaluations). If publications are numerous, then the 10 most recently published articles, 10 articles selected by the candidate from all journal publications, or other evidence of scholarly work during the previous 5 years are to be included.

V. Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

A. Pre-Tenure Review

- 1.** Purpose: The Institute for Biomedical Sciences will conduct a pre-tenure review of each tenure-track faculty member. A formal review of the progress made toward promotion and tenure will be made after three years so that the tenure track faculty member has a clear idea of how adequately he or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure. When a faculty member is hired with one or two years of probationary credit towards tenure and promotion there shall also be a mid-course pre-tenure review. A faculty member hired with three years of probationary credit may waive pre-tenure review with written approval of the Institute for Biomedical Sciences. The pre-tenure review should provide an opportunity for colleagues to review accomplishments and provide assistance to the tenure track faculty member seeking tenure and promotion.

- 2.** Procedure: This review will be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty of the appropriate rank elected from the tenured faculty from the Institute for Biomedical Sciences. However, faculty of appropriate rank from outside the Institute for Biomedical Sciences may also be elected. This cumulative review should address accomplishments in scholarship, teaching; and service. It will be based on available information as articulated in the Institute for Biomedical Sciences guidelines: e.g., annual reports, student and peer evaluations of teaching, curriculum vita, publications, etc.; a candidate should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the cumulative review but may prepare a short statement. The pre-tenure evaluation conducted by the Institute for Biomedical Sciences should be reviewed and commented on by the Institute for Biomedical Sciences Director and the Provost. Faculty must receive a written report of the results of this review and comments by Institute for Biomedical Sciences Director and the Provost.

- 3.** Organization of materials for pre-tenure review: Review materials shall include the faculty member's curriculum vita, annual reports from the previous three years, selected evidence of scholarly contributions (publications, grant proposals, presentation abstracts, etc.), all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations of teaching, and any other available materials that address accomplishments in teaching, advising and serving students, scholarly activity, and service. Materials should be organized in one three-ring binder with the following sections:
 - (a)** Curriculum vita
 - (b)** Annual reports
 - (c)** Selected evidence of scholarship, (e.g., publications, grant proposals, presentation abstracts)
 - (d)** All student and peer evaluations of teaching, including all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments
 - (e)** Other materials addressing accomplishments
 - (f)** Two-page statement of effectiveness
 - (g)** One-page outline of five year goals

B. Post-Tenure Review

- 1. Purpose:** The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the Institute for Biomedical Sciences and to the university. Post-tenure review is one of several types of faculty performance reviews (e.g., annual, promotion, and tenure reviews) and is intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.
- 2. Procedure:** With the exception of tenured administrators whose majority of duties is administrative, all tenured faculty will be reviewed. Each faculty member must be assessed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews will continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion or leave of absence. At such time when a faculty/administrator returns full-time to the faculty, she/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under those guidelines as a faculty member in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five-year intervals.
- 3. The post-tenure review should focus on the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarship teaching, and service, relating these to the stated expectations for performance developed by the Institute for Biomedical Sciences. The faculty member being reviewed should prepare a dossier based on available information such as annual reports, student/peer evaluations of teaching, curriculum vita, publications, etc. In addition, the faculty member should provide a statement that summarizes his/her accomplishments and effectiveness in research, scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous five years and outlines goals for the next five years. The review involves the Institute for Biomedical Sciences director, the Provost, and one elected committee of tenured faculty of similar or higher rank from the Institute for Biomedical sciences. The initial review will be conducted by the faculty review committee. The faculty review committee will prepare a report based on the faculty member's dossier and statement that assesses the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous five years. The initial report will be reviewed and commented on by the Institute for Biomedical Sciences Director as well as by the Provost. The faculty member must receive copies of the initial review as well as of all subsequent comments.**

The results of post-tenure reviews must be linked to rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements. This may include merit pay increases, and study and research leave opportunities. When a faculty member has not met the standards for promotion to the rank of professor or maintained the standard for the rank of professor in his/her scholarly, teaching or service, the Director of the Institute for biomedical sciences and the faculty member will work together to develop a formal plan for faculty development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a

timetable, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy.

4. Organization of materials for post-tenure review: Review materials shall include the faculty member's curriculum vita, annual reports, publications, all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments, peer evaluations of teaching, and any other available materials that address accomplishments in teaching, advising and serving students, scholarly activity, and service. A two-page statement of effectiveness in teaching, research, and service over the previous five years and a third page outlining projected five-year goals are also required. Materials should be organized in one three-ring binder with the following sections:

- (a) Curriculum vita
- (b) Annual reports
- (c) Publications
- (d) All student and peer evaluations of teaching, including all computer-summarized student evaluation forms and attached comments
- (e) Other materials addressing accomplishments
- (f) Two-page statement of effectiveness
- (g) One-page outline of five year goals

Appendices

Appendix A: Standard Letter for External Reviewers

Dear Professor/Dr. [External Reviewer Name]:

Professor/Dr. [Candidate Name], [Rank], Professor in the College/School of [Discipline] at Georgia State University, is a candidate for [promotion and/or tenure] to the rank of XXX. A key part of this process is an assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly/creative contributions from experts in the field of scholarship and research from outside of GSU. We understand that you do not have access to the teaching and service accomplishments of this candidate, so our request is to assess just the scholarly/creative accomplishments which are an important part of the decision process.

You have been suggested as a reference who is in a position to assess of Professor/Dr. [Candidate name]'s research/scholarship/creative contributions and reputation, and I would greatly appreciate your help with this evaluation process. We are specifically interested in the following:

- The length and nature of your relationship with Professor/Dr. [Candidate name];
- Quality and significance of the candidate's scholarship/creative contributions;
- The candidate's professional reputation and standing in the field at the national and/or international level;
- How Professor/Dr. [Candidate name] compares to others in the field at approximately the same stages in their careers; and
- Whether Professor/Dr. [Candidate name] would be [tenured and/or promoted to the rank of XXX] at your institution.

Enclosed with this letter are Professor/Dr. [Candidate name]'s curriculum vitae, statement of accomplishments, and samples of publications/creative achievements. [This section may vary by college/department depending on what is included as samples of productive work.]

Please direct your letter to me at the address indicated in this letter at your earliest convenience, but no later than [Date]. If necessary, you can email your letter to me at [dean@gsu.edu], and follow up with a signed copy in the mail. Please also include a short biosketch) for members of our review committees that may not be familiar with your work.

Finally, please be assured that your letter will be made available only to Georgia State University personnel participating in the review process. You should know, however, that external reviewer letters may be subject to release under the Georgia Open Records Act.

Thank you for your help in this important matter.

Sincerely,
Director
Institute for Biomedical Sciences

Enclosures

Appendix B: General Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Process

Timetable for Tenure and Promotion Review		
Date	Responsible Party	Action
Early February	IBMS Director	The IBMS Director notifies in writing Faculty who will be eligible in the upcoming academic year by virtue of length of service for promotion and/or tenure.
February through Mid-March	IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee	The IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee hold an informational meeting to discuss promotion and tenure procedures. Candidates are encouraged to attend. The meeting is open to all faculty members.
Mid-March	Candidate	<p>Eligible faculty who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure respond in writing to IBMS Director with copies to the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.</p> <p>The candidate also provides the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee with a list of five (5) possible external reviewers (including their qualifications and credentials) who meet the criteria set forth in Section II C.</p>

Late March	IBMS Director and Candidate IBMS Director	Complete and sign "P&T Face Sheet" in Appendix F. The IBMS Director creates a list of five (5) possible external reviewers (including their qualifications and credentials) who meet the criteria set forth in Section II C in consultation with the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.
Early April	IBMS Director Candidate	The IBMS Director selects the top 6-10 external reviewers and contacts the selected external reviewers to ascertain their willingness to serve as reviewers. The candidate submits seven (7) packets of materials (including the CV, narrative for scholarly activity if desired, and three examples of scholarly work as specified in Section II C) to the Director of IBMS for forwarding to the external reviewers.
End of April	IBMS Director	Sends a standard letter including a request for the external reviewer's CV or biosketch, along with the candidate's packet of materials, to the 6-10 external reviewers who agree to serve. The review should be completed for return to the Director within 4 weeks.
End of May	IBMS Director	Contacts reviewers who have not completed the review
End of May	IBMS Director	Alternate reviewers are contacted if necessary.

End of June	IBMS Director	The external reviewers' letters and the CV's/bio-sketch's of the external reviewers in paper and electronic formats are due to the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.
July	IBMS Director	The Director places the external review letters and the CVs of external reviewers in the candidate's dossier.
Mid-September	IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee	The IBMS Promotion and Tenure Working Committee forwards their letter of recommendation, along with copies of the candidate's CV and dossier, to the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.
Early October	Candidate	The last day for the candidate to add material to his/her dossier.

Calendar for Pre-Tenure Review Process

By September 30	The IBMS Director notifies the faculty member in writing of his/her review during the upcoming Spring semester and notifies the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.
By October 30	The Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee initiates the nomination/election process to establish the Pre-Tenure Review Sub-Committee for involved faculty.
By January 10	The faculty member submits one copy of the pre-tenure materials to the IBMS Director, who distributes these materials to the Chair of the IBMS Promotion and Tenure Committee.
Before March 1	The Committee reviews materials and comments upon the faculty member's achievements and progress toward meeting his/her established goals.
Before March 15	The Review Committee meets to discuss the written report with the faculty member. The Review Committee and the faculty member may add any additional information that results from that meeting in an addendum to the report.
By March 15	The faculty member's Review Committee forwards the written report, including any addenda, to the faculty member and the IBMS Director.
Approx. April 15	The IBMS Director reviews the materials, comments on the materials, and forwards the materials submitted by the faculty member, the written report, and any addenda to the Provost within 10 working days (when possible) of receipt of the materials. A copy of the Director's report will be sent to the faculty member being reviewed.

Appendix C: Rating Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Outstanding: The faculty member's scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance. In such instances, faculty may publish significant numbers of refereed articles in top tier journals and serve a leading role (e.g., PI, PD, Co-PI) on multiple or particularly prestigious externally funded projects, in addition to meeting the criteria for excellent outlined below.

Excellent: The evidence indicates that the faculty member produces high quality scholarship. The faculty member demonstrates a research program with a trajectory towards a national/international reputation. The faculty member has published a significant number of high quality refereed articles. Book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses are also considered. The faculty member demonstrates efforts to obtain external support for their scholarly work. The faculty member also demonstrates significant activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Very Good: The evidence indicates the faculty member has not yet consistently produced high quality scholarship. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member demonstrates some activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Good: The evidence indicates that the faculty member has not published a sufficient number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality. Although the faculty member may have demonstrated activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer, this activity does not constitute a substitute for generating a sufficient number of publications.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

B. Teaching

Faculty are expected to be engaged in activities related to classroom instruction and individual mentoring. However, the ways in which faculty participate in these types of activities vary by program area as well as by individual areas of expertise. In assessing the quality of teaching, the

institute will evaluate faculty based on the whole body of evidence presented in their teaching portfolios, taking into account the diverse ways in which faculty in the institute participate in classroom-related instructional and mentoring activities. The institute also takes into consideration that factors such as research obligations and other responsibilities affect the quantity of classroom-related teaching year to year.

Outstanding: The record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent described below. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional preparation; the faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, as indicated, for example, by training grants or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may have published a textbook or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.

Excellent: The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Highly involved mentoring typically includes (a) chairing one or more completed or ongoing dissertation and/or thesis committee(s); (b) being a member of additional dissertation and/or thesis committees; (c) preparation or evaluation of Ph.D. exams; and (d) mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, for example through supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica. Other mentoring activities described in candidates' dossiers (e.g., postdoctoral or post-baccalaureate supervision) will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship. Examples of such endeavors for graduate students include authorship on publications and professional conference presentations, submission and award of doctoral fellowships and grants, and other activities relevant to students' specific program of study and career trajectory. Effective mentoring is a process that may unfold over several years.

Very Good: The evidence indicates effective classroom teaching and moderate involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent course development, preparation, and/or execution. Markers of classroom teaching effectiveness are described above. Moderately involved mentoring typically includes being a member of dissertation and/or thesis committees, plus some evidence of individual supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate students, for example through chairing a dissertation or thesis committee, supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica.

Good: The faculty member does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness

described above.

Fair: The evidence indicates a minimally acceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Poor: The evidence indicates an unacceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal and ineffective or no involvement in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

C. Service

Outstanding: A faculty member will be judged *outstanding* in service if criteria for *excellent* are met and s/he has been substantially active and engaged in a professional organization or won a prestigious service award.

Excellent: A faculty member will be judged *excellent* in service if the criteria for *very good* are met and s/he has been active and effective in significant service. Typically, this includes significant service outside of the institute or holding a major leadership role within the institute.

Very Good: The faculty member has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) carried out the service tasks assigned and, (c) effectively assumed service roles that serve the mission of the institute (e.g., membership on a standing committee of the institute, chairing a faculty search committee).

Good: The faculty member has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks that were assigned.

Fair: The faculty member manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on committees of the institute, but makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Poor: The faculty member manifests no significant service accomplishments and does not carry out service roles assigned. The faculty member may serve on other committees of the institute, but without a documentable impact.

Appendix D: Rating Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Outstanding: The faculty member's scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance. In such instances, faculty may publish significant numbers of refereed articles in top tier journals and serve a leading role (e.g., PI, PD, Co-PI) on multiple or particularly prestigious externally funded projects, in addition to meeting the criteria for excellent outlined below.

Excellent: The evidence indicates that the faculty member produces high quality scholarship. The faculty member demonstrates a research program with an established national/international reputation. The faculty member has published a significant number of high quality refereed articles. Book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses are also considered. The faculty member has a track record of external grant funding that demonstrates the national/international prominence of their scholarship. The faculty member also demonstrates significant activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Very Good: The evidence indicates that the faculty member produces quality scholarship but has not continued to demonstrate a trajectory consistent with significant national/international impact. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member demonstrates some activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Good: The evidence indicates that the faculty member is not consistently publishing a sufficient number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality. Although the faculty member may currently be insufficiently active in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer, this activity does not constitute a substitute for generating a sufficient number of publications.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

B. Teaching

Faculty are expected to be engaged in activities related to classroom instruction and individual mentoring. However, the ways in which faculty participate in these types of activities vary by

program area as well as by individual areas of expertise. In assessing the quality of teaching, the institute will evaluate faculty based on the whole body of evidence presented in their teaching portfolios, taking into account the diverse ways in which faculty in the institute participate in classroom-related instructional and mentoring activities. The institute also takes into consideration that factors such as research obligations and other responsibilities affect the quantity of classroom-related teaching year to year.

Outstanding: The record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent described below. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional preparation; the faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, as indicated, for example, by training grants or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may have published a textbook or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.

Excellent: The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Highly involved mentoring typically includes (a) chairing multiple completed or ongoing dissertation committees; (b) being a member of additional dissertation and/or thesis committees; (c) preparation or evaluation of Ph.D. exams; and (d) mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students through, for example, supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica. Other mentoring activities described in candidates' dossiers (e.g., postdoctoral or post-baccalaureate supervision) will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students' endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship. Examples of such endeavors for graduate students include authorship on publications and professional conference presentations, submission and award of doctoral fellowships and grants, and other activities relevant to students' specific program of study and career trajectory. Effective mentoring is a process that may unfold over several years.

Very Good: The evidence indicates effective classroom teaching and moderate involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent course development, preparation, and/or execution. Markers of classroom teaching effectiveness are described above. Moderately involved mentoring typically includes being a member of dissertation and/or thesis committees, plus some evidence of individual supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate students, for example through chairing a dissertation or thesis committee,

supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica.

Good: The faculty member does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described above.

Fair: The evidence indicates a minimally acceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Poor: The evidence indicates an unacceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal and ineffective or no involvement in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

C. Service

Outstanding: A faculty member will be judged *outstanding* in service if criteria for *excellent* are met and s/he has been substantially active and engaged in a professional organization or won a prestigious service award.

Excellent: A faculty member will be judged *excellent* in service if the criteria for *very good* are met and s/he has been active and effective in significant service. Typically, this includes significant service outside of the institute or holding a major leadership role within the institute.

Very Good: The faculty member has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) carried out the service tasks assigned and, (c) effectively assumed service roles that serve the mission of the institute (e.g., membership on a standing committee of the institute, chairing a faculty search committee).

Good: The faculty member has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks that were assigned.

Fair: The faculty member manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on committees of the institute, but makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Poor: The faculty member manifests no significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on committees of the institute, but without a documentable impact.

Appendix E: Promotion and Tenure Application Face Sheet

Part A: (To be completed and signed by unit head and candidate. Please indicate the month, day, and year for each required date)

Date of employment (full-time, tenure track) from: _____ to: _____
 Date of employment (full-time, non-tenure track) from: _____ to: _____
 Date of first approved leave of absence from: _____ to: _____
 Date of second approved leave of absence from: _____ to: _____
 Date of third approved leave of absence from: _____ to: _____
 Years of prior credit granted from: _____ to: _____
 Earliest possible year eligible for initiation of promotion review procedures: _____
 Earliest possible year eligible for initiation of tenure review procedures: _____

 Candidate's Signature

 IBMS Director's Signature

Part B: Summary of Review Actions: (please check appropriate box)

	Recommended	Not Recommended	Date
IBMS P & T Committee			
IBMS Director			

