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Introduction

At Georgia State University, the quality of faculty accomplishments in scholarship, teaching and service influences the quality of the institution. To ensure the institution and its faculty sustain a high level of excellence, we engage in systematic evaluations of faculty. In evaluations for the purpose of promotion and tenure, it is imperative that clear standards be articulated and publicized. This document provides a statement of promotion and tenure standards and procedures for tenure-track faculty at Georgia State.

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. It is essential that faculty members be treated fairly and granted due process in the deliberations that determine tenure and promotion.

This document defines the procedures to be followed in the university-level promotion and tenure review. As specified by the Board of Regents and SACSCOC, Georgia State University operates under a single mission that comprehensively defines our scope of activities and is expressed in our Mission Statement. The university's Board-approved scope includes the blended functions of a research university and a state college. The research university function is carried out by the majority of colleges, departments, and tenure-granting institutes at Georgia State, which are collectively referred to in this manual as the Atlanta campus of Georgia State. The Atlanta campus is governed by Part One of this manual. Perimeter College of Georgia State carries out the state college function, with its emphasis on access and teaching. Perimeter is governed by a separate set of promotion and tenure requirements that are contained in Part Two of this manual.

This manual also provides guidelines that govern specific college and departmental procedures for promotion and tenure review. A college is defined as a major academic unit of the university and may include colleges, schools or institutes. A college, school or institute that is not further subdivided may be considered as a single department. Similarly, references to "the dean" refer to the candidate’s college dean or administrator at the level of a dean. The department chair or the appropriate supervisor refers to the unit/department head to whom the faculty report. These procedures and guidelines assure fairness and due process throughout the review
process. Included among them are the appeals procedures to be followed when there
are disagreements over promotion and tenure recommendations.

Department chairs and senior faculty are expected to mentor and advise new faculty
members. In particular, chairs shall inform them of promotion and tenure
requirements. They shall provide the new faculty members with copies of the
appropriate departmental, college and university promotion and tenure policies and
explain the contents of these documents to them.

The University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee is charged with
periodically reviewing these standards and procedures and those of the colleges to
ensure their adherence to the university policy. This committee will be composed of
the current chairs of the college/school promotion and tenure committees, a faculty
member representing the University Senate’s Faculty Affairs Committee and a
member appointed by the provost. The committee will meet annually. At that time,
the committee will review the various college/school promotion and tenure manuals
and their adherence to university policy, as well as college/school pre-tenure and
post-tenure review policies. It will provide a report of its findings to the provost with
a recommendation to approve (or not to approve) college promotion and tenure
manuals and pre-tenure and post-tenure review policies. When appropriate, the
committee may make recommendations to the University Senate for changes to
university policies. Amended policies will be implemented in the next promotion and
tenure cycle.

The University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee shall review the
university’s post-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions, and
submit these to the provost for final approval.
Part One: Promotion and Tenure Standards for the Atlanta Campus

Tenure and promotion decisions are to be based on discipline-specific departmental and college criteria determined by departmental and college faculty, but satisfaction of these criteria should reflect equivalent levels of accomplishment across the university. Although faculty members in different colleges are engaged in varied forms of research, creative effort and other scholarly activity, the quality and significance of achievement appropriate to the field in question should be comparable. Additionally, the university strongly supports, values, and endorses interdisciplinary work.

This document provides a statement of the university-wide standards that govern the specific departmental and college criteria. These university standards define the expected quality and significance of faculty accomplishments, while the departmental and college criteria identify the concrete forms these achievements should take. Standards should be high even as they take into account such factors as teaching loads and the level of institutional support for scholarship. Standards may rise as Georgia State continues to strive for excellence.

I. Tenure Policies

The tenure criteria and procedures established by Georgia State 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 (https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.7_tenure_and_criteria_for_tenure).

A. Tenure Requirements

Tenure resides at the institutional level at Georgia State. However, the Atlanta campus units and Perimeter College place different emphasis on research and teaching, and tenure acquired under Perimeter College standards is not transferable to the Atlanta campus.

Only assistant professors, associate professors and professors are eligible for tenure. The university is responsible for the employment of tenured faculty until retirement, resignation, or separation as remedial action related to post-tenure review, dismissal for cause or release because of financial exigency or program modification.
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. Award of Tenure

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 years’ suspension of the probationary period may be granted because of 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. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period, the maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or higher without the award of tenure shall be seven years.

C. Probationary Credit toward Tenure and Promotion

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/or tenure may relinquish some or all probationary credit received, with notification to the department chair and dean. When a candidate with probationary credit is first eligible for consideration for promotion and tenure, the candidate must notify the department chair if they will keep or relinquish some or all of the awarded credit. This notice will be provided to the department chair at the beginning of that year’s promotion and tenure cycle at the time the candidate informs the department chair whether they would like to be considered for tenure.

D. Loss of Tenure or Probationary Credit toward Tenure

Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon:

1. Resignation from an institution; or
2. Resignation from a tenure-track or tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position; or

3. Resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given in order to take a position for which no probationary credit is given.

If such an individual is again employed by Georgia State University in a tenure-track position, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution.

II. Tenure and Promotion Goals and Standards

A. Tenure

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, scholarship and/or creative activities; teaching and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each); the trajectory of continued accomplishments throughout the faculty member’s career; and the mission of the department, the college and the university.

B. Promotion

Promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on an assessment of a faculty member’s research, scholarship, and/or creative activities; teaching and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each).

Normally, an assistant professor will apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor in the spring of the fifth year of service and be considered for promotion during the sixth year of service. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an assistant professor may apply for promotion in the spring of the fourth year of service and be considered for promotion during the fifth year of service. Strong justification must be provided to support consideration for promotion whenever the candidate has served fewer than four years at the rank of assistant professor at Georgia State. Where national standards deviate from these norms, the dean of a college may request a waiver from the provost on behalf of the college.
At a minimum, an associate professor is expected to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of knowledge in the faculty member’s field as determined by peers within and outside the university, and have a record of growth in research, scholarship and/or creative activities that demonstrates a strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory in terms of high-quality and productive research, scholarship and/or creative activities. Candidates for promotion to associate professor should be establishing a national reputation in their field. They also must demonstrate high-quality teaching and appropriate evidence of service.

Normally, an associate professor will be eligible to apply for promotion to the rank of professor in the spring of the fourth year of service at the rank of associate professor and will be considered for promotion in the spring of the fifth year of service at the rank of associate professor. An associate professor may seek early promotion if a strong justification exists for doing so. Earliest consideration in this case occurs, however, during the fourth year of service.

Promotion to the rank of professor is also based on research, scholarship and/or creative activities; teaching and service (including any student success activities). The quality and the level of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of professor must exceed expectations of those of an associate professor. Professors are expected to have established a national/international reputation in their field and have a high probability of continued high-quality and productive research, scholarship and/or creative activities. They must demonstrate high-quality teaching and provide significant service to the university and professional communities.

C. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The candidate’s record will be evaluated according to university, college, and department criteria and professional standards for conduct in research, scholarship and/or creative activities, teaching and service (including related student success activities that may be interwoven into each). The successful candidate will have demonstrated they have fulfilled expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate’s discipline, and the mission and resources of the Department.
D. 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.

E. 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 referred to as tenure upon appointment. When necessary, such tenure may be awarded outside of the timelines identified in this manual.

Each such recommendation shall be granted only in cases in which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an associate or professor, was already tenured at a prior institution and has brought a demonstrably national reputation to the institution. If the person is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the award of tenure must be approved by the chancellor.

III. Procedures

All promotion and tenure decisions at Georgia State are to be based on department, college and university procedures, as applicable. A college is defined as a major academic unit of the university and may include colleges, schools or institutes. A college that is not further subdivided may be considered as a single department. Similarly, references to “the dean” refer to the candidate’s college dean or administrator at the level of a dean.

Each college engaged in promotion and tenure decisions must have written guidelines on promotion and tenure that clearly set forth its criteria and standards for promotion and tenure as well as the procedures to be followed in the promotion and tenure process. A department may choose to adopt and follow its college/school procedures for this purpose. Department promotion and tenure guidelines must be reviewed and approved regularly by a college committee, as designated by the college’s promotion and tenure manual. This committee is also responsible for
reviewing the college manual. Each college will include in its promotion and tenure manual a calendar for the various steps involved in the promotion and tenure process. College manuals must be annually reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee and approved by the provost.

A. Calendar

The exact dates for the notification of the outcomes of university review will be determined by the Office of the Provost and communicated to the faculty in advance of each year’s promotion and tenure cycle. The dates for candidates to submit their dossier and list of recommended external reviewers, and the dates for reviews by the department, chair and college committee will be clearly stated in the college manuals.

B. Annual College Meeting

Each college will conduct a meeting each year for the promotion and tenure candidates in the college. This meeting should be held prior to the date that candidates must declare their intention to seek promotion and/or tenure.

The purpose of the meeting is to explain promotion and tenure policies and to answer candidates’ questions about any and all phases of the promotion and tenure process. The meeting shall be open to all interested faculty members in the college.

C. Candidate’s Dossier

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure will prepare a dossier that contains a record of their professional career achievements in research, scholarship and/or creative activities, teaching and service, and appropriate documentation as defined by the department and college promotion and tenure guidelines. In addition, candidates shall provide a statement that summarizes their accomplishments and effectiveness in research, scholarship and/or creative activities; teaching; and service. In the case of candidates for promotion to the rank of professor, the dossier should emphasize the record of professional achievements since the candidate’s promotion to the rank of associate professor. Documentation of these areas to be included in the candidate’s dossier is outlined below.
Dossiers of candidates with joint appointments should include a letter of evaluation from the chair/s of the candidates’ secondary department/s. The letter should reflect the candidate’s research, scholarship and/or creative activities, teaching, and service activities in the secondary department/s as indicated in the joint appointment memorandum, in the context of the scholarly customs of the secondary discipline/s. The chair/s of the secondary department/s may seek input from the appropriate faculty in their units when preparing this letter.

1. Assessment of Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Activities
A clear description of the types of indicators used to assess research, scholarship and/or creative activities including any related student success activities will be included in each college promotion and tenure manual and each department’s guidelines for promotion and tenure. Candidates shall indicate which of their publications appear in peer-reviewed journals and shall assess the quality and standing in the profession of the journals. In addition, candidates with multi-authored works should describe their contribution to the works. Acknowledging that methods of disseminating research are changing, when using alternative methods of sharing scholarly output, candidates are encouraged to provide assessments of the quality and standing of those alternative methods.

2. Assessment of Teaching
Candidates for promotion and tenure must submit in the dossier the results of student evaluations of instruction within a timeframe to be determined by their college. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness including student success activities must be presented in the dossier. Evidence of teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes 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.

3. Assessment of Service
College manuals and departmental guidelines will provide a clear description of the types of service indicators to be used in departmental and college reviews. These guidelines should include service allocation expectations. Departmental, college and university service, including any related student success activities, and faculty mentorship in scholarship, professional development, and teaching as well as professional or community accomplishments and leadership, constitute appropriate
activity in this area of assessment.

4. Student Success

Evaluation of the Student Success component will involve an assessment of the faculty member’s involvement in activities inside and outside the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement for all learners. These aspects may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by the college/department to deepen student learning.

D. External Reviewer Letters

It is expected that five letters from external reviewers will be obtained for each candidate. Additional letters are acceptable as defined by the college. The number of external review letters procured shall not be regarded as an indicator of the quality of the candidate’s dossier. External reviewers shall be drawn from lists of those recommended by the candidate and by the chair in consultation with senior faculty in the department. If after repeated efforts five reviewers are not found a dean may accept fewer letters (but not fewer than three) with a memorandum in the candidate’s dossier summarizing the steps taken to obtain reviewers and the number of people contacted from both lists. External reviewers from academic institutions must hold the rank of associate professor or professor (or the international equivalent) for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor and the rank of professor (or the international equivalent) for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor. Appropriate rank and scholarship should be the deciding factors for selecting an external reviewer.

The external reviewers from academic institutions are to be affiliated with research universities in which the emphasis on research and scholarship is of a rigor similar to aspirational peer institutions for the candidate’s discipline. In special circumstances (with written justification from the department chair and with the approval of the dean), external reviewers may be used who are not affiliated with academic institutions or who are affiliated with academic institutions that are not research universities. A brief resume of the external reviewer or a description of this person’s accomplishments, standing in the field and past relationship with the candidate shall accompany the reviewer’s letter of evaluation. This description is to be prepared by
the department chair or other comparable academic official. 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.

In the case of candidates with joint appointments, the chair/s of the candidate’s secondary department/s, in consultation with the appropriate senior faculty in their respective unit/s, should provide names of external reviewers in the secondary discipline/s to the chair of the candidate’s primary department.

Each college will determine the number of names for external reviewers that shall be presented to the dean. The college will also designate the minimum number of reviewers that shall come from the candidate’s list and from the list of the department chair.

The dean is responsible for the selection of and communication with the external reviewers. The external reviewers will be provided with the candidate’s vitae and evidence of scholarly achievements (for example, multiple or selected publications, research endeavors, artistic works, etc.) and asked to speak to the quality and level of the candidate’s scholarly achievements and the significance and overall contributions of these achievements to the discipline/field. External reviewers must be instructed to return their review letters to the dean.

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.

**IV. Evaluation of Dossier and Letters from External Reviewers**

The candidate’s dossier and external reviewer letters will be reviewed by individuals and committees at various levels as indicated below.

Reviews at all levels for candidates with joint appointments should consider their research, scholarship and/or creative activities, teaching, and service in their primary and secondary discipline/s as indicated in the joint appointment memorandum.

**A. Departmental Review**
If the college or unit has departments, the candidate’s dossier and outside letters will be reviewed by a departmental committee composed of at least three tenured faculty at the rank of associate and professor for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and at least three tenured faculty at the rank of professor for candidates seeking the rank of professor. In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members.

The departmental committee will prepare a recommendation to the department chair reviewing the candidate’s dossier, the letters from external reviewers and other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier. This recommendation along with the candidate’s dossier and external review letters will be forwarded to the department chair by the date specified in the college promotion and tenure calendar.

**B. Department Chair Review**

The department chair will review and evaluate the candidate’s dossier, the outside reviewer letters, other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier and the recommendation of the departmental committee. The department chair forwards the chair’s recommendation to the college committee by the date specified in the college promotion and tenure calendar.

**C. College Committee Review**

Each college or unit will have a minimum of one committee on promotion and tenure. Such committees 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, other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier and the recommendations of the department chair and departmental committee. The committee(s) will make recommendations to the dean concerning the promotion
and/or tenure of each candidate by the date specified in the college promotion and
tenure calendar.

D. Dean’s Review

The dean will evaluate the candidate’s dossier, outside reviewer letters, other
materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier, and the recommendations of
the departmental committee, department chair and college committee. Unless the
candidate has withdrawn from consideration, the dean will forward their
recommendation to the provost along with the candidate’s curriculum vitae,
statement, the various letters of internal assessment, and letters from external
reviewers. The dean will notify the candidate by the date specified in the calendar.

Candidates who are not recommended by the dean may appeal the dean’s decision to
the provost as noted in Section V.

E. Provost’s Review

The provost will review the materials forwarded by the dean and any other materials
directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines,
norms and expectations for the university, college and department, and make a
promotion and tenure recommendation. The provost will consult with an Advisory
Panel to Promotion and Tenure. The panel will provide the provost with a written
recommendation (including the reporting of minority views as expressed) on each
tenure and promotion case. In cases where the recommendation of the panel is to
reverse the college recommendation, the panel shall provide a justification for such a
recommendation. Recommendations (concurrences or reversals) and justifications of
the panel will be conveyed in a written document that accompanies the provost’s
recommendation and will be shared with the candidate and respective dean.

The members of the panel will hold the rank of professor with tenure and serve three-
year staggered terms, representing the various colleges/schools, so that there is one
member on the committee corresponding to each college promotion and tenure
committee. Each member will be elected by their home college faculty. Members of
the committee who have had earlier involvement in a particular promotion or tenure
case at unit, area committee, or college level, shall recuse themselves from
discussions about the case when it reaches the University Committee. Advisory panel
members will recuse themselves from discussions of promotion and tenure cases from their own academic department.

Taking the recommendation of the panel under consideration along with the other materials pertinent to the decision, the provost will make a recommendation on each case and forward it to the president, notifying the candidate with a copy to the appropriate dean.

Before forwarding a negative recommendation to the president, the provost will consult with the dean. In response to the query from the provost, the dean may gather additional information from the candidate, the departmental chair and the departmental or college promotion and tenure committee, and any other materials directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy. The dean will notify the candidate and department chair of their reply to the provost.

F. President’s Review

The president will review the materials forwarded by the provost and any other material relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms and expectations for the university, college and department, and make a promotion and tenure decision, notifying the candidate with a copy to the appropriate dean.

V. Written Notification and Appeals

A. Written Notification to Candidates

At each stage of review, a candidate must receive a written notice of the outcome of the deliberations and a copy of any evaluation/s that are made of the candidate’s credentials. In the case of a split decision, the report, listing all committee members, should include both majority and minority views.

A candidate has the right to respond in writing to evaluations made by the departmental committee, department chair and/or college committee, and copies of the candidate’s response/s will be included in the material reviewed at all subsequent levels. The response is an opportunity for the faculty member to provide clarifications and corrections to the reports.
B. Appeals to the Provost

Appeals of negative recommendations by deans may be made, in writing, to the provost within 10 business days after receiving the negative recommendation from a dean. If a candidate does not appeal a negative decision by the dean, the case will not be considered at subsequent levels of review. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the college dean, the department chair, the departmental and/or college promotion and tenure committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or outside the university. The provost shall provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected.

C. Appeals to the President

A candidate may appeal to the president in writing, the provost’s negative recommendation or decision regarding the candidate’s appeal within 10 business days after receiving the negative recommendation. The appeal to the president shall conform to the principles and processes stated above for appeals to the provost. The president shall provide the candidate a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate’s appeal is supported or rejected.

VI. Dean’s Feedback to the College P&T Committee

The dean will meet annually with the college promotion and tenure committee and provide feedback on the outcome of the year’s tenure and/or promotion cases and discuss the committee’s assessments and recommendations in light of the final tenure and/or promotion outcomes.

VII. Other Tenure-Related and Promotion-Related Reviews

A. Pre-Tenure Review

1. Purpose

The department will conduct a pre-tenure review of tenure-track faculty members. The purpose of the pre-tenure/third-year review is to provide a rigorous analysis and
detailed feedback of the faculty member’s body of work in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and service (including any student success activities that may be interwoven into each) towards tenure. A formal review of the progress made toward promotion and tenure will be made so that tenure-track faculty members have a clear idea of how they are 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 be a mid-course pre-tenure review. The pre-tenure review of a faculty member hired with three years of probationary credit may be waived with written approval of the department chair and dean.

An approved suspension of the probationary period for promotion and tenure (see Section I.C. above) will delay the pre-tenure review accordingly. During the year of suspension, the faculty member will be reviewed according to normal annual review procedures.

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. Such review should complement any mentoring programs within each department. While this review is distinguished from the annual review, in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments, previous annual evaluations must be part of the review and the assessment of the pre-tenure review will take the place of that year’s annual review. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion (BOR Policy Manual 8.3.5.1).

2. Procedures

This review will be conducted by a committee of either at least three faculty of the appropriate rank elected from the tenured faculty or all departmental faculty of appropriate rank and tenure. Normally these faculty members will be from the department; however, in small units faculty of appropriate rank from outside the department may be elected. This pre-tenure review should address accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities; teaching; and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each). The result of faculty annual reviews will be utilized as a part of subsequent pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews as well as retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. It will be based on available information as articulated in the departmental or college guidelines: for example, annual reports, student and peer evaluations of teaching, student success
activities, curriculum vitae, 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.

For faculty with joint appointments, pre-tenure evaluation materials should additionally include letter/s from the chair/s of the candidate’s secondary department/s commenting on their research, scholarship, creative activities, and/or service as appropriate to the joint appointment memorandum.

The department chair will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member’s pre-tenure review. A written report of the faculty member’s progression towards achieving future milestones of tenure will be provided to the faculty member after the conference. Faculty must receive a written report of the results of this review and comments by department chair, the dean and the provost. The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the pre-tenure evaluation. The faculty member will be given 10 business days to respond in writing to the pre-tenure written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.

The department chair will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the written pre-tenure review made because of either the conference or the faculty member’s written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 business days from the faculty member’s rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.

If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The department chair will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member and any committee that participated in the pre-tenure review. The PRP must include input from the faculty member, the chair, and the committee. The PRP must also be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

**B. Annual Review**
Faculty are evaluated annually by their department chair or appropriate supervisor as defined by the college/school against the minimum criteria listed in the BOR Policy 8.3.5.1 and BOR Policy 8.3.7.3.

The annual evaluation will encompass teaching; research/scholarship/creative activity or academic achievement; professional service to the institution or community (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each); and continuous professional growth appropriate to Georgia State's sector and mission, college or school and department.

Colleges/schools must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage as noted in the below mentioned Likert scale.

1. Procedure

All faculty members are subject to an annual review. Annual reviews are outlined in college/school guidelines.

The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the annual evaluation. The department chair or appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and their progression towards achieving future milestones.

The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.

The faculty member will be given 10 business days to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.

The department chair or appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 business days from the faculty member's
rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the official personnel records. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review. (BOR Policy 6.26)

All annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following Likert scale:

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
2 – Needs Improvement
3 – Meets Expectations
4 – Exceeds Expectations
5 – Exemplary

If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year. The department chair or appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. This will become part of the official personnel records.

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the Likert Scale.

Each college/school can decide to use the above Likert Scale for other reviews, including pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure.

C. Performance Remediation Plan

The Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review or pre-tenure review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Two meetings during the fall and two meetings during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and discuss planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each meeting, the department chair will summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP.
Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting. Each college/school should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

1. Elements of the Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

For faculty who do not meet annual performance or pre-tenure review expectations, a performance remediation plan (PRP) is put in place. The department chair will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member and any committee that participated in the pre-tenure review. The PRP must include input from the faculty member, the chair, and the committee. The PRP must also be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development and strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The components of the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken
3. A timetable
4. Available resources and supports
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

2. Corrective Post-Tenure Review

A faculty member evaluated as deficient in any one of the elements of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and/or service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each) for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review.

Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The faculty member will follow the guidelines and procedures for post-tenure review (See Part 1, Section VII. D.)

If the outcome of the corrective post-tenure review is successful, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the corrective post-tenure review date. If the outcome of
a corrective post-tenure review does not meet expectations or needs improvement,
the same process for an unsuccessful post-tenure review will be followed.

D. Post-Tenure Review

1. Purpose

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of
tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong
performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure.

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 academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-
tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader 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.

The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward.
Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition
for their achievements. Each college/school will prescribe how the review results will
be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit
pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.

2. Procedure

With the exception of tenured administrators whose majority of duties are
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 successful voluntary post-
tenure review, promotional review, or a leave of absence. In cases where a leave of
absence occurs due to the birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability or
prolonged illness of the faculty member or immediate family member, the post-
tenure review will be delayed accordingly.

The post-tenure review should focus on the faculty member's accomplishments in
research, scholarship and/or creative activities; teaching; and service, (including
related student success activities that may be interwoven into each) pertaining to the
stated expectations for performance developed by the colleges and departments. Annual reviews encompassing the previous five years must be incorporated in the post-tenure review processes. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous five-year period. The faculty member being reviewed should prepare a dossier based on available information such as annual reports, student/peer evaluations of teaching, curriculum vitae, publications, etc. In addition, the faculty member should provide a statement that summarizes accomplishments and effectiveness in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service over the previous five years and outlines goals for the next five years.

For candidates with joint appointments, post-tenure evaluation materials should additionally include letter/s from the chair/s of the candidate's secondary department/s commenting on their research, scholarship, creative activities, and/or service as appropriate to the joint appointment memorandum.

Each college shall determine the details of the post-tenure review process, subject to the following considerations. The review shall involve the department chair, at least one elected committee of tenured faculty of similar or higher rank, the dean and the provost. The initial review shall be conducted by the department chair or by the faculty review committee. The initial reviewer will prepare a report based on the faculty member's dossier and statement that assesses the faculty member's accomplishments in research, scholarship and/or creative activities; teaching and service over the previous five years. The initial report will be reviewed and commented on by the department chair or the faculty review committee (whichever party was not involved in the initial review) as well as by the dean and the provost. The faculty member must receive copies of the initial review as well as of all subsequent comments.

Tenured administrators who hold faculty rank will receive an annual review by their appropriate supervisor and will undergo a comprehensive evaluation, including a 360° feedback assessment every three years (University Senate Bylaws, Article VII Committees; Section 12. Committee on Faculty Affairs).

3. Voluntary Review

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for a post-tenure review before the five-year time limit. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of
the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure reviews should include a review of the faculty member’s accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the voluntary post-tenure review date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year post-tenure review date remains in place.

E. Performance Improvement Plan and Remedial Actions

In the event of a post-tenure review that does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the faculty member’s department chair or appropriate supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the post-tenure review committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee.

Consistent with the developmental intent of the post-tenure review, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the post-tenure review. The PIP’s goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be scheduled no less than twice per semester during the fall and spring.

The assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year’s annual review. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The college/school will follow appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal the final assessment of their PIP and the resulting remedial actions as outlined below.

The department chair or appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of post-tenure review. Each faculty member must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the post-tenure review. In the event of an unsuccessful post-tenure review the letter must also include next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does
not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document however no action is required by the department chair or appropriate supervisor.

The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

The components of the PIP must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken
3. A timetable
4. Available resources and supports
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and discuss planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the department chair or appropriate supervisor should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member’s progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from an elected committee of faculty colleagues. Each college/school should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member’s next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, the appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s deficiencies will be taken. In consultation with the department chair, the Dean will recommend the appropriate remedial action to the President or their designee. The severity of remedial actions should be proportionate with the outcome of the performance improvement plan and appropriate for the faculty appointment type. Remedial actions may include but are not limited to professional development in the area(s) of deficiency, mentoring, temporary workload
adjustments (to be reviewed at annual review), revocation of graduate faculty status, reclassification, suspension of pay, salary reduction, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment. A faculty member shall receive written notice of the possibility of such remedial actions when the performance improvement plan begins.

The President will make the final determination on regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution’s final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Performance Improvement Plan

If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the performance improvement plan, the department chair and dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has refused to engage reasonably in the process), the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s deficiencies. Upon request by the faculty member, the post-tenure review committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and the proposed remedial action and make their recommendation.

The faculty member has 10 business days from receiving the recommendation of the dean/dept. chair to request the post-tenure review committee review. Upon request to review the recommended action by the faculty member, further due process will include the following:

1. The post-tenure review committee will review the recommendation of the department chair and dean. The post-tenure review committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the post-tenure review committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The post-tenure review committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
2. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the post-tenure review committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.

3. The faculty member may appeal to the President within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President’s final decision shall be made within 10 business days and should notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents’ Policy.

4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.

5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution’s final decision pursuant to Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26).

F. Emeriti Status

The dean may recommend for approval by the provost emeriti status for a retired tenured or non-tenured faculty member who, at the time of retirement, had 10 years or more of honorable and distinguished service in the University System of Georgia. In making recommendations for the emeriti status, departments should be specific with respect to the emeriti status title (for example, associate professor emeritus/emerita, professor emeritus/emerita, etc.). Candidates for the emeriti status may be nominated by faculty in their department or may self-nominate to be considered for emeriti status. Nominations for emeriti status must be voted on by departmental faculty and their recommendation must be supported by the department chair, dean, provost and the president.
Part Two: Promotion and Tenure Standards for Perimeter College

Promotion and tenure decisions are to be based on discipline-specific departmental and college criteria as determined by departmental and college faculty, but satisfaction of these criteria should reflect equivalent levels of accomplishment across Perimeter College. Although faculty members in different divisions within Perimeter College are engaged in teaching and/or varied forms of research, creative and other scholarly activity, the quality and significance of achievement appropriate to the field in question should be comparable. This document provides a statement of the general Perimeter College-wide standards that govern the specific departmental criteria. These college standards define the expected quality and significance of faculty accomplishments. Standards should be high even as they take into account such factors as teaching loads and differing disciplinary requirements. The standards should be expected to rise as Georgia State continues to strive for excellence.

Requirements of the Georgia Board of Nurses requires that the associate degree nursing program at Perimeter College and the baccalaureate/masters/doctoral nursing degree programs at the Atlanta campus be one administrative unit. While Perimeter College nursing faculty remain part of the Perimeter College faculty, the hiring and promotion and tenure-related evaluation is completed through the Atlanta campus College of Nursing. Perimeter College nursing faculty are evaluated according to Perimeter College standards and criteria. The promotion and tenure procedures of Perimeter College will be followed except as noted in Section IV below.

I. Tenure Policies

The tenure criteria and procedures established by Georgia State 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).

A. Tenure Requirements

Tenure resides at the institutional level at Georgia State. However, the Atlanta campus and Perimeter College place different emphasis on research and teaching, and tenure acquired under Perimeter College standards is not transferable to the Atlanta campus.
Tenure-track positions at Perimeter College include those at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor. However, only assistant professors, associate professors and professors are eligible for an award of tenure. The university is responsible for the employment of tenured faculty until retirement, resignation, or separation as remedial action related to post-tenure review, dismissal for cause or release because of financial exigency or program modification.

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. Award of Tenure

Normally, a faculty member will apply and be considered for tenure at the beginning of the sixth year of service at the rank of assistant professor. In cases of exceptional achievement, a faculty member may apply and be considered for tenure at the beginning of the fifth year of service. A maximum of two years’ suspension of the probationary period may be granted because 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. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period, the maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven years. The maximum time that may be served in combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be 10 years.

C. Probationary Credit toward Tenure

A maximum of three years of credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure-track positions at other institutions or for service at Perimeter College at the rank of instructor. Credit for prior service at other institutions shall be approved in writing by the president at the time of the initial appointment. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion may relinquish some or all probationary credit received for service at other institutions by notifying the department chair and dean. When a candidate with probationary credit is first eligible for consideration for tenure, the candidate must notify the department chair if they will keep or relinquish some or all of the awarded credit. This notice will be provided to the department chair at the beginning of that year’s promotion-and-tenure cycle, at the time the
candidate informs the department chair whether they would like to be considered for tenure.

D. Loss of Tenure or Probationary Credit toward Tenure

Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon:

1. Resignation from an institution; or
2. Resignation from a tenure-track or tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position; or
3. Resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given in order to take a position for which no probationary credit is given.

If such an individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution.

II. Tenure and Promotion Goals and Standards Tenure

A. Tenure

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. For Perimeter College, the decision to award tenure is based on the merit of the individual faculty member’s demonstrated accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each), the trajectory of continued accomplishments throughout the faculty member’s career and the mission of the department, the college and the university.

B. Promotion

1. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

Faculty hired into tenure-track positions at Perimeter College will be awarded the initial rank of either instructor or assistant professor. The criteria for determination of the initial rank will be specifically listed in the hiring manual for the college.
However, faculty hired without a terminal degree cannot be offered the initial rank of assistant professor.

Faculty who are hired at the rank of instructor may apply for promotion to assistant professor. A faculty member who completes a terminal degree, is eligible to apply for promotion in the promotion and tenure cycle immediately following receipt of the terminal degree. Promotion to the rank of assistant professor is based on a faculty member’s demonstrating a record of superior teaching, scholarly/creative activities and service to the institution (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each). A faculty member hired at the rank of instructor who does not complete a terminal degree may apply for promotion only with strong justification demonstrating the faculty member’s record of superior teaching, scholarly/creative activities (this may include additional graduate study beyond the master’s degree) and service to the institution. The specific requirements for promotion will be listed in the Promotion and Tenure Manual for Perimeter College.

Faculty must hold at least the rank of assistant professor to be eligible for tenure. Faculty who are not awarded tenure cannot remain employed at Perimeter College in a tenure-track position. Faculty who are hired at the rank of instructor must work to be awarded the rank of assistant professor and must continue to perform in order to earn tenure. The maximum time that may be served in combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be ten years.

2. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor at Perimeter College is based on the merit of the individual faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each).

Normally, an assistant professor will apply and be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor at the beginning of the sixth year of service, five of which must be in rank at Perimeter College. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an assistant professor may apply and be considered for promotion at the beginning of the fifth year of service, four of which must be in rank at Perimeter College. Strong justification must be provided to support consideration for promotion whenever the candidate has served fewer than four years at the rank of assistant professor at
Georgia State. Nevertheless, where national standards deviate from these norms, the dean of Perimeter College may request a waiver from the provost on behalf of the college.

Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period, the maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven (7) years.

At a minimum, an associate professor is expected to demonstrate high-quality teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and appropriate evidence of service.

3. Promotion to Professor

Normally, an associate professor will apply or be considered for promotion to the rank of professor at the beginning of the eighth year of service, at least five of which must have been served at the rank of associate professor at Perimeter College. An associate professor may seek early promotion if a strong justification exists for doing so. Earliest consideration in this case occurs, however, during the seventh year of service, at least five of which must have been served at Perimeter College.

Promotion to the rank of professor is based on demonstrated accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each). The quality and the level of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of professor must exceed the expectations of those of an associate professor. A professor is expected to demonstrate high-quality teaching and provide significant service to the university and professional communities.

C. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The candidate’s record will be evaluated according to university, Perimeter College and departmental criteria, and professional standards for conduct in teaching, scholarly/creative activities and service. In each area -- teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service -- the successful candidate will have demonstrated they have fulfilled expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate’s discipline, and the mission and resources of the Department.
D. 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. When necessary, such tenure may be awarded outside the timelines identified in the manual.

Each such recommendation shall be granted only in cases in which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an associate professor or professor, was already tenured at a prior institution and brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution. If the person is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the award of tenure must be approved by the Chancellor.

III. Procedures

Promotion and tenure decisions at Perimeter College are to be based on department, Perimeter College and university procedures, as applicable. Perimeter College must have written guidelines on promotion and tenure that clearly set forth its criteria and standards for promotion and tenure as well as the procedures to be followed in the promotion-and-tenure process. A department may choose to adopt and follow these procedures for this purpose. Departmental promotion and tenure guidelines must be reviewed and approved regularly by a Perimeter College committee, as designated by the college’s promotion and tenure manual. This committee is also responsible for reviewing the college manual. This manual must be annually reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee and approved by the provost.

A. Calendar

The exact dates for the notification of the outcomes of university review will be determined by the Office of the Provost and communicated to the faculty in advance of each year’s promotion and tenure cycle. The dates for candidates to submit their dossier, as well as the dates for reviews by the department, chair and college committee will be clearly stated in the college calendar.

B. Annual College Meeting
Perimeter College will conduct a meeting each year for the promotion and tenure candidates in the college. This meeting should be held prior to the date when candidates must declare their intention to seek promotion and/or tenure.

The purpose of the meeting is to explain promotion and tenure policies and to answer candidates’ questions about any and all phases of the promotion and tenure process. The meeting shall be open to all interested faculty members in the college.

C. Candidate’s Dossier

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure will prepare a dossier that contains a record of their professional career achievements (teaching, scholarly/creative activities and service) and appropriate documentation. In addition, candidates shall provide a statement that summarizes their accomplishments and effectiveness in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. In the case of candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor, the dossier should emphasize the record of professional achievements since the candidate’s promotion to the rank of assistant professor. In the case of candidates for promotion to the rank of professor, the dossier should emphasize the record of professional achievements since the candidate’s promotion to the rank of associate professor. Documentation of the areas to be included in the candidate’s dossier is outlined below.

1. Assessment of Teaching
Candidates for promotion and tenure must submit in the dossier the results of student evaluations of instruction within a timeframe to be determined by Perimeter College. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness including any related student success activities must be presented in the dossier. Evidence of teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes 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.

2. Assessment of Scholarly and Creative Activities
Candidates for promotion and tenure must demonstrate evidence of scholarly/creative activities in their fields of expertise including any related student
success activities. This may include, but is not limited to, evidence of membership in professional organizations, conference attendance, presentations and offices held in professional organizations.

3. Assessment of Service
The Perimeter College manual and departmental guidelines will provide a clear description of the types of service indicators to be used in departmental and college reviews. These guidelines should include service allocation expectations. Departmental, college and university service, including any related student success activities and, faculty mentorship in scholarship, scholarly/creative activities, and teaching as well as professional or community accomplishments and leadership, constitute appropriate activity in this area of assessment.

4. Student Success
Evaluation of the Student Success component will involve an assessment of the faculty member’s involvement in activities inside and outside the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement for all learners. These aspects may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by the college/department to deepen student learning.

D. Recommendation Letters

1. At least three letters of support, including at least one from a tenured faculty member in the discipline at Perimeter College and at least one from a tenured faculty member in another discipline within Perimeter College, are required. Faculty members may also include one letter from a peer outside Perimeter College. Faculty members should inform their colleagues of the criteria that should be addressed in the letters. Letters should be sent directly to the Dean of Perimeter College.

2. Colleagues writing letters of support should address how the faculty member demonstrates some or all of the following:

• the capacity and likelihood for continued intellectual, scholarly and professional vitality
- the ability and willingness to perform assigned duties
- a sense of responsibility and dedication to make the continuing exemplary performance of duties a reasonable expectation
- maintenance of proper professional ethics
- excellence in teaching
- excellence in professional activities/development
- excellence in service
- any related student success activities that may be interwoven in teaching, professional activities/development, and service

IV. Evaluation of Dossier

A. Departmental Review

The candidate's dossier and recommendations will be reviewed by a departmental committee composed of at least three tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and at least three tenured faculty at the rank of professor for candidates seeking the rank of professor. In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members.

The departmental committee will prepare a recommendation to the department chair reviewing the candidate's dossier, recommendations letters and any other materials directly relevant to the candidate's dossier. This recommendation along with the candidate's dossier will be forwarded to the department chair by the date specified in the college promotion and tenure calendar.

B. Department Chair Review

The department chair will review and evaluate the candidate's dossier, the recommendation letters, other materials directly relevant to the candidate's dossier and the recommendation of the departmental committee. The department chair forwards their recommendation to the college committee by the date specified in the college promotion and tenure calendar.
For Perimeter College Nursing faculty, the department chair refers to the Perimeter College Nursing Program Chair. The Nursing Program Chair forwards a recommendation to the Assistant Dean of Nursing by the date specified in the college promotion and tenure calendar.

C. Assistant Dean of Nursing Review (for Perimeter College Nursing Faculty only)

The Assistant Dean of Nursing will review and evaluate the candidate’s dossier the recommendation letters, other materials directly relevant to the candidate's dossier, and the recommendation of the departmental committee and the Nursing Program Chair. The Assistant Dean of Nursing forwards a recommendation to the college committee by the date specified in the college promotion and tenure calendar.

D. College Committee Review

Perimeter College will have at least one committee on promotion and tenure. Such committees 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, letters of recommendation, other materials directly relevant to the candidate’s dossier and the recommendations of the department chair and departmental committee (and the Assistant Dean of Nursing for Perimeter College Nursing faculty). The committee/s will make recommendations to the dean concerning the promotion and/or tenure of each candidate by the date specified in the college promotion-and-tenure calendar.

E. Dean's Review

The dean will evaluate the candidate’s dossier, recommendation letters, other materials directly relevant to candidate’s dossier and the recommendations of the departmental committee, department chair, (Assistant Dean of Nursing for Perimeter College faculty) and college committee. Unless the candidate has withdrawn from consideration, the dean will forward recommendations to the provost along with the file containing the candidate’s curriculum vitae and statement, and the various letters of internal assessment. The dean will notify the candidate by the date specified in the
calendar. Candidates who are not recommended by the dean may appeal the dean’s decision to the provost as noted in Section V.

F. Provost’s Review

The provost will review the materials forwarded by the dean and any other materials directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms and expectations for the university, college and department, and make their promotion and tenure recommendation. The provost will notify the candidate of this recommendation with a copy to the dean.

Before forwarding a negative recommendation to the president, the provost will consult with the dean. In response to the query from the provost, the dean may gather additional information from the candidate, the departmental chair, the departmental and/or college promotion and tenure committee, and from any materials directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy. The dean will notify the candidate and department chair of the dean's response to the provost.

G. President’s Review

The president will review the candidate’s curriculum vitae and statement, recommendation letters and any other material directly relevant to the faculty member’s candidacy, also applying the guidelines, norms and expectations for the university, college and department, and make a promotion-and-tenure decision, notifying the candidate with a copy to the dean.

V. Written Notification and Appeals

A. Written Notification to Candidates

At each of the stages of review, a candidate must receive a written notice of the outcome of the deliberations and a copy of any evaluation(s) that are made of the candidate's credentials. In the case of a split decision, the report, listing all committee members, should include both majority and minority views.
A candidate has the right to respond in writing to decisions made by the departmental committee, department chair and/or college committee. Copies of the candidate’s response(s) will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels. The response is an opportunity for the faculty member to provide clarifications and corrections to the reports.

**B. Appeals to the Provost**

Appeals of negative recommendations by the dean of Perimeter College may be made, in writing, to the provost within 10 business days after receiving the negative recommendation from the dean. If a candidate does not appeal a negative decision by the dean, the case will not be considered at subsequent levels of review. In reviewing the appeal, the provost may gather additional information pertaining to the appeal from the candidate, the college dean, the department chair, the departmental and/or college promotion and tenure committee, and other appropriate individuals inside or outside the university. The provost shall provide the candidate and the dean with a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the appeal is supported or rejected.

**C. Appeals to the President**

A candidate may appeal to the president in writing the provost’s negative recommendation or decision regarding the candidate’s appeal within 10 business days after receiving the negative recommendation. The appeal to the president shall conform to the principles and processes stated above for appeals to the provost. The president shall provide the candidate a written decision, including a statement of the bases upon which the candidate’s appeal is supported or rejected.

**VI. Dean’s Feedback to the College Committee**

The dean will meet annually with the Perimeter College promotion and tenure committee and provide feedback on the outcome of the year’s tenure and/or promotion cases and discuss the committee’s assessments and recommendations in light of the final tenure and/or promotion outcomes.

**VII. Other Tenure-Related and Promotion-Related Reviews**
A. Pre-Tenure Review

1. Purpose

Normally, each department will conduct a pre-tenure review of each tenure-track faculty member. The purpose of the pre-tenure/third-year review is to provide a rigorous analysis and detailed feedback of the faculty member’s body of work in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service (including any student success activities that may be interwoven into each) towards tenure. A formal review of the progress made toward promotion and tenure will be made during the third year so that tenure-track faculty members have a clear idea of how adequately they are progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure. When a faculty member is hired with one or two years of probationary credit towards tenure 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 department chair and dean. An approved suspension of the probationary period for tenure will delay the pre-tenure review accordingly. During the year of suspension, the faculty member will be reviewed according to normal annual review procedures.

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. Such review should complement efforts to implement mentoring programs within each department. While this review is distinguished from the annual review, in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments, previous annual evaluations must be part of the review and the assessment of the pre-tenure review will take the place of that year’s annual review. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion (BOR 8.3.5.1).

2. Procedure

This review will be conducted by a committee of either at least three faculty of the appropriate rank elected from the tenured faculty or all departmental faculty of appropriate rank and tenure. Normally, these faculty members will be from the department. However, in small units, faculty of appropriate rank from outside the department may be elected. This pre-tenure review should address accomplishments in teaching; scholarly/creative activities; and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each). The result of faculty annual reviews will be utilized as a part of subsequent pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews as well as
retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. It will be based on available information as articulated in the departmental or college guidelines: e.g., annual reports, student and peer evaluations of teaching, student success activities, curriculum vitae, 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 department should be reviewed and commented on by the department chair, the dean and the provost. Faculty must receive a written report of the results of this review and comments by the department chair, the dean and the provost.

The University Promotion and Tenure Manual Review Committee shall review the university’s pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions, and submit these to the provost for final approval.

**B. Annual Review**

Faculty are evaluated annually by their department chair or appropriate supervisor as defined by the college/school against the minimum criteria listed in the BOR Policy 8.3.5.1 and BOR Policy 8.3.7.3.

The annual evaluation will encompass teaching; research/scholarship/creative activity or academic achievement; professional service to the institution or community (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each); and continuous professional growth appropriate to Georgia State’s sector and mission, college or school and department.

Colleges/schools must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage as noted in the below mentioned Likert scale.

**1. Procedure**

All faculty members are subject to an annual review. Annual reviews are outlined in college/school guidelines.
The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the annual evaluation. The department chair or appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member’s annual written evaluation and their progression towards achieving future milestones.

The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.

The faculty member will be given 10 business days to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.

The department chair or appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member’s written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 business days from the faculty member’s rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the official personnel records. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review. (BOR Policy 6.26)

All annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following Likert scale:

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
2 – Needs Improvement
3 – Meets Expectations
4 – Exceeds Expectations
5 – Exemplary

If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year. The department chair or appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. This will become part of the official personnel records.
Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the Likert Scale.

Each college/school can decide to use the above Likert Scale for other reviews, including pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure.

C. Performance Remediation Plan

The Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review or pre-tenure review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Two meetings during the fall and two meetings during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and discuss planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each meeting, the department chair will summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting. Each college/school should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

1. Elements of the Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

For faculty who do not meet annual performance or pre-tenure review expectations, a performance remediation plan (PRP) is put in place. The department chair will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member and any committee that participated in the pre-tenure review. The PRP must include input from the faculty member, the chair, and the committee. The PRP must also be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development and strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The components of the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken
3. A timetable
4. Available resources and supports
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

2. Corrective Post-Tenure Review

A faculty member evaluated as deficient in any one of the elements of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and/or service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each) for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review.

Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The faculty member will follow the guidelines and procedures for post-tenure review (See Part Two, Section VII. D.).

If the outcome of the corrective post-tenure review is successful, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the corrective post-tenure review date. If the outcome of a corrective post-tenure review does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the same process for an unsuccessful post-tenure review will be followed.

D. Post-Tenure Review

1. Purpose

Perimeter College will also conduct a post-tenure review of tenured faculty. The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure.

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 academic discipline, institution, and the institution’s mission. Post-tenure review is one of several types of faculty performance reviews (for example, 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 retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member’s career.
The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. Each college/school will prescribe how the review results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.

2. Procedure

With the exception of tenured administrators whose majority of duties are 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 promotion or successful voluntary post-tenure review, or a leave of absence. In cases where a leave of absence occurs due to the birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability or prolonged illness of the faculty member or immediate family member, the post-tenure review will be delayed accordingly.

The post-tenure review should focus on the faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service; including related student success activities that may be interwoven into each) pertaining to these to the stated expectations for performance developed by the colleges and departments. Annual reviews encompassing the previous five years must be incorporated in the post-tenure review processes. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous five-year period. The faculty member being reviewed should prepare a dossier based on available information such as annual reports, student/peer evaluations of teaching, curriculum vitae, publications, etc. In addition, faculty members should provide a statement that summarizes their accomplishments and effectiveness in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service over the previous five years and outlines goals for the next five years.

Perimeter College shall determine the details of the post-tenure review process, subject to the following considerations. The review shall involve the department chair, at least one elected committee of tenured faculty of similar or higher rank, the dean and the provost. The initial review shall be conducted either by the department chair or by the faculty review committee. The initial reviewer will prepare a report based on the faculty member’s dossier and statement that assesses the faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activities and service over
the previous five years. The initial report will be reviewed and commented on by the
department chair or the faculty review committee (whichever party was not involved
in the initial review) as well as by the dean and the provost. The faculty member must
receive copies of the initial review as well as of all subsequent comments.

Tenured administrators who hold faculty rank will receive an annual review by their
appropriate supervisor and will undergo a comprehensive evaluation, including a
360° feedback assessment every three years (University Senate Bylaws, Article VII,
Committees: Section 12, Committee on Faculty Affairs).

3. Voluntary Review

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for a post-tenure review
before the five-year time limit. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage
of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in
their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure
reviews should include a review of the faculty member’s accomplishments since they
were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most
recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next post-tenure review will
be five years from the voluntary post-tenure review date. If the faculty member is
unsuccessful, the 5-year post-tenure review date remains in place.

E. Performance Improvement Plan and Remedial Actions

In the event of a post-tenure review that does not meet expectations or needs
improvement, the faculty member’s department chair or appropriate supervisor(s)
and faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance
Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the post-tenure review committee
based around the deficiencies found by the committee.

Consistent with the developmental intent of the post-tenure review, the PIP must be
designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the
deficiencies identified in the post-tenure review. The PIP’s goals or outcomes must be
reasonable, achievable within the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the
faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of
Faculty Affairs. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be
scheduled no less than twice per semester during the fall and spring.
The assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year’s annual review. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The college/school will follow appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal the final assessment of their PIP and the resulting remedial actions as outlined below.

The department chair or appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of post-tenure review. Each faculty member must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the post-tenure review. In the event of an unsuccessful post-tenure review the letter must also include next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document however no action is required by the department chair or appropriate supervisor.

The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

The components of the PIP must include the following:

- Clearly defined goals or outcomes
- An outline of activities to be undertaken
- A timetable
- Available resources and supports
- Expectations for improvement
- Monitoring strategy

Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and discuss planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the department chair or appropriate supervisor should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member’s progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from an elected committee of faculty colleagues. Each
college/school should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member’s next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, the appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s deficiencies will be taken. In consultation with the department chair, the Dean will recommend the appropriate remedial action to the President or their designee. The severity of remedial actions should be proportionate with the outcome of the performance improvement plan and appropriate for the faculty appointment type. Remedial actions may include but are not limited to professional development in the area(s) of deficiency, mentoring, temporary workload adjustments (to be reviewed at annual review), revocation of graduate faculty status, reclassification, suspension of pay, salary reduction, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment. A faculty member shall receive written notice of the possibility of such remedial actions when the performance improvement plan begins.

The President will make the final determination on regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution’s final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

**Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Performance Improvement Plan**

If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the performance improvement plan, the department chair and dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has refused to engage reasonably in the process), the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s deficiencies. Upon request by the faculty member, the post-tenure review committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and the proposed remedial action and make their recommendation.
The faculty member has 10 business days from receiving the recommendation of the dean/dept. chair to request the post-tenure review committee review. Upon request to review the recommended action by the faculty member, further due process will include the following:

1. The post-tenure review committee will review the recommendation of the department chair and dean. The post-tenure review committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the post-tenure review committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The post-tenure review committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.

2. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the post-tenure review committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.

3. The faculty member may appeal to the President within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President’s final decision shall be made within 10 business days and should notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents’ Policy.

4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.

5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution’s final decision pursuant to Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26).

F. Emeriti Status

The dean may recommend for approval by the provost emeriti status for any retired tenured or non-tenured faculty member who, at the time of retirement, had 10 years or more of honorable and distinguished service in the University System of Georgia. In making recommendations for emeriti status, departments should be specific with respect to the emeriti status title (for example, associate professor emeritus, professor emeritus, etc.). Candidates for the emeriti status may be nominated by faculty in their department or may self-nominate to be considered for emeriti status.
Nominations for emeriti status must be voted on by departmental faculty and their recommendation must be supported by the department chair, dean, provost and the president.