

VII. PRE-TENURE REVIEW

The Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual stipulates that the college and its departments normally conduct a pre-tenure review of each tenure-track faculty member. This policy states that a “formal review of the progress made toward promotion and tenure will be made late in the third year so that the tenure track faculty member has a clear idea of how adequately he or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure.”

The university manual provides a general structure for three-year reviews; each unit specifies its own guidelines. This document outlines the guidelines for the College of Arts and Sciences. According to the university policy, the review must be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty of appropriate rank elected from the tenured faculty. To implement this policy, the tenured faculty of each department shall elect a committee of at least three faculty members to conduct the review. In the case of small departments, faculty of appropriate rank from other departments in the same area will be selected.

Three-year reviews will address a faculty member’s cumulative accomplishments in professional development (i.e., research, scholarship, and creative activity), teaching, and service. According to university policy, the review will be based on available information. In the College of Arts and Sciences, these materials will include annual reports, curriculum vitae, publications/creative achievements, and evidence of teaching effectiveness. The chair will provide the review committee with an updated vitae, copies of all annual reports, and available documentation related to teaching and professional achievements by the sixth week of the spring semester. In the College of Arts and Sciences, a faculty member may also provide the committee with a two-page statement that outlines current professional development and teaching projects and plans for the next three years. This is also due to the committee by the sixth week of the spring semester.

This review is to take place in the spring semester of the third year. Faculty with probationary credit of one year will be reviewed in the spring of the second year. It will not be necessary to have a mid-course review for faculty hired with two or three years of credit. In such cases, a review of accomplishments in previous positions should be part of the hiring decision.

Candidates will be evaluated in professional development, teaching, and service, using the terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. The evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate’s discipline, and the mission and resources of the department. Guidelines for the application of the terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor* as they apply within the candidate’s field are specified in an appendix to each department’s promotion and tenure guidelines.

For each faculty member undergoing review, the review committee will provide a written assessment of effectiveness in teaching, research, and service to the department chair by the tenth week of the spring semester. The chair will comment in writing on this report and forward all materials, the committee report, and his/her comments to the Office of the Dean by the thirteenth week of the spring semester. After adding a one page letter of analysis, the dean will forward all materials to the provost. In accordance with university guidelines, faculty will receive a written report of the results of the review. After completion of all assessments, a conference will be held between the chair, the area associate dean, and the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and to make further recommendations to the faculty member.