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INTRODUCTION

The Department of Chemistry has formulated these promotion and tenure policies in conformity with the minimum general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. Before a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Chemistry can be nominated by the Departmental Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure for consideration by the Dean's Advisory Area Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the individual must be judged to have met the standards and criteria given in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences and the supplemental criteria listed in this document. Any faculty member who might be considered for promotion and/or tenure should study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures which are outlined in both documents.

For tenure-track positions, the Department of Chemistry will nominate for promotion and/or tenure only those candidates who present evidence of significant achievements in Professional Development (research) and instruction. Strong creative service contributions which promote the common goals and general welfare of the department can strengthen a candidate's record and are highly desirable; a sound service record is required for promotion. However, contributions in the area of service will not be equated with the primary areas of teaching and research unless the candidate can provide unequivocal evidence for national recognition in professional service.

For lecturer positions, the Department of Chemistry will nominate for promotion to Senior Lecturer only those candidates who present evidence of a sustained record of excellence in instruction. High quality service which promotes the general goals and welfare of the Department and fits the needs of the Department is also required for promotion.

For Academic Professional positions, the Department of Chemistry will nominate for promotion to Senior Academic Professional only those candidates who present evidence of a
sustained record of excellence in service. Excellent instruction which promotes the general goals and welfare of the department and fits the needs of the department is also required for promotion.
Overview

The goal of this document is to elaborate the criteria and policies for promotion and tenure in the Department of Chemistry at Georgia State University. To that end, this document attempts to be entirely consistent with University and College policies on promotion and tenure. In the event of conflict, the University and College policies shall take precedence. In many instances, wording in this document mirrors that in the University and College policies and procedures to enhance a single point of view in the various documents.

The Department of Chemistry is a complex and multifaceted organization with a wide variety of responsibilities in professional development (research), instruction (teaching) and service. Meeting these responsibilities requires the collegial and conscientious participation of all the faculty in all aspects of the departmental operations and programs. This document attempts to outline the important aspects of collegial participation in the Department, with specific emphasis on the recognition of this in promotion and/or tenure.

As described in the University Policy on Promotion and/or Tenure:

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the three areas of
(1) [Instruction:] teaching, advising and serving students (to include instruction both inside and outside the classroom environment and professional practice, when appropriate), (2) [Professional Development:] academic achievement and professional development (to include research, other forms of scholarship, and creative activity), and (3) [S]ervice: (to include departmental, college, university, and professional service as well as public service involving professional expertise). In each of these areas candidates will be evaluated as to whether or not they have met, exceeded, or clearly surpassed the expectations for promotion or tenure at peer institutions, defined to be those institutions rated at the same level by the Carnegie [System] or a comparable criteria.

Faculty may not participate in appointment, mentoring or promotion and tenure recommendations if there exists a significant conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest include personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude objective and unbiased assessment of a candidate's efforts.
Review for Promotion and/or Tenure

The timing of the review for promotion and tenure, as well as the details of the documentation, will follow that outlined in the University and the College of Arts and Sciences policies. For tenure-track candidates, the review will assess the candidate's Professional Development (scholarship), Instruction (teaching effectiveness) and Service. More detailed descriptions of these three areas are in the sections that follow. For Senior Lecturer candidates, the review will assess the candidate’s Instructional and Service effectiveness. For Senior Academic Professional candidates, the review will assess the candidate’s Service and Instructional effectiveness.

Assessment of Professional Development (Scholarship) for Tenure-Track Candidates

Scholarship is one of the fundamental aspects of the Department of Chemistry. The Department distinguishes between routine and innovative research efforts as judged by the candidate's peers at the University and elsewhere. The principal standard should be quality, rather than quantity. A candidate's scholarship is affected by many factors including the difficulty of the research, access to appropriate experimental equipment, and the number and background of students available to participate in the research. All of these factors will be taken into account in evaluating the candidate's accomplishments. It is the responsibility of the candidate to assess the availability of appropriate equipment, personnel and space so that the candidate's research plan is both ambitious and feasible.

The rating system will result in evaluations of outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair and poor. Definitions of terms and factors for evaluation are listed in Table I.
Table I. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Internationally recognized research program</td>
<td>Publications,(^1) grants,(^2) awards (prizes) and invitations(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Nationally recognized research program</td>
<td>Publications(^1) and grants(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Emerging nationally competitive research program</td>
<td>Publications(^1) and modest grants(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Growing research program</td>
<td>Some peer-reviewed publications or grants(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Limited research program</td>
<td>Occasional publications or meeting presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No research program</td>
<td>No publications, presentations, or grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Publications are defined as the appropriate number of quality papers for the area in major peer-reviewed journals, invited chapters and/or books appropriate to chemistry.

\(^2\)Grants are nationally competitive and peer-reviewed.

\(^3\)Invited speakers at major national and international conferences or at important national or international professional workshops.

Additional Considerations and Notes

1. Scholarship is indicated most clearly by publications in refereed journals. It is exceptionally difficult to rank the quality of journals accurately. However, it is clear that some journals have more impact than others and the Department will take this into account in assessing the candidate's productivity. The quality and quantity of citations and reprints of the candidate's research publications will also be assessed. It is recognized that each research area will have different expectations in regard to numbers of publications and specific journal importance.
2. The Department of Chemistry values collaboration both within Georgia State and with colleagues at other institutions. Such collaborations can allow rapid progress in research. A balance of collaborative and single research group efforts in research is useful. Candidates with co-authored works should clearly indicate their contribution to the works. The evaluative committee(s) will incorporate assessment of this contribution in its letter of recommendation. The candidate must have an independent research program to be considered for promotion and/or tenure.

3. Grant support is a significant indication of research productivity. Candidates for tenure should have a demonstrated ability to attract funding, especially from federal agencies or nationally competitive major funding sources. Funding as Co-P.I. is of value, but the candidate must have funding as the P.I. for the individual’s independent research program. It is recognized that the level of funding will be a function of the area of research, however.

4. Invited seminars and presentations (abstracts), if travel funds are provided, are also an indication of scholarship. Secondary indications would be contributed presentations and presentations by students and other research associates of the candidate.

5. Patents for materials, processes, instruments are also an indication of productivity.

6. Election to offices, committee activities, and important service to professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer reviewing as related to research and other creative activities also indicate the scholarly efforts of the candidate. Note: many activities related to professional associations should be listed under service if scholarship is not involved.

Assessment of Instruction (Teaching Effectiveness) for Tenure-Track and Senior Lecturer Candidates

Teaching communicates the discipline of chemistry to students, develops in them an excitement about the molecular structure of the world around them, and trains them to be skilled,
responsible members of a profession. The rating system for tenure-track promotion/tenure and
Senior Lecturer candidates will be: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair and poor.
Definitions and factors used in the evaluation are listed in Table IIA for tenure-track faculty and
in Table IIB for non-tenure-track faculty.

Table IIA. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Instruction for Tenure
Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outstanding        | Innovative, inspirational teacher, recognized as national leader in development of instruction and/or training of students or postdocs | 5 of 6 items, including (a), (b) and (f):  
(a) develop courses and research projects for students,  
(b) appropriate student perceptions,  
(c) instructional grant funds,  
(d) pub. in instructional jour.,  
(e) instructional creativity,  
(f) appropriate grades/drop rates/or student exam scores |
<p>| Excellent          | Innovative, inspirational, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction in university community | 4 of 6 items, including (a), (b) and (f) |
| Very Good          | Innovative teacher; provides leadership in instructional development      | 3 of 6 items, including (a) and (b)                                    |
| Good               | Meets obligations well; local level teacher                               | 2 of 6 items, including (b)                                            |
| Fair               | Limited performance; substandard teacher                                  | 1 of 6 items                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Needs significant improvement; substandard, ineffective teacher</th>
<th>0 of 6 items and pattern of complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Compared to the departmental 4 year average for the area and course level.
2. Fellowships and/or stipends for students or postdocs which are part of external research grants are applicable.
3. Department's normal statistics for each level of courses will be used as the standard. Student performance and honors are applicable. Results on ACS national exams meet Departmental goals (median ~60 percentile) and expectations (previous results used as criteria).

**Table IIB. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Instruction for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outstanding        | Innovative, inspirational, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction | 5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f):  
(a) develop and/or update courses  
(b) appropriate student perceptions,¹ and appropriate grades/drop rates²  
(c) direct independent study and/or Chem 4160 courses,  
(d) pub. in instructional jour.  
(e) instructional creativity,  
(f) appropriate learning outcomes/ACS exam results²,³  
(g) involvement/participation with educationally focused grants/proposals |
| Excellent          | Innovative, inspirational, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact) | 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f) |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Items Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Innovative teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(narrow impact)</td>
<td>3 of 7 items,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Meets obligations</td>
<td>2 of 7 items,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Limited performance; uninspiring teacher</td>
<td>1 of 7 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Substandard, ineffective teacher</td>
<td>0 of 7 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and pattern of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Compared to the departmental 4 year average for the area and course level.
2Department's normal statistics for each level of courses will be used as the standard. Student performance and honors are applicable.
3Results on ACS national exams meet Departmental goals (median ~60 percentile) and expectations (previous results used as criteria).

For Senior Academic Professional candidates, instructional assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The effectiveness of instruction will be evaluated as it relates to the department’s mission and the specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate.

For Senior Academic Professional candidates Instruction will be rated to determine if the standard of excellent is achieved.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must include the teaching portfolio in the dossier. This evidence might include:

1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
3. Development of innovative courses, preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques.
4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or collated by the candidate, especially if these include significant revision of the current documents.
5. Student evaluation summaries and representative student comments that indicate the instructor's abilities to enhance student interest and to stimulate work and achievement by students. Evidence should be presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.

6. Results of standardized exams given to the students (e.g., the ACS standardized exams).

7. A list of research projects, theses and dissertations directed.

8. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations at professional meetings).

9. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.

10. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or to fund stipends for students.

11. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs; participation in textbook development.

12. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

Assessment of Service

For tenure-track candidates, service is key to the function of the Department. However, the Department realizes that extensive service, especially for untenured faculty, can decrease their potential for scholarship and teaching. It is thus expected that candidates will perform service requests competently and in a timely fashion, but that the Department will minimize requests for service from untenured faculty.

Service will be rated: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair or poor. Definitions and factors used in the evaluation are listed in Table III.

Departmental service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:

(a) Safety is always of primary concern in a chemistry department. It is expected that the candidate will maintain the highest safety standards at all times.
Research productivity is strongly affected by access to state-of-the-art, functioning equipment. It is expected that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that Departmental equipment is in working order, both by overseeing equipment purchase and repair, and by training students and research associates carefully in the use of equipment.

Graduate recruitment often falls to the untenured faculty, in part due to most candidates' recent graduate school experience and in part due to the necessity to attract graduate students to start a research group. Candidates should monitor their efforts in the area with feedback from the Chair and mentor.

Attending seminars and meeting with speakers

Committee assignments including general exams

Departmental report writing, including sections of Departmental level proposals

Oversight of staff

Membership on dissertation/thesis committees.

For lecturers, service will be rated to determine if the standard of high quality is achieved using the standard approach similar to that outlined above (see page 12). However, service for lecturers is normally at the departmental and college level and the quantity is dependent upon specific requirements and work load assignments as defined by the Department. University level, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.

Table III. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service (for Tenure-Track Candidates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Major effective leader</td>
<td>Major effective role in College or Senate or University, or major effective role in the Department or in a professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Role in the Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Effective leader</td>
<td>Effective role in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College or Senate or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University, or in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Helpful citizenship; Departmental</td>
<td>Effective role in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>Department; meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>effectively and is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>helpful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>active role in College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Acceptable citizenship; minimal</td>
<td>Meets minimum Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>obligations/requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Needs improvement; substandard</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>Departmental obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs major improvement; negative</td>
<td>Hinders the Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Service to the Department and College is expected to be minimal in the junior faculty member's first three years.
Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for Lecturers

The service of Lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of "high quality" service.

Each Lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term will have a different service load than those assigned major departmental and/or College roles. Only service that meets the Department's mission will be considered.

A. For Lecturers With Full Teaching Loads. Service assignments are limited to (a) safety issues, (b) equipment oversight, (c) departmental committee and seminar participation, and (d) limited course oversight/coordination or limited assigned departmental tasks (science fair judges, etc.).

B. For Lecturers with Major Assigned Obligations in Departmental and/or College Committees/Tasks. Service assignments in addition to (a)-(d) above include one or more of the following: (e) Undergraduate Director, (f) Area Committee (e.g., Freshman, Organic, etc.), (g) Pre-Med Advisor (departmental), (h) College committee work (Pre-Med. etc.), (i) course lab manual responsibilities, (j) course/area WebCT responsibilities, and (k) Science Olympiads or other major assigned departmental tasks.

For Lecturers in Category A: Service items (a)-(d) must be carried out with diligence and with quality (e.g., timely/thorough and effective performance of assigned tasks) to achieve the rating of high quality.

For Lecturers in Category B: The assigned extra service items from (e)-(k) in addition to (a)-(d) must be carried out as stated for Category A to achieve the rating of high quality.

Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for Academic Professionals
Service is at least 50% of the Academic Professional’s job functions. Service roles are assigned by the department depending on departmental needs and mission. Service effectiveness will be judged as outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair and poor with respect to the assigned service duties. Service roles normally assigned by the department (individual assignments may include all or some of these roles):

- Facility/Service Management
- Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- Instructional Service
- Academic Advisement and Curriculum
- Contributions to the Department, College or University
- Professional Service
- Community and Public Service
- Published Materials
- Additional Service

Please see College document for detailed descriptions.

The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To receive an excellent rating all assigned tasks must be performed thoroughly and in a timely manner. Safety, cost effectiveness and planning will also be part of the evaluation.

DEPARTMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall be composed of all tenured Professors in the Department excluding the Chair. The Chair of the Department shall appoint one of the members of the Committee as the Chair of the Committee. For evaluation of those faculty members being considered for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to the Chair of the Department using the promotion and/or tenure procedures adopted by the Department of Chemistry in accord with the Promotion and Tenure
Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. All actions of the Departmental Advisory Committee shall be approved by majority vote.

For tenure-track candidates, the Departmental Committee of the Whole shall be composed of all tenured Professors and Associate Professors in the Department excluding the Chair. For evaluation of those faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure to the rank of Associate Professor, the Departmental Committee of the Whole shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to the Chair of the Department using the promotion and tenure procedures adopted by the Department of Chemistry in accord with the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. In its work the Committee of the Whole shall employ the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure as a subcommittee.

For lecturer candidates, the Departmental Committee of the Whole will consist of all Senior Lecturers, Senior Academic Professionals, and the tenured faculty of the Department. For evaluation of lecturers being considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturers, the Departmental Committee of the Whole shall review and evaluate each candidate’s credentials. The Departmental Advisory Committee will serve as a subcommittee to ensure that all required procedures and reports are properly executed. The Committee of the Whole must make the recommendation to the Departmental Chair.

For Academic Professional candidates, the Departmental Committee of the Whole will consist of all Senior Lecturers, Senior Academic Professionals and tenured faculty of the Department. For evaluation of Academic Professionals being considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, the Departmental Committee of the Whole shall review and evaluate each candidate’s credentials. The Departmental Executive Committee shall serve as a subcommittee to ensure that all required procedures and reports are properly executed. The Committee of the Whole must make the recommendation to the departmental Chair.

Duties of the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure as a subcommittee of the Committee of the Whole include the following:
1. Ensure that all Departmental, College, and University required processes, procedures, and reports are properly executed.

2. Provide a list of outside reviewer names to the Chair of the Department (tenure-track candidates only).

3. Review and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and/or tenure procedures adopted by the Department of Chemistry.

4. Provide written recommended evaluations and supporting analyses based on its review and evaluation of each candidate to the Committee of the Whole.

5. Submit to the Chair of the Department a written statement of the recommendation of each candidate by the Committee of the Whole along with a detailed justification of it.

Duties of the Departmental Committee of the Whole include the following:

1. Review and evaluation the record of each candidate using the promotion and tenure procedures adopted by the Department of Chemistry.

2. Accept or change by a majority vote each recommended evaluation by the Departmental Advisory Committee for each candidate in the areas of Instruction, Professional Development (tenure-track candidates only), and Service.

3. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate.

4. Provide appropriate analyses and justifications for its evaluations and recommendation to the Departmental Advisory Committee.

5. The written statement of the evaluations and recommendation by the Committee of the Whole that is provided to the Chair of the Department must be signed by the Chair of the Departmental Advisory Committee (for authentication purposes) and by all members of the Committee of the Whole who agree with the overall recommendation.

6. Committee members who do not sign the written statement are encouraged (but not required) to provide signed separate letters (minority report) indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.
The written statement and all separate letters from the Committee of the Whole must be sent to the Chair of the Department and then to the College Area Committee as required by the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Other duties of the Departmental Advisory Committee include the following:

1. Provide a written annual review to the Chair of the Department for each non-tenured faculty member serving in a tenure track position until the tenure decision is reached.

2. Provide written three-year Promotion and Tenure reviews for each non-tenured faculty member serving in a tenure track position using the promotion and tenure procedures adopted by the Department of Chemistry in accord with the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

**SENIOR LECTURER**

In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as excellent in instruction by the aforementioned criteria and must also be rated as having provided high quality service. The service of Lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of "high quality" service. The detailed procedure is outlined in the College document.

**SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL.**

In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, each candidate must be rated as excellent in service by the aforementioned guidelines and must also be rated as having provided excellent instruction. Instruction of Academic Professionals is evaluated with respect to the nature of the courses assigned and the level of quality. The specific assignment of instructional duties often varies widely within the department depending on departmental needs.
The instructional effectiveness will be assessed in relation to the department’s mission and the candidate’s instructional responsibilities. The guidelines are outlined in the College document.

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

A candidate for the position of Assistant Professor must have completed the Ph.D. in the individual’s discipline and have written a dissertation of substance and quality. The candidate must have published in peer reviewed journals in his/her area of expertise and have shown the potential to develop an independent and productive research program.

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Before a faculty member can be nominated to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, he/she normally must have served as an Assistant Professor at Georgia State University for not less than five years (see provisions for credit below). Outside reviewers will be asked to provide letters before the initiation of the Departmental review process. All candidates recommended for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor must be evaluated as at least excellent in professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other. Service must be evaluated as at least good.

The Departmental Committee of the Whole and the Chair of the Department independently evaluate the credentials of all candidates and the outside reviewer letters with all deliberations to be completed according to the College calendar. The Departmental Committee of the Whole in judging professional development determines if the candidate has developed an independent research program of national reputation that has resulted in publications in major peer-reviewed journals. At a minimum, the successful candidate is expected to have published (or have manuscripts in press) an appropriate number of such articles or papers based on research conducted while at Georgia State University. A candidate also must have a record of extramural grant support for the individual’s independent research program. When major funding has not been secured, evidence of vigorous and consistent efforts to secure such extramural funds from national agencies and/or foundations will be considered. Indication of effort to secure funding may include reviewers’ comments on proposals. If a candidate elects to submit these for any
proposal, the full set of comments and scores received from the agency must be made available to the committee.

For the candidate to be judged outstanding in research, there should be strong evidence of international recognition of his or her research program. This recognition could include invitations and citations of accomplishments in conjunction with national recognition of publications and grants. This rating would rarely apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor as it would be more appropriate when directed to a history of such recognition. The evaluation of excellent (national level program) is appropriate for recognition of successful acquisition of major extramural funding in conjunction with publications in peer-reviewed journals suitable for the science. Evaluation as very good (emerging national level program) demonstrates a strong effort in seeking extramural support and success by the candidate in obtaining "seed" or preliminary funding in conjunction with publications. The evaluation of good reflects success in publication with evidence of effort to secure funds. A fair evaluation reflects publication or presentations, whereas poor indicates no productivity in research.

For outstanding or excellence in instruction, a candidate should exhibit teaching competence, enthusiasm, effectiveness and sound standards in both the undergraduate and the graduate programs. Involvement in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is strongly recommended by the Department for demonstration of excellence in teaching. Data to be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee include: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as numbers of students directed in independent studies (Chem 4160, Chem 4170, Chem 4950, Chem 8900, Chem 8910, Chem 8999 and Chem 9999). Candidates are required to turn in their teaching portfolios as part of the dossier. Information about graduate students who have successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a degree, by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed. The quality of the students and publications will be considered more than the number of students. Evidence for an evaluation of "outstanding" or "excellent" in instruction may be on the basis of recognition of instruction-relevant publications.
and grants. The Department will permit the candidate to develop evidence from course materials and student evaluations as indicated above to support evaluations of "excellent," "very good," "good," etc.

The faculty member should strive for a sound service record. Membership on Departmental and University Committees, membership on committees of professional organizations, service as an ad hoc reviewer for journals and granting agencies, a symposia convener, an invited presenter, and presentations at scientific meetings (particularly those with the involvement of students) are among activities reviewed in promotion considerations by the Department; (dependent upon the meeting these activities may also indicate professional recognition). If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of his/her appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary credit for tenure is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and tenure at Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not be considered for promotion of that candidate at Georgia State University. Assistant Professors may be judged to have performed service suitable for promotion to the Associate rank by good service at the Departmental level.

Candidates with a primary contract (or mission) in the area of science education must present evidence of scholarly achievement in this specialized area. Evidence of the development of successful liaison programs with other Departments, Colleges and sectors of the public school system may be presented. The documentation of these liaison programs should include evidence of vigorous involvement and success in procurement of internal and extramural support for program implementation.

**PROFESSOR**

Nomination for promotion to Professor usually requires service for five years as Associate Professor at Georgia State University. Outside reviewers will be asked to provide
letters before the Departmental process review. The same evaluation scales (outstanding, excellent, very good, etc.) established for promotion to Associate Professor apply to promotion to full professor, but the magnitude and history of accomplishments must be substantially greater to achieve the ranking. A candidate for Professor must present at a minimum clear evidence of excellence in research and instruction that surpasses the requirements for rank of Associate Professor and must present a very good service record in the Department, College, and/or University. Such accomplishments include the establishment and maintenance at Georgia State University of an independent research program which has consistently received extramural funds from state or national agencies, industries or foundations. The recognition of the candidate's expertise as evidenced by a history of publication in quality journals should exceed that required for a recommendation to the rank of Associate Professor. Other evidence of achievement could include membership on editorial boards of significant chemical journals, service as a referee for those journals or service on review boards for funding agencies and participation in programs of regional and national scientific organizations. Accomplishments in research or teaching may be given special consideration. Accomplishments in research as documented by national recognition, coupled with required achievements in instruction and a major service role may warrant promotion to Professor. Excellent accomplishments in research could include a substantial history of significant (major) extramural support for the research program coupled with unusually high productivity evidenced by publication of peer reviewed articles. Similarly, accomplishments in instruction, as documented by national recognition, coupled with appropriate research and at least a very good record in service may warrant promotion to Professor. Outstanding accomplishments in instruction could include extramural support for educational projects or achievements such as publication of a nationally-recognized textbook. If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of his/her appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary credit is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and/or tenure at Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will
not be considered for promotion of that candidate at Georgia State University. A candidate for promotion to Professor must submit his/her credentials to the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure in basically the same format in which these credentials are submitted to the College Area Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The Department may recommend specialized guidelines and a modified format for the documents to facilitate evaluation of credentials in Chemistry.

Informal Appendix

**Mentoring Program**

A strong mentoring program can provide invaluable assistance to faculty in the development of their careers. Each Assistant Professor in Chemistry will be assigned a mentor in consultation with the Chair of the Department and with the consent of the faculty member chosen as a mentor. The choice normally is for one year at a time with the option to change mentors at any time. At the end of the academic year, the Chair will evaluate the candidate's needs and the responsibilities of the past year's mentor to judge whether or not to continue with the same assignment. It is expected that the mentor will meet twice a month with a first year Assistant Professor and monthly with more experienced new faculty. It is also expected that the Chair, mentor and Assistant Professor will all meet together at least once a semester. Advice from the mentor might be useful in areas such as:

1. Grant proposal preparation; graduate student direction; faculty-faculty and faculty-staff interaction.
2. Review of manuscripts.
3. Assistance in prioritizing efforts.
4. Assistance in organizing and scheduling teaching of large classes.
ANNUAL REVIEW OF NON-TENURED FACULTY

The Chair of the Department of Chemistry and the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall review annually each non-tenured faculty member serving in a tenure track position until a tenure decision is reached. The committee should complete its written review and forward recommendations to the Chair in time to meet College deadlines for renewal/non-renewal of contract. The annual report of the previous year, plus an updated curriculum vita and any other appropriate material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF LECTURERS AND ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

The Departmental Executive Committee shall make a recommendation to the Chair for renewal/non-renewal based on the performance in instruction and service.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF SENIOR LECTURERS AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

The Departmental Executive Committee shall make an annual review of Senior Lecturers and Senior Academic Professionals and make a recommendation to the Chair.

THREE YEAR REVIEWS (TENURE-TRACK FACULTY)

The Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and/or Tenure will review all tenure track faculty. Three year reviews will address a faculty member's cumulative accomplishments in Professional Development (research/scholarly/creative activity), Instruction (teaching), and Service. According to University policy, the review will be based on available information such as annual reports, curriculum vita, publications/creative achievements, and evaluations for teaching. The Chair, with assistance from the candidate, will provide to the review committee an updated curriculum vita, copies of all annual reports, and available documentation related to teaching and professional achievements. The faculty member under
review should also provide the committee with a two page statement that outlines current projects and plans for the next three years.

This cumulative review will address accomplishments in Instruction (teaching, advising and serving students), in Professional Development (research/scholarly/creative activity), and in Service.

1. Grant funding
2. Publications
3. Presentations at meetings
4. Progress reports of graduate students
5. Courses taught with consideration of the size of the class, the complexity of the class and new courses developed
6. Student evaluations of teaching
7. Service to the scientific community (e.g., reviews of grant proposals or manuscripts)
8. Service to the Department.

The three year evaluation will be based on available information, e.g., annual reports and the curriculum vita, with minimal added material. The candidate is not expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the cumulative review other than the requested statement. Most candidates turn in a copy of their teaching portfolio to aid in the evaluation.

This cumulative review should provide an opportunity for colleagues to review accomplishments and provide assistance to the tenure track faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure. In view of the stringent demands of starting a career in an experimental science, it is expected that service to the University will be minimal in the candidate's first three years.

This review is to take place in the Spring Semester of the third year at Georgia State University. Faculty with probationary credit of one year will be reviewed during the Spring Semester 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.

For each faculty member undergoing review, the review committee will provide a written assessment of the effectiveness in Professional Development, Instruction and Service to the Departmental Chair by the tenth week of the Spring Semester by the appropriate deadlines.

THREE-YEAR REVIEW OF LECTURERS AND ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

For Lecturers, a Departmental committee composed of at least three members (tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers), one of whom must be tenured will evaluate the required materials and provide a written assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the Departmental Chair. The Chair will provide an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

For Academic Professionals, a Departmental committee composed of at least 3 tenured faculty and senior academic professionals, with at least 1 being a tenured faculty member, will evaluate the required materials and provide a written assessment addressing effectiveness in Service and Instruction to the departmental Chair. The Chair will provide an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

POST-TENURE REVIEWS

All tenured faculty should undergo a post-tenure review every five years as outlined in the College documents.