

**DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE  
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Policy Title:	Department of Computer Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	4
Department Approval:	02/14/2013
College Approval:	Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 02/05/2014

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

1  
2  
3 **PROLOGUE**

4 The Department of Computer Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines supplements and  
5 complements the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual and the Georgia  
6 State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors. The  
7 basic, fundamental, expert peer-review of the candidate takes place within the Department.  
8 Accordingly, the purpose of this set of guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria for  
9 promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Departmental guidelines are intended to conform  
10 to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, those of Georgia State University,  
11 and those of the College of Arts and Sciences. In the event of any conflict, the System, University,  
12 and College policies will take precedence. Therefore, it is important for candidates to study  
13 carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this document and in that of the  
14 College of Arts and Sciences.

15 **INTRODUCTION**

16  
17 The Department of Computer Science at Georgia State University (GSU) assumes as a primary  
18 aspect of its mission to provide research and teaching in the fundamental concepts and  
19 applications of computer science both for the students of the university as well as other citizens of  
20 the State of Georgia.

21  
22 The Department seeks to fulfill this mission in four ways: (i) offering bachelor of science,  
23 masters of science, and Ph.D. degree programs that prepare computer science majors for careers in  
24 business, industry, education, science, and government; (ii) participating in various research and  
25 funding activities; (iii) providing a wide variety of computer science courses appropriate to majors  
26 in the discipline; and (iv) engaging in advisement, academic counseling, and other related services  
27 to the University and the larger community.

28  
29 To meet these responsibilities, the Department of Computer Science is committed to attracting  
30 and maintaining a faculty with exceptional research and instructional abilities, expertise in the  
31 various areas of computer science, and a facility and willingness to serve both the University and  
32 the greater community. Therefore, this document is prepared to assist in this mission and in  
33 consideration of the policies of the Board of Regents, Georgia State University, and its College of  
34 Arts and Sciences. In the event of conflict, the university and college manuals take precedence  
35 over this set of departmental guidelines.

36  
37 As such, all recommendations for promotion and tenure within the Department are evaluated  
38 based on the past performance of each candidate in the areas of professional development,  
39 teaching, and service. Candidates should strive for excellence in all three components while  
40 keeping in mind the criteria described in this document. The purpose of this document, along with  
41 that of the College, is to help the appropriate committees and individuals involved in the process  
42 make these evaluations, and to help the candidates prepare their dossiers so that they display their  
43 accomplishments in a clear and convincing fashion. Clearly, the granting of tenure is a serious  
44 commitment of future resources.

45  
46 The College Area Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CAACPT) independently

47 evaluates all candidates according to the College Promotion and Tenure Manual, a portion of  
48 which provides guidelines for the departmental review and the production of this departmental  
49 document. The departmental review by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee  
50 (DPTC) is made in accordance with this departmental document and the College Promotion and  
51 Tenure Manual.

## 52 53 **THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS** 54 **IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE**

55  
56 Policies relating to promotion and tenure (P&T) at Georgia State University, and in the  
57 College of Arts and Sciences, are described in the College Manual. The College Manual also  
58 describes the P&T process, the college area P&T committee, and the schedule for the various steps  
59 in the process. In all cases, candidates must satisfy the minimum requirements set forth by the  
60 Regents, Georgia State University, and the College of Arts and Sciences.

### 61 **EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

62  
63 As described in the University Policy on Promotion and Tenure:

64 The candidate's record will be evaluated according to University, college, and  
65 department criteria, and professional standards for conduct in research, scholarship,  
66 and creative activities, teaching, and service. In each area-- (1) research, scholarship,  
67 and creative activities; (2) teaching; and (3) service--the candidate will be evaluated as  
68 either having met or having not met the standards for promotion or tenure. It is  
69 necessary to meet the standards in each of the three areas for promotion or tenure.  
70 Norms and expectations appropriate to the discipline are specified in the college and  
71 department manuals and must be consistent with University standards.

72 Thus, the three areas that will be evaluated by the P&T committee for all candidates for  
73 promotion and/or tenure are professional development, teaching, and service. These evaluations  
74 will be based on peer judgments from materials submitted to the committee by the candidate and  
75 the external reviewers.

### 76 77 **Terms of Evaluation**

78 As described in the College Manual, "Candidates will be evaluated as either having met or  
79 having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in each of the following three areas:  
80 professional development, teaching, and service. The single measure for achieving the college  
81 standard in each category is defined below in relation to a specific qualitative term (i.e., *excellent*,  
82 *very good*, or *good*)..."

### 83 84 **Guidelines for the Terms of Evaluation in the Department of Computer Science**

85  
86 Specific items to be considered are listed in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual.  
87 Candidates should consult that manual concerning the format and organization of the materials to  
88 be submitted to the DPTC and the CAACPT. The materials submitted by each candidate will be  
89 evaluated on an individual basis. It is the candidate's responsibility to build his/her case for

90 promotion and/or tenure.

91 The terms, descriptors, and evidence are the same regardless of the level at which the  
92 promotion and/or tenure is sought. However, evidence for more extensive activity and  
93 accomplishment is required at the level of professor than at associate professor, and at associate  
94 professor than at assistant professor.

95 As stated in the college manual, to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank  
96 of associate professor by the college, a candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional  
97 development and teaching and *good* in the area of service. To be recommended for promotion to  
98 and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional  
99 development and teaching and *very good* in service.

## 100 101 **Assessment of Professional Development**

102 Assessment of professional development reflects the professional accomplishment and  
103 effectiveness of the candidate. Peer review is a vital component of professional development  
104 activities and can take the forms of referees, panels, committees, editorial board, or some such  
105 juried review process appropriate for the work, with the key element being an external review that  
106 provides an assessment of the professional value of the work. Professional accomplishment and  
107 effectiveness is demonstrated by, as appropriate to the specialty or area of the candidate, a  
108 combination of: publications in peer-reviewed media (including (alphabetically) books appropriate  
109 to the discipline and chapters in books, electronic formats, journals, and proceedings of national  
110 and international conferences and workshops); success in proposing funding or support from  
111 traditional (e.g., national agencies, foundations, state agencies, and internal award programs)  
112 and/or industry-related sources; peer recognition in the forms of invitations to present at  
113 conferences or workshops, elections to posts in professional organizations, or invitations or  
114 appointments to serve on committees or as session organizers or chairs; and professional activity  
115 in the form of contributions to professional meetings.

116  
117 The goal of the Department is for the faculty to be recognized within their respective  
118 specialties or areas as leaders who make significant contributions to the advancement of those  
119 specialties or areas. All faculty members are expected to submit proposals seeking extramural  
120 funding or support for their research activities, and reviews of these proposals provide an  
121 important indication of the value with which the activities are viewed by the sources of the  
122 funding or support. Success in professional development activities may be affected by many  
123 factors including the difficulty of the work, access to appropriate equipment or facilities or  
124 processes, and the number and backgrounds of students available to assist in the work. It is the  
125 responsibility of the candidate to assess the availability of appropriate equipment, facilities,  
126 processes, personnel, and space so that the plans for professional development activities are  
127 ambitious yet feasible.

128  
129 To be tenured and/or promoted, the candidate must achieve a rating of *excellent* in  
130 Professional Development, meaning they must have a nationally recognized research program.  
131 Evidence of such a program could be 1) publications<sup>1</sup> and funding<sup>2</sup>, or 2) exceptional publications

---

1 "Publications" indicates publications in peer-reviewed media, including (alphabetically) books appropriate to the discipline and chapters in books, electronic formats, journals, and proceedings of national and international conferences and workshops.

2 "Funding" indicates competitive peer reviewed funding or support from national agencies, foundations, industries,

132 and promising proposal reviews.

133

134 **Considerations on Evaluating Quality of Contributions to Professional Development:**

135 The candidate must submit evidence of professional development organized according to the  
136 categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.). Types of  
137 evidence of achievement in professional development include:

138

139 1. *Publications in peer-reviewed media:*

140 i. Papers: Significance and scope of results; prestige, stature, and scope of media; acceptance  
141 rate; quality and quantity of citations.

142 ii. Books appropriate to the discipline: Published reviews; citations; number of printings.

143 iii. Chapters in books: Published reviews of book in which chapter(s) appears.

144

145 2. *Funding/Support:* Degree of competition; scope of funding or support agency; appropriateness  
146 of funding or support agency to the candidate's research; scope of award; quality of proposal  
147 reviews.

148

149 3. *Invited Presentations:* Prestige of conference or workshop.

150 4. *Reviewing and refereeing:* Amount of reviewing and refereeing; prestige of media or  
151 organization for which work was done.

152

153 In judging the quality of a candidate's contributions to professional development, the DPTC  
154 and the Chair will be guided by the following:

155

156 **A. Publications.** Because explosive change is expected to continue to be the normal state in the  
157 discipline of computer science for years to come, the Department recognizes that the core  
158 indicator of scholarly attainment in computer science should be publication in competitive  
159 peer-reviewed, or juried, media (e.g., books, chapters in books, electronic journals, electronic  
160 postings, journals, proceedings, workshops – listed here in alphabetical order). The particular  
161 media and its physical characteristics are not issues. The competition for contributing to a  
162 particular instance of a media is important. The candidate should clearly indicate for each  
163 publication if it was juried and the degree of competition for a particular instance of a media  
164 that contains the publication. Evidence of competition would include the acceptance rate for  
165 the proceedings or electronic postings of a specific instance of a conference and an historical  
166 rate of acceptance by a journal or conference. The Department recognizes and will take into  
167 account that different media have different bases for judging competition and for reviewing  
168 and that each specialty or area has different expectations in regard to the appropriateness of  
169 specific publishing media.

170

171 **B. Citations.** The quality and appropriateness of a contribution of a candidate may be clarified by  
172 the use and recognition it receives from other researchers. For this purpose of clarification,  
173 citations to and reviews of the candidate's professional development publications will also be  
174 assessed, as available and as appropriate to the specialty or area.

175

---

state agencies, and internal programs.

176 **C. Productivity.** The Department recognizes and will take into account that each specialty or area  
177 has different expectations in regard to the numbers of publications and of funding or support  
178 efforts undertaken.  
179

180 **D. Co-authors.** The Department accepts and values multiple authorship in publications and grant  
181 funding efforts because specialties or areas in the discipline are becoming increasingly  
182 interdependent and collaboration can focus the talents of multiple experts to produce rapid  
183 advance of the discipline. The Department anticipates no particular research model will be  
184 used in publications and funding or support efforts of the faculty that would be expected to  
185 document the roles of the co-authors. So, while the Department recognizes that multiplicity of  
186 authorship occurs differently in different areas or specialties, candidates with co-authored  
187 works and funding or support efforts should clearly indicate their contribution to the works  
188 and efforts. The evaluation committee(s) will incorporate assessment of this contribution in its  
189 letter of recommendation. Overall, the evidence must indicate that the contributions in each  
190 specialty or area, which is exhibited in a candidate's contributions to professional  
191 development, form a coherent role for the candidate in that specialty or area in order to warrant  
192 promotion and/or tenure.  
193

194 **E. Funding / Support.** The Department recognizes that funding or support may be secured from  
195 a number of sources for a variety of needs in conjunction with a candidate's professional  
196 development activities that vary with the specialty or area. Traditional sources (e.g., national  
197 agencies, foundations, state agencies, and internal award programs) may be sought to support  
198 more traditional research needs (e.g., equipment, training graduate assistants, and release time  
199 for research). The Department recognizes the emerging need in the discipline to have access to  
200 state-of-the-art environments (e.g., complex mixed-hardware networks and industrial-strength  
201 software and hardware development processes) that are generally found in industries. Industry  
202 may also be an efficient source of support in regard to in-kind contributions and matches of  
203 equipment. In any case, the candidate should clearly indicate how the source at which each  
204 funding or support effort is directed fits needs of the candidate's research activities and  
205 describe the juried process that provides the external assessment of the professional value of  
206 the work proposed for funding or support. In the case of industry funding or support, which  
207 typically involves contractual arrangements, the candidate should also indicate the competition  
208 for acquiring the funding or support, which would include the acceptance rate of responses to  
209 RFPs, levels of funding or support obtained by competing proposals, and/or the track record of  
210 proposals accepted by the source at which the funding or support effort is directed. Overall,  
211 the candidate's funding or support efforts should evidence relationships with publications, past  
212 and/or planned. A funding or support effort that evidences professional development that is  
213 not related to the majority of the past work of the candidate will be regarded as a "seed" or  
214 startup effort, which should not be confused, however, with funding or support that allows a  
215 candidate to extend, generalize, synthesize, or modernize past work of the candidate.  
216

217

## 218 **Assessment of Teaching**

219 Assessment of teaching reflects accomplishment, performance, and effectiveness in teaching-  
220 related activities. As stated in the College Manual, "The candidate should include the teaching

221 portfolios he/she has compiled for the last four years at Georgia State (include summers, if  
222 applicable), as required in the college’s Teaching Assessment Policy...”

223  
224 To be tenured and/or promoted, the candidate must achieve a rating of *excellent* in Teaching,  
225 implying that the candidate is an innovative, inspirational, and creative teacher. The candidate  
226 must satisfy five of the eight criteria listed below, including (a), (b), and (c) to achieve a rating of  
227 excellent.

228

229 **Considerations on Evaluating Quality of Contributions to Teaching:**

230

231 The candidate must submit evidence of effective teaching organized according to the  
232 categories of teaching listed in the College Manual (section V.F.). Types of evidence of effective  
233 teaching include:

234

235 (a) Quality of courses developed; quality of modifications to existing courses.

236

237 (b) Quality of accomplishments of students supervised; level of students; amount of supervision.

238

239 (c) Quality of student evaluations.

240

241 (d) Significance and scope of student accomplishments such as the quality of student publications,  
242 and the stature and scope of journals or conferences in which the student publications  
243 appeared.

244

245 (e) Degree and novelty of innovations used in instructing current courses.

246

247 (f) Significance and scope of teaching-related publication results; peer-review, stature and scope  
248 of the journal or conference; acceptance rate. Significance of textbook, including adoption and  
249 stature of publisher.

250

251 (g) Significance and scope of organization issuing teaching award.

252 (f) Instructional grants, including both competitive peer-reviewed awards as well as state and  
253 internal awards;

254 (h) Significance of student placement and performance in industry, academia, and  
255 licensure/certification examinations, internships, etc.

256

257 **Assessment of Service**

258 Evaluation in the area of Service reflects contributions and effectiveness as demonstrated by  
259 departmental, College, and University service, by service to professional organizations, and by  
260 profession-related service to the community. The College Manual clarifies that “Contributions to  
261 professional associations of an administrative nature shall be counted in the category of service

262 rather than professional development. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations  
263 count in the professional development category.” Service is a critical ingredient to the successful  
264 functioning of the Department. Candidates are expected to perform service requests competently  
265 and in a timely fashion. However, only minimal service to the Department and College is  
266 expected of junior faculty during the first three years, and an average amount of service to the  
267 Department in the fourth and fifth years.

268 To be promoted to and/or tenured at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must achieve a  
269 rating of *good*, meaning they must have played an effective role for service on departmental  
270 committees.

271 To be promoted to and/or tenured at the rank of Professor, the candidate must achieve a rating of  
272 *very good*. This means they have played (1) an active role for service on College, Senate, or other  
273 University or System committees and (2) an effective role for service on departmental committees.

274  
275 **Considerations on Evaluating Quality of the Candidate’s Contributions to Service:**  
276

277 The candidate must submit evidence of effective service organized according to the categories  
278 of service listed in the college manual (section V.G.). Types of evidence of effective service:

- 279  
280 (a) Quality of contribution to departmental committee; scope and responsibilities of committee.  
281 (b) Quality of contribution to College, Senate, or other University or System committee; scope and  
282 responsibilities of committee.  
283 (c) Reputation and scope of professional organization, conference, or publication; responsibilities  
284 of position held.

285  
286  
287 **CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO RANK**  
288

289 **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

290 In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a  
291 candidate must be evaluated as at least *excellent* in professional development and teaching. The  
292 candidate must also be rated as at least *good* in service.  
293

294 The DPTC of the Whole (i.e., the professors and the associate professors who are the members  
295 of the DPTC) and the Chair of the Department independently will evaluate the credentials of all  
296 candidates with all deliberations to be completed according to the College calendar.  
297

298 For the candidate to be judged *excellent* in professional development (a nationally recognized  
299 program), there should be evidence of publications and of funding or support efforts as follows.  
300 The mix of publications must include publications in peer-reviewed media suitable for the areas or  
301 specialties to which the publications belong. Publications in this mix may involve electronic and



302 print formats but competitive peer-reviewed media is the core indicator of scholarship. At a  
303 minimum, the successful candidate is expected to have published some publications, as  
304 appropriate to the specialty or area of the candidate, while at Georgia State University. The mix of  
305 funding or support efforts must include one of the following: efforts that resulted in acquisition of  
306 extramural funding or support from foundations, industries, national agencies, or state agencies; or  
307 vigorous and consistent efforts to acquire extramural funding or support from foundations,  
308 industries, national agencies, or state agencies plus the acquisition of funding from internal award  
309 programs that is “seed” or startup funding. Indication of effort to secure funding or support may  
310 include reviewers' comments on proposals. If a candidate elects to submit these, the full set of  
311 comments and scores from the funding or support source must be made available to the  
312 committee.

313  
314 For a rating of *excellent* in teaching, a candidate must exhibit teaching competence, teaching  
315 effectiveness, the facility to engage students in constructive exchanges, imparting new insights  
316 into the material, and sound standards in both undergraduate and graduate teaching. To  
317 demonstrate excellence in teaching, the department recommends involvement in both  
318 undergraduate and graduate teaching. Data to be reviewed by the DPTC include syllabi,  
319 examinations, problem sets (including programming assignments, as appropriate), and student  
320 evaluations, as well as numbers of students directed in independent work, such as independent  
321 studies and theses directions. Information about graduate students who have successfully  
322 completed their degrees, as well as those who show progress toward a degree, by accumulating  
323 met requirements for the degree, will also be reviewed. The quality of students and publications by  
324 and/or with students will be weighed more than the number of students. Co-authorship is a clear  
325 indication of a significant contribution by the candidate to a student publication. Otherwise, the  
326 extent of the contribution to each student publication by the candidate should be supported by  
327 documentation. Evidence for an evaluation of *excellent* in teaching may be on the basis of  
328 recognition of teaching-relevant publications. The Department will permit the candidate to  
329 develop evidence from course materials and student evaluations as indicated above to support an  
330 evaluation of *excellent*.

331  
332 The Department expects all its faculty members to contribute to self-governance of the  
333 Department, College, and University, commensurate with rank and experience, and to nurture the  
334 professional reputation of the Department in the computer science community. For promotion to  
335 and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, membership on Departmental committees,  
336 membership on committees of professional organizations and of conferences, and other  
337 administrative services in professional organizations are among activities reviewed in promotion  
338 and/or tenure considerations by the Department. (Depending upon the committee and meeting,  
339 membership and meeting activities may also indicate professional recognition that should also be  
340 submitted as contributions to professional development.)

341  
342 If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of her/his  
343 appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary  
344 credit for tenure is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and/or tenure at  
345 Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not  
346 be considered for promotion and/or tenure of that candidate at Georgia State University. Assistant  
347 Professors may be judged to have performed service suitable for tenure and promotion to the

348 Associate Professor rank by a rating of *good*.

349

350 **Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

351 The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of  
352 Associate Professor.

353

354

355 **Promotion to Professor**

356 Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have  
357 distinguished records of achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia State  
358 University. External reviewers will be asked to provide letters before the departmental review  
359 process. Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank  
360 of Professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. The  
361 same evaluative terms established for promotion to Associate Professor apply to promotion to  
362 Professor but the magnitude and history of accomplishments must be substantially greater. A  
363 candidate for promotion to Professor must present at a minimum clear evidence of *excellence* in  
364 both professional development and teaching that significantly surpasses the requirements for rank  
365 of Associate Professor and must present a *very good* record in service in the Department, College,  
366 and/or University.

367

368 Such accomplishments include the establishment and maintenance at Georgia State University  
369 of an independent research program and the procurement of competitive extramural funding or  
370 support from foundations, industries, and/or national or state agencies. The recognition of the  
371 candidate's expertise as evidenced by a history of publication in high-quality media, appropriate to  
372 the specialty or area, should exceed that required for a recommendation to the rank of Associate  
373 Professor. Other evidence of achievement could further include membership on editorial boards  
374 of significant computer science publication media or on program committees of significant  
375 conferences, as well as serving as a referee for those publication media or conferences, a member  
376 of review boards for funding organizations, a reviewer for promotion and tenure at other  
377 universities, or a member of an accreditation board. Accomplishments in professional  
378 development or teaching may be given special consideration. Accomplishments in professional  
379 development as documented by national recognition, coupled with *excellent* achievements in  
380 teaching and a major service role may warrant promotion to Professor. *Excellent* accomplishments  
381 in professional development include a history of significant extramural support for the research  
382 program coupled with high productivity evidenced by peer-reviewed, or juried, publications in  
383 media that are appropriate to the specialties and areas of the publications of the candidate.  
384 Similarly, accomplishments in teaching, as documented by national recognition, coupled with  
385 *excellent* professional development and at least a *very good* record in service may warrant  
386 promotion to Professor.

387

388 If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of her/his  
389 appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary  
390 credit for tenure is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and/or tenure at  
391 Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not  
392 be considered for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate at Georgia State University.

393

394 A candidate for promotion to Professor must submit his/her credentials to the DPTC in  
395 basically the same format in which these credentials are submitted to the CAACPT (according to  
396 the categories of professional development, teaching and service in the college manual, sections  
397 V.E. through V.G.). The Department may recommend specialized guidelines and a modified  
398 format for the documents to facilitate evaluation of the candidate's professional credentials. For  
399 instance, a facilitating format may be warranted if the candidate's publications are in  
400 nontraditional media.

401

#### 402 **Tenure at the Rank of Professor**

403 The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of  
404 Professor.

405

### 406 **DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS**

407

408 The promotion and tenure review process in the Department begins during the academic year  
409 prior to the submission of materials and evaluation at the College level and beyond. The  
410 departmental review involves both the Chair of the Department and the Departmental Promotion  
411 and Tenure Committee (DPTC). The DPTC is a standing committee of the Department consisting  
412 of all tenured associate professors and professors. No candidate for promotion or tenure may serve  
413 on the DPTC during the period of her/his own consideration for promotion and/or tenure. After  
414 the departmental process, recommendations are forwarded to the College Area Advisory  
415 Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CAACPT) according to the following sequence of events.

416

417 A. The Chair of the Department shall ask all faculty members who are eligible for  
418 consideration for promotion and/or tenure in writing if they wish to be reviewed by the  
419 DPTC. (Refer to the College calendar for the deadline by which this must be done.)  
420 Eligibility is set forth by rules of the University and the College in which either time in  
421 rank or in untenured status is the major criterion. All interested candidates will be  
422 provided with copies of the current version of the departmental guidelines and of the  
423 College and University manuals.

424

425 B. Candidates desiring to be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure must respond to the Chair  
426 with a list of eight possible external reviewers. (Refer to the College calendar for the  
427 deadline by which this must be done.) Although faculty members are normally considered  
428 for both promotion and tenure during the same review process, candidates may request  
429 consideration for only promotion or tenure.

430

431 C. The Chair, together with the DPTC, will submit a list of an additional eight possible  
432 external reviewers to the Office of the Dean. (Refer to the College calendar for the deadline  
433 by which this must be done.) There should be no duplication in the names of the proposed  
434 reviewers of the previous list. Also provided to the Dean's Office will be brief profiles on  
435 the reviewers and the professional development materials to be transmitted to the reviewers  
436 for each candidate.

437

438 D. The Dean's Office provides the Chair and the DPTC with copies of the letters of  
439 assessment that have been received from the external reviewers. (Refer to the College

- 440 calendar for the deadline by which this must be done.)  
441
- 442 E. Candidates must submit complete dossiers of supporting materials to the Chair in the  
443 required format. Prior to submission of his/her dossier, a candidate should consult with the  
444 Chair or members of the DPTC for advice concerning format, procedure, and style. No  
445 materials can be added to the dossiers after the date specified in the College calendar.  
446
- 447 F. After receiving the materials from the Chair, the DPTC will review the dossiers to  
448 determine the committee recommendation. Only the professors on the DPTC are eligible  
449 to vote on candidates at the rank of professor or associate professor. The professors and  
450 associate professors on the DPTC (that is, the DPTC Committee as a Whole) are eligible to  
451 vote on candidates at the rank of assistant professor or instructor. The DPTC will forward  
452 to the Chair all materials required for departmental review, the candidate's statement of  
453 interests and goals, the curriculum vita included in the dossier, and the letter of assessment  
454 and its letter of assessment and recommendation for each candidate (refer to the College  
455 calendar for the deadline by which this must be done).  
456
- 457 G. The Chair separately evaluates each candidate. After this evaluation, the Chair will  
458 forward to the CAACPT all materials required for departmental review, the candidate's  
459 statement of interests and goals, the curriculum vita included in the dossier, the  
460 recommendation letter of the department committee, and the Chair's letter of assessment  
461 and recommendation (refer to the College calendar for the deadline by which this must be  
462 done). At this time, copies of the reports by the Chair and the DPTC will be made  
463 available to the candidate.  
464

## 465 **REVISIONS OF THE GUIDELINES**

466 Any approved version of this set of guidelines may be revised at a called departmental faculty  
467 meeting by a majority of the full-time faculty members of the Department of Computer Science.  
468  
469

470 **APPENDIX I:**  
471 **Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

472  
473 **A. Professional Development**

474  
475 **Poor:** The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.  
476

477 **Fair:** The faculty member maintains a limited program in professional development with  
478 occasional publications or paper presentations.  
479

480 **Good:** The faculty member maintains an active program in professional development with some  
481 publications or funding. The scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development  
482 contributions are limited.  
483

484 **Very Good:** The faculty member maintains an emerging nationally competitive research program  
485 in professional development with publications and startup funding. While maintaining an active  
486 program of professional development, the faculty member has yet to establish a national reputation  
487 as a leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are  
488 likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.  
489

490 **Excellent:** The faculty member has established a nationally recognized research program in  
491 professional development, or there are clear indications that the faculty member is well on the way  
492 to establishing a nationally recognized research program, with evidence of publications and  
493 funding or exceptional publications and promising proposal reviews. The mix of publications must  
494 include publications in peer-reviewed media suitable for the areas or specialties to which the  
495 publications belong. Publications in this mix may involve electronic and print formats but  
496 competitive peer-reviewed media is the core indicator of scholarship. At a minimum, the  
497 successful candidate is expected to have published some publications, as appropriate to the  
498 specialty or area of the candidate, while at Georgia State University. The mix of funding or  
499 support efforts must include one of the following: efforts that resulted in acquisition of extramural  
500 funding or support from foundations, industries, national agencies, or state agencies; or vigorous  
501 and consistent efforts to acquire extramural funding or support from foundations, industries,  
502 national agencies, or state agencies plus the acquisition of funding from internal award programs  
503 that is "seed" or startup funding.  
504

505 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field by establishing an  
506 internationally recognized research program in professional development, as evidenced by  
507 substantial grant activity, publications in highly ranked journals and conference proceedings,  
508 national or international awards, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

509 **B. Teaching**

510

511 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching and needs significant  
512 improvement in all areas.

513

514 **Fair:** The faculty member's instructional performance is sub-standard and has limited positive  
515 effect on students.

516

517 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive.  
518 S/He demonstrates limited accomplishments in (a) the supervision of students, and (b) student  
519 evaluations.

520

521 **Very Good:** The faculty member's record demonstrates effectiveness in the classroom and in  
522 mentoring students, with involvement in instructional development. S/He has accomplishments in  
523 (a) the development of new course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of  
524 students, and (c) student evaluations.

525

526 **Excellent:** The faculty member's record demonstrates evidence of a highly effective, innovative,  
527 and engaged teacher. S/He has significant accomplishments in (a) the development of new  
528 course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of students, (c) student  
529 publications, and (d) student evaluations.

530

531 **Outstanding:** In addition to the criteria stated above for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member  
532 must have significant achievements in (a) Innovative pedagogy in instruction, (b) Teaching related  
533 publications including textbooks, (c) Teaching awards, (d) Instructional grants, or (e) Student  
534 placement in industry/academia.

535 **C. Service**

536

537 **Poor:** The faculty member needs major improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty  
538 member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service  
539 accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a  
540 documentable, significant impact.

541

542 **Fair:** The faculty member needs improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty member  
543 may serve on departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of  
544 those committees.

545

546 **Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly and  
547 thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

548

549 **Very Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by  
550 responsibly and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities  
551 and plays an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees or in  
552 service to the professional community.

553

554 **Excellent:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly  
555 and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and plays  
556 an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees and plays an  
557 active role in service to the professional community.

558

559 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member  
560 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments indicating a major  
561 effective role in service in at least one area.

562

**APPENDIX II:  
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

563

564

565 **A. Professional Development**

566

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

568

569 **Fair:** The faculty member maintains a limited program in professional development with  
570 occasional publications or paper presentations.

571

572 **Good:** The faculty member maintains an active program in professional development with some  
573 publications or funding. The scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development  
574 contributions are limited.

575

576 **Very Good:** The faculty member's professional development profile may indicate steady  
577 development that falls short of achievement or maintenance of a nationally recognized research  
578 program. The faculty member may have high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals,  
579 small external grants, and significant professional service.

580

581 **Excellent:** The faculty member continues to maintain and advance a nationally recognized  
582 research program in professional development with strong evidence of publications and sustained  
583 competitive extramural funding and/or support from foundations, industries, and/or national or  
584 state agencies. The recognition of the faculty member's expertise as evidenced by a history of  
585 publication in high-quality media, appropriate to the specialty or area, should exceed that required  
586 for a recommendation to the rank of Associate Professor. Other evidence of achievement could  
587 include membership on editorial boards of significant computer science publication media or on  
588 program committees of significant conferences, as well as serving as a referee for those  
589 publication media or conferences, a member of review boards for funding organizations, a  
590 reviewer for promotion and tenure at other universities, or a member of an accreditation board.

591

592 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field by establishing an  
593 internationally recognized research program in professional development, as evidenced by a  
594 sustained level of substantial grant support, publications in highly ranked journals and conference  
595 proceedings, national or international awards, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

596 **B. Teaching**

597



598 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching and needs significant  
599 improvement in all areas.

600  
601 **Fair:** The faculty member's instructional performance is sub-standard and has limited positive  
602 effect on students.

603  
604 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive.  
605 S/He demonstrates limited accomplishments in (a) the supervision of students, and (b) student  
606 evaluations.

607  
608 **Very Good:** The faculty member's record demonstrates effectiveness in the classroom and in  
609 mentoring students, with involvement in instructional development. S/He has accomplishments in  
610 (a) the development of new course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of  
611 students, and (c) student evaluations.

612  
613 **Excellent:** The faculty member's record demonstrates evidence of a highly effective, innovative,  
614 and engaged teacher, providing major leadership in the development of instruction in the  
615 department and/or in the larger university community. S/He has significant accomplishments in (a)  
616 the development of new course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of  
617 students, (c) student publications, and (d) student evaluations

618  
619 **Outstanding:** In addition to the criteria stated above for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member  
620 must have significant achievements in at least three of the following areas: (a) Innovative  
621 pedagogy in instruction, (b) Teaching related publications including textbooks, (c) Teaching  
622 awards, (d) Instructional grants, or (e) Student placement in industry/academia.

623 **C. Service**

624

625 **Poor:** The faculty member needs major improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty  
626 member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service  
627 accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a  
628 documentable, significant impact.

629  
630 **Fair:** The faculty member needs improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty member  
631 may serve on departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of  
632 those committees.

633  
634 **Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly and  
635 thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

636  
637 **Very Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by  
638 responsibly and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities  
639 and plays an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees or in  
640 service to the professional community.

641  
642 **Excellent:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly  
643 and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and plays  
644 an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees and plays an  
645 active role in service to the professional community.

646  
647 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member  
648 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments indicating a major  
649 effective role in service in at least one area.