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.
INTRODUCTION

The Neuroscience Institute has formulated these promotion and tenure guidelines 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 Neuroscience Institute can be nominated by the appropriate Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure and the Neuroscience Institute director for consideration by the college area promotion and tenure committee, he/she 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 that are outlined in both documents.

The goal of this document is to describe the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State University. To that end, this document is intended 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. Candidates are directed to both the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion, and for details on the university and college expectations. The candidate is responsible for providing necessary evidence and justification that their record of accomplishment meets the criteria set forth in this document.

OVERVIEW

The Neuroscience Institute is a complex and multifaceted organization with a wide variety of responsibilities in research, teaching and service. To meet these responsibilities requires the collegial and conscientious participation of all faculty members in many ways. This document outlines the important aspects of collegial participation in the field of Neuroscience and in the Neuroscience Institute, with specific emphasis on how participation is recognized in promotion and tenure.

As described in the University Policy on Promotion and Tenure, all candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in three areas: Professional Development, Teaching, and Service. Professional Development includes academic achievement in research, other forms of scholarship, creative activity, and some types of professional service. Teaching includes classroom teaching, mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, and when appropriate, professional practice. Service includes departmental, college, university, some types of professional service, and some types of public service that involve professional expertise. As described later in this document, the Institute values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its members in each one. At the time of promotion and/or tenure, candidates will be evaluated as to whether or not they have met the expectations for promotion or tenure. In accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, in order to meet the expectations for promotion, the candidate must exhibit excellence in Professional Development and Teaching appropriate for his/her rank. She/he is also expected to perform Service appropriate to rank.

For science education faculty, specific criteria apply such that Professional Development may include laboratory research and/or science education research, but Teaching and Service categories may not include activities also listed under Professional Development.
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT RANK

Associate Professor

The Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure and the Director of the Institute will independently evaluate the credentials of all candidates in the Fall Semester with all deliberations to be completed according to the College calendar.

Professional Development: To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a successful candidate must be deemed excellent in professional development and thus will have developed a substantial body of work that has contributed to the advancement of their discipline within the broad field of neuroscience as determined by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the outside reviewers. In particular, the candidate is expected to have:

1. 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 in press) several publications based on research conducted while at Georgia State University or during time at another institution for which the candidate has received probationary credit.

2. Established a record as a Principal Investigator (PI) on a major extramural grant. While viewed favorably, seed grants are generally not sufficient to earn promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In the case where there is a clear upward trajectory and a judgment that a candidate’s research program is highly competitive, however, such smaller extramural grants and/or indication of efforts to secure funding may be considered. The candidate may include scores or reviewers' comments on submitted, unfunded proposals as part of the tenure dossier. 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.

Candidates with a primary contract (or mission) in the area of science education must present evidence of scholarly achievement in science education or laboratory/field research or both. Evidence of the development of successful liaison programs with other Departments, Colleges, and sectors of the K-12 education 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.

Teaching: To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a successful candidate must be rated as excellent in the category of teaching and should therefore exhibit evidence of:

1. Teaching competence, effectiveness, and sound standards.
2. Involvement in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level.
3. Effective mentorship of student research and independent study projects.
4. Effective non-course related training or mentorship.

Data to be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee include the following: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations. Selected classroom materials may be included as evidence of creativity or effectiveness in the classroom. Numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications, meeting presentations) of students directed in independent studies should be provided. Formal course numbers should be given for students registered in independent studies. 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 their accomplishments under the
candidate’s mentorship will be given more weight than the number of students.

**Service:** To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a successful candidate must have demonstrated effective service to the Neuroscience Institute and thus rated as good in this category. Types of service include oversight or training of institute staff or oversight of institute facilities and equipment.

**Professor**

Promotion to the rank of professor is a recognition awarded to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing in both their professions and at Georgia State University.

**Professional Development:** For the candidate to be judged as excellent in professional development, thereby meeting the criteria for promotion to the rank of professor, there should be:

1. Evidence of international recognition of his/her research program. Expected accomplishments must include the establishment and maintenance at Georgia State University of an independent research program that has consistently received extramural funds from state, national or international agencies, industries, or foundations.
2. Significant recognition of the research program as evidenced by a history of publication in high quality, peer-reviewed international and national journals that are targeted for a more general scientific audience than the candidate’s specialty. Other evidence of achievement could include membership on editorial boards of significant international/national scientific journals, service as a referee for those journals, service on review boards for funding agencies, and invited presentations at national and international scientific meetings.

**Teaching:** To be recommended for promotion to the rank of professor, a successful candidate must be evaluated as excellent in the category of teaching and therefore should:

1. Provide evidence indicating that his/her performance in teaching is highly effective. Student perceptions, grade distributions and learning outcomes will be used to assess teaching effectiveness. Course materials must show impressive preparation and the successful candidate must demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.
2. Show excellence in mentoring student research projects. It is expected that the candidate will have mentored both undergraduate and graduate students. Effectiveness can be indicated by student accomplishments. Post-doctoral mentorship will also be considered.
3. Be effective in non-course related training/mentorship such as Chairmanship or membership on student exams, thesis and/or dissertation committees. This can include students at other institutions.
4. Show additional evidence for teaching recognition, which could include publishing textbooks or other teaching materials such as papers on teaching or pedagogy in peer-reviewed education journals, receipt of teaching awards, or receipt of extramural funding of educational projects. Teaching creativity, including the development of new undergraduate or graduate courses, is also viewed favorably.

**Service:** To be recommended for promotion to the rank of professor, a successful candidate must be evaluated as very good in the category of service, having demonstrated:

1. Effective service for the Institute and College level as well as for fields related to neuroscience. Service to the University is expected although not required. Types of service that could be included are: oversight or training of staff at the institute, college, or university; oversight of institute, college, or university facilities and equipment; and
substantial participation and planning of institute, college, or university events.

2. A history of professional service that supports local, state, national or international professional organizations. Organization of scientific programs at conferences, membership on committees of professional organizations, and offices held in professional organizations are all considered examples of effective service to the field. Scholarly activities that result in research findings and/or teaching publications may count in Professional Development or Teaching but will normally not count as Service.

REVIEW FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The timing of the review for tenure and promotion, as well as the details of the documentation, will follow those outlined in the University and the College of Arts and Sciences policies. The review will assess the candidate's Professional Development, Teaching, and Service as defined above.

Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure

The Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall be composed of all tenured faculty who have primary appointments (i.e., are “core” members) in the Institute. The Committee shall nominate to the Director of the Institute one of the Committee members (a full professor) to serve as Chairman of the Committee for a two-year period. Full-time tenured Associate Professors and Professors in the Neuroscience Institute who are familiar with the candidate’s area of neuroscience will constitute an Area Committee that will serve as a subcommittee for primary review of each candidate for promotion to Associate Professor.

The Neuroscience Institute Area Committee shall discuss and evaluate the record of each candidate using criteria for promotion and tenure adopted by the Neuroscience Institute and the College of Arts and Sciences. Robert’s Rules of Order (Revised) shall be followed throughout the deliberations, except that all such deliberations are considered to be in executive session and are to remain confidential within the Area Committee. The Area Committee shall submit a written report summarizing its findings to the Chair of the Institute Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure. The chair will distribute this report to the members of that committee, who will review and evaluate the record of the candidate and submit a written report to the Director of the Neuroscience Institute and to other appropriate committees (e.g., College P&T Committee) as coordinated by the Director. The Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee shall review all candidates for promotion to Assistant Professor or Associate Professor. Members of the overall Neuroscience Institute Advisory Committee who are Professors shall review all candidates for promotion to Professor.

Faculty may not participate in appointment, mentoring, or promotion/tenure recommendations if a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest exists. Conflicts of interest include personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude objective and unbiased assessment of a candidate's efforts.
APPENDIX I. RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR PRE-TENURE REVIEW

A. Professional Development

**Poor:** The faculty member has no significant research program, with no publications\(^1\) or presentations.

**Fair:** The faculty member has a limited research program with only occasional publications or meeting presentations.

**Good:** The faculty member has a moderate research program with a few publications, meeting presentations, and one or more internal grants.

**Very Good:** The faculty member has a well-established research program with high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals, small external grants or evidence for submission of major grant proposals, and at least some professional service.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has an emerging nationally recognized research program with several high quality refereed publications, significant external funding, and significant professional service. Impact factor and acceptance rates (indicative of journal quality) and citation rates or other factors supplied by the candidate will be used to determine if a publication is considered ‘high quality’. Grants from external sources should be comparable to those of other junior faculty members at peer institutions. Professional service considered under the Professional Development category includes peer review for scholarly journals, grant review for granting agencies, membership on evaluation panels, or service as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations.

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has an emerging internationally recognized research program with highly significant publications and funding, prestigious national or international invitations, and significant professional service. Prestigious invitations include those for invited speaker at major national or international conferences or important national or international professional workshops, or invited seminar speaker at other universities.

---

\(^1\) Publications are defined throughout as high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals, invited chapters, and/or books appropriate to the field of neuroscience.
B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced by low student evaluations and limited or ineffective individual teaching or mentoring. A pattern of complaints or evidence of unprofessional activity may also be considered.

Fair: The faculty member displays an ineffective record of teaching as evidenced by student evaluations that are well below average and/or ineffective teaching or mentoring of individual students.

Good: The faculty member’s record shows evidence for adequate teaching in the classroom and mentorship of individual students based on the criteria listed for excellent.

Very Good: The faculty member’s record shows evidence for effective teaching in the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship based on the criteria listed for excellent.

Excellent: The faculty member’s record shows evidence for highly effective teaching in the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship, which includes: (a) strong, positive student perceptions and evidence of teaching effectiveness from student evaluations, grade distributions, course materials, and/or learning outcome assessments, (b) highly effective mentoring of students’ research and independent study projects at the graduate and/or undergraduate level as evidenced by student accomplishments, and (c) effective non-course related training/mentoring including serving on and/or chairing exam, thesis, or dissertation committees.

Outstanding: In addition to the criteria for excellent, the record shows additional evidence for exceptional teaching performance such as (a) development of new courses or educational programs, (b) teaching grants, (c) publications in teaching journals, (d) strong evidence of teaching creativity supported by material in the teaching portfolio, or (e) honors or special recognitions for teaching.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member does not meet Neuroscience Institute obligations.

Fair: The faculty member meets Neuroscience Institute obligations and requests, but not in a timely manner.

Good: The faculty member meets Neuroscience Institute obligations and requests effectively. Types of service that qualify include participation in departmental committees and assistance with other departmental activities or functions.

Very Good: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in the Institute, or in a professional organization. The former includes taking a major role in department committees, oversight or training of staff, oversight of department facilities or equipment, substantial participation and planning of department events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. The latter includes memberships on advisory boards or service as a consultant, organization of scientific programs at conferences, membership on committees of professional organizations, convening symposia/workshops, or public outreach.

Excellent: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in the Institute, and in the College or University or in a professional organization. The former includes membership in college or university committees, oversight or training of department, college, or university staff, oversight of department, college, or university facilities and equipment, substantial participation and planning of department, college, or university events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. The latter includes memberships on advisory boards or service as a consultant, organization of scientific programs at conferences, membership on committees of professional organizations, convening symposia/workshops, and public outreach.

Outstanding: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in the Institute, and in the College or University or in a professional organization. In addition, the faculty member has a leading effective role in one of the above as evidenced, for example, by exceptional service as a graduate or undergraduate director, or as a scientific editor for a major peer-reviewed journal.
APPENDIX II. RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member has no significant research program, with no publications¹ or presentations.

Fair: The faculty member has a limited research program with only occasional publications or meeting presentations.

Good: The faculty member has a moderate research program with a few publications, meeting presentations, and one or more internal grants.

Very Good: The faculty member may have high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals, small external grants, and significant professional service, but lacks significant external funding.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a nationally recognized research program with several high quality refereed publications, a sustained level of significant external funding, and significant professional service. Impact factor and acceptance rates (indicative of journal quality) and citation rates or other factors supplied by the candidate will be used to determine if a publication is considered ‘high quality’. Expected accomplishments include the establishment and maintenance of an independent research program that has consistently received external funds from state, national and/or international agencies, industries, or foundations. Professional service considered under the Professional Development category includes peer review for scholarly journals, grant review for granting agencies, membership on evaluation panels, or service as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved an internationally recognized research program with highly significant publications and funding, prestigious national or international invitations, and very significant professional service. Prestigious invitations include those for invited speaker at major national or international conferences or important national or international professional workshops, or invited seminar speaker at other universities.

¹ Publications are defined throughout as high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals, invited chapters, and/or books appropriate to the field of neuroscience.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced by low student evaluations and limited or ineffective individual teaching or mentoring. A pattern of complaints or evidence of unprofessional activity may also be considered.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays an ineffective record of teaching as evidenced by student evaluations that are well below average and/or ineffective teaching or mentoring of individual students.

**Good:** The faculty member’s record shows evidence for adequate teaching in the classroom and mentorship of individual students based on the criteria listed for excellent.

**Very Good:** The faculty member’s record shows evidence for effective teaching in the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship based on the criteria listed for excellent.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s record shows evidence for highly effective teaching in the classroom and in individual teaching and mentorship, which includes: (a) strong, positive student perceptions and evidence of teaching effectiveness from student evaluations, grade distributions, course materials, and/or learning outcome assessments, (b) highly effective mentoring of students’ research and independent study projects at the graduate and/or undergraduate level as evidenced by student accomplishments, and (c) highly effective non-course related training/mentoring including serving on and/or chairing exam, thesis, or dissertation committees.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the criteria for excellent, the record shows additional evidence for exceptional teaching performance such as (a) development of new courses or educational programs, (b) teaching grants, (c) publications in teaching journals, (d) strong evidence of teaching creativity supported by material in the teaching portfolio, or (e) honors or special recognitions for teaching.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member does not meet Neuroscience Institute obligations.

Fair: The faculty member meets Neuroscience Institute obligations and requests, but not in a timely manner.

Good: The faculty member meets Neuroscience Institute obligations and requests effectively. Types of service that qualify include participation in departmental committees and assistance with other departmental activities or functions.

Very Good: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in the Neuroscience Institute and in a professional organization. The former includes taking a major role in department committees, oversight or training of staff, oversight of department facilities or equipment, substantial participation and planning of department events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. The latter includes memberships on advisory boards or service as a consultant, organization of scientific programs at conferences, membership on committees of professional organizations, convening symposia/workshops, or public outreach. In addition, the faculty member normally has served effectively on college- and/or university-level committees.

Excellent: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in the Neuroscience Institute, and in the College or University or in a professional organization. The former includes membership in college or university committees, oversight or training of department, college, or university staff, oversight of department, college, or university facilities and equipment, substantial participation and planning of department, college, or university events, or heavy involvement in student recruitment efforts. The latter includes memberships on advisory boards or service as a consultant, organization of scientific programs at conferences, membership on committees of professional organizations, convening symposia/workshops; and public outreach.

Outstanding: In addition to meeting Institute obligations and requests effectively, the faculty member has a major effective role in the Neuroscience Institute, and in the College or University and/or in a professional organization. In addition, the faculty member has a leading effective role in one of the above as evidenced, for example, by exceptional service as a graduate or undergraduate director, or as a scientific editor for a major peer-reviewed journal.