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I. INTRODUCTION

The College of Law’s ability to achieve its educational, academic and professional missions requires a committed faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, research and service. The College regularly assesses faculty achievement in these areas through reappointment and promotion reviews. This document sets forth the criteria, standards and procedures for conducting such reviews of College of Law faculty who are non-tenure track faculty (“NTT”). The policies and procedures contained in this document must be read in conjunction with the Georgia State University Promotion and Reappointment Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, as approved on March 24, 2022, and the bylaws and policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

As aptly noted in the University’s Promotion Manual, “[p]romotion decisions for NTT faculty are extremely important to the professional life of the faculty member and the institution.” This document is meant to safeguard these interests and afford NTT faculty members notice, fairness, and the opportunity and resources needed for successful promotion and ongoing professional development.

II. CATEGORIES OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The following NTT Faculty categories are eligible for promotion within the College of Law:

1. Clinical Faculty (Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor)
2. Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer)
3. Academic Professional (Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional)
4. College of Law Library (Law Librarian Instructor, Law Librarian Assistant Professor, Law Librarian Associate Professor, and Law Librarian Professor)

The following NTT Faculty position is available within the College of Law but is not eligible for promotion:

Professor of Practice.

III. SUPPORT OF NTT FACULTY
The College of Law Non-Tenure Review Manual will be presented to each new NTT faculty member soon after employment begins.

Upon the arrival of each newly hired NTT faculty member, the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development will designate a member of the faculty to serve as a mentor for the new faculty member. In addition, the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development will be responsible for reviewing the promotion process with the NTT faculty member and discussing opportunities and means to progress toward fulfilling the requirements.

Faculty mentors will provide support and guidance that will aid the new colleague in the development of his or her teaching, research and service, as appropriate. At the same time, faculty mentors are not meant to be the only source of communication, but to facilitate the faculty’s commitment to providing regular, constructive and candid advice.

Another source of support is provided by the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development. This office oversees a series of programs designed for junior faculty development and enrichment. NTT faculty members are encouraged to participate in these programs.

IV. ANNUAL REVIEW FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

All GSU faculty members with appointments in the College of Law are subject to annual review by the dean under criteria provided by Board of Regents Policy 8.3.5.1 and Board of Regents Policy 8.3.7.3. The annual review shall be based on specific metrics organized into three categories:

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision
2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities
3. Service/Administration/Management

Each of these categories includes metrics for student success activities. Examples of student success activities include individualized academic advisement, guidance of student research, supervision of student organizations, career counseling and support, writing letters of recommendation, oversight of certificate programs, regular office hours, classroom discussion, supervised in-class exercises, routine feedback on class assignments, and detailed feedback on final exams.

A. Documentation for Annual Review

1. Each faculty member will annually submit to the Dean the following documentation as the basis for annual review: a completed Faculty Annual Review Summary Report (see Appendix A),

2. the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae,
3. a Digital Measures report covering activities in the current academic year,
4. a published scholarship citation report,
5. copies of the faculty member’s student evaluations from the fall of the current academic year and the spring of the previous academic year, and
6. a completed Faculty Annual Review Questionnaire (see Appendix B).

The Dean shall complete for each faculty member under review a Faculty Annual Review Form (see Appendix C).

**B. Timing of Annual Review**

The annual review shall cover activities from June 1 to May 31 of the current academic year and will follow the following timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>faculty are notified by the dean to submit documentation for annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>faculty member submits documentation for annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>dean submits draft of Faculty Annual Review Form to faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>dean meets with faculty member upon request of either to discuss draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>faculty member resubmits draft to dean with comments if desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>faculty member and dean sign the written evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a faculty member’s annual review triggers a Performance Remediation Plan, the dean must propose such a plan no later than April 1.

**C. Duties, Responsibilities, and Workload Expectations for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

1. *Clinical Faculty*

The following is a description of the duties and responsibilities of clinical faculty listed in the order of importance. For specific examples of work that qualifies as teaching, scholarship, or service, as well as guidance for the dean in allocating workload among faculty members, see Appendix L – Clinical Faculty Workload Guidelines.

a) Teaching:

The primary responsibility of Clinical Faculty is teaching, related to one or more of the following in the College of Law:
teaching, coordinating, supervising and/or advising clinics, externships, or similar out-of-class educational opportunities for students;
• teaching courses related to professional practice or substantive law;
• supervising and teaching in a clinical or practice setting;
• teaching and/or supervising applied clinical courses;
• providing academic instruction in skills relevant to the practice of law;
• training and supervising students to help them acquire clinical skills for the profession.

The typical Clinical Faculty member is expected to teach a clinic, externship, or equivalent activity in the Fall and in the Spring semesters each academic year. After the first year of service, each clinical faculty member should either teach one additional course during the year or engage in equivalent activity.

The Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean of Experiential Learning may grant a modification, reallocation, or redistribution in workload and/or additional compensation for Clinical Faculty who have, or propose to have, teaching overloads; significantly higher than expected research or scholarship productivity; or significant service overloads, or who are assigned significant administrative responsibilities. The Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean of Experiential Learning, may also assign additional teaching or service responsibilities to Clinical Faculty in lieu of research and scholarship.

Five years after obtaining clinical job security and every five years thereafter, a clinical faculty member may receive a one-semester release of teaching and service responsibilities if the faculty member proposes and the Dean approves a substantial research or teaching item.

b) Research:

Clinical Faculty also are expected to engage in some form of research that develops expertise in and advances the field of skills, clinical education or substantive areas of law. Research activities for this purpose include, although are not limited to, the following: significant participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; engagement with academic and professional audiences; leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees; and research on pedagogy, the scholarship of teaching and learning, law practice, substantive law or clinical practice. Research may, but need not, include the publication of scholarly articles.

c) Service:

Clinical Faculty also are expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include, but are not limited to, the following: advising and serving the academic needs of students; serving on committees; or participating in other forms of service to the clinic/program, college and/or University. Service also includes activities related to the legal or greater community.

A typical clinical faculty member will serve as a member of two committees in the law school, the University, or the University System every year. A typical pre-presumptively renewable
annual contract clinical faculty member will have limited committee assignments each year, when possible, until clinical faculty job security with presumptively renewable contracts is achieved. In particularly, a clinical faculty member in the first year of service should normally be expected to serve on only one committee.

2. Lecturers

The following is a description of the duties and responsibilities of Lecturers listed in the order of importance.

a) Teaching:

The primary responsibility of Lecturers is teaching. The typical Lecturer is expected to teach 6-12 credits (or the equivalent) each academic year, depending on the degree to which the assigned courses require intensive student engagement. Courses that involve experiential learning, such as externships, or intensive writing instruction, such as Lawyering Foundations, fall in this category.

The typical course distribution will be as follows:

- Lawyering Foundations faculty, including Director – Lawyering Foundations I in the fall semester and Lawyering Foundations II in the spring semester; and
- Other Lecturers - one to three courses each semester during the academic year; and

b) Service:

Lecturers also are expected to engage in service activities. These activities may include advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the college and/or university level. Service also may involve activities related to the professional and greater communities. The typical Lecturer will be expected to serve, after the first year of employment, on one committee in the law school, the University, or the University System each academic year.

c) Research:

Lecturers are not required to engage in research activities.

The Dean may grant a modification, reallocation, or redistribution in workload and/or additional compensation for Lecturers who have, or propose to have, teaching overloads or significant service overloads, and/or are assigned significant administrative responsibilities. When Lawyering Foundations faculty are impacted, the Dean will consult with the Director of the program before granting such modification, reallocation, or redistribution.
3. Academic Professionals

Pursuant to Board of Regents Policy and the University NTT Manual, the faculty designation of Academic Professional applies to a variety of academic assignments that call for academic background similar to that of a faculty member with professional rank, but which are distinctly different from professorial positions. The primary responsibility of Academic Professionals is service. Accordingly, the Academic Professional must have an appropriate terminal degree and may not be assigned to a position where teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment (BOR Policy Manual, Academic Professional, Section 8.3.8.3). The duties and responsibilities of each Academic Professional will be determined by the Dean, in consultation with the Academic Professional’s faculty supervisors, on a case-by-case basis. The following describes the scope of duties and responsibilities that may be expected of Academic Professionals.

a) Service:

The primary responsibility of Academic Professionals is service, which may include activities such as:

- Administrative management of major initiatives, centers, or programs within the College of Law;
- Oversight of academic programs (particularly those responsibilities falling outside the expectation of tenure-track faculty members);
- Academic, curricular, and professional advising;
- Provision of specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs;
- Hosting of substantive events, including speakers, panels, symposium and conferences, for internal and external audiences; and,
- Working in conjunction with other faculty members on program, course and curriculum development.

Service may also include advising and serving the academic needs of students, serving on committees, or participating in other forms of academic service. Service may be at the college and/or university level. Service also may involve activities related to the professional and greater communities. After the first year of employment, Academic Professionals will also serve on one committee in the COL, the University, or the University System.

b) Teaching:

Academic Professionals are not expected to engage in teaching. However, when appropriate, in consultation with the Dean and/or supervisory faculty members, Academic Professionals may as part of their regular duties teach 1-4 credits each academic year.

c) Research:
Academic Professionals are not expected to engage in research. However, when appropriate, in consultation with the Dean and/or supervisory faculty members, Academic Professionals may as part of their regular duties engage in legal and interdisciplinary scholarship, practical research, and translation and dissemination activities. These research activities may include, although are not limited to, participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; engagement with academic and professional audiences and/or any other relevant activities. Research need not include the publication of scholarly articles.

The Dean may grant a modification, reallocation, or redistribution in workload and/or additional compensation for Academic Professionals who have, or propose to have, teaching overloads; significant service overloads; significantly higher than expected research or scholarship productivity; and/or who are assigned significant administrative responsibilities beyond management of the major initiatives, centers or programs for which they were hired.

4. Law Librarian Faculty

a) In General

The primary mission of the Law Library is to provide faculty, students, and staff of the College of Law with the information resources and services that are necessary to support effective legal instruction and research. Additionally, Law Librarians instruct students in information-seeking skills for their academic success and for use in their legal career. They also provide resources and services to the larger legal community of Atlanta.

The Law Library fulfills its mission by pursuing the following objectives: (i) selecting, maintaining, and providing access to materials that are best suited for faculty and student instructional and research needs; (ii) providing high-quality research assistance and (iii) instructing students, faculty, and other library users in methods for evaluating and using library resources. College of Law students must have excellent legal research skills as they enter the job market. Thus, the library has an educational mission and is where the law student learns to use the tools of the profession.

b) Teaching

The primary responsibility of College of Law Library faculty is teaching, defined broadly to encompass professional librarianship as well as teaching as traditionally defined, where applicable. Professional librarianship includes professional library service for students, faculty, and staff in support of the College of Law’s educational and research mission, as well as library service for members of the public, including members of the Georgia Bar, the Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court of Georgia.
Professional librarianship includes a variety of activities listed in the American Association of Law Libraries Competencies of Law Librarianship. These competencies may include core competencies, applicable to all librarians, and specialized competencies related to individual librarian job duties. Examples include, but are not limited to, providing research assistance to library users, evaluating materials for possible acquisition or weeding, teaching, and the organization and delivery of information within its technological context.

Law Librarians are expected to complete their duties as professional librarians, described as teaching in the Law Librarian Promotion and Reappointment Manual. Law Librarian Faculty with a J.D. are expected to teach one section of the introductory legal research class per academic year.

c) Service

Librarians at the College of Law also are expected to perform internal and external service. Specific areas of internal library service may include: Serving on Law Library, College of Law, or University committees; participating in the life of the law school; serving as an advisor or mentor; presentations for, or tours of, College of Law or University affiliates. Specific areas of external library service may include: guest lecturing; serving on committees, task forces, or boards of library associations or related groups; mentoring other librarians, either informally or formally; and supervising interns.

After the first year of employment, Law Librarians will also serve on one committee in the law school, the University, or the University System, as well as perform external service consistent with part VII of the College of Law Non-Tenure Track Review Manual.

d) Research

Law librarians are not required to engage in research or scholarship activities, although such efforts are welcome and encouraged. Law librarians are expected to be familiar with current trends and methods in the discipline.

Research or scholarship may include: Publication of articles, book reviews, bibliographies, etc., in print or electronic format; creating Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction lessons; serving on an editorial board; serving on an advisory committee/board; seeking additional training or education, including continuing education courses or trainings as well as seeking an additional, relevant degree.

The Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Law Library and Information Services, may grant a modification, reallocation, or redistribution in workload and/or additional

---

compensation for Law Librarian Faculty who have, or propose to have, teaching overloads, significant professional librarian duties, significant research and scholarship activities, or significant service overloads; and/or who are assigned significant administrative responsibilities.

The Associate Dean for Law Library and Information Services, in consultation with the Dean, may consider a redistribution in workload for Law Librarian faculty as the demands of the Law Library and the COL require.

5. **Professor of Practice**

The primary responsibility and workload distribution of Professors of Practice are negotiated on a case-by-case basis with the Dean.

D. **Annual Review Metrics**

In assessing the faculty member's performance, the Dean’s Annual Review Form will utilize the following Likert scale:

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

The requirements for each rating will vary according to the position, rank, seniority, and annual workload allocation of the faculty member under review (see Appendices D, E, F, and G).

E. **Summer Assignments**

Summer assignments are not part of the academic year workload, except for those faculty hired on a 12-month contract. All summer responsibilities are a factor to be considered by the Dean in determining whether any faculty member has a significant overload justifying a workload modification, reallocation, or redistribution.

Summer teaching normally will not be considered a substitute for teaching during the academic year, absent extraordinary circumstances. However, summer teaching may be considered as contributing to student success.

F. **Procedures**

1. **Workload Distribution**

The Dean or a member of the administration designated by the Dean shall consult with individual faculty members and their supervisors, as appropriate, each year to establish equitable teaching, research, and scholarship, service, and administration assignments. Any modification, reallocation, or redistribution of workload or granting of additional compensation will be
determined on a case-by-case basis, will not be granted automatically, and will be documented in
writing annually by the Dean. The inability to complete proposed activities that served as the basis
for such workload modification, relocation, or redistribution may result in the denial of future
requests or cancellation of additional redistributions that may have been pre-approved.

2. **Faculty Submission**

   For each faculty member subject to annual review, the Dean shall review the completed Faculty
Annual Review Summary Report and prepare and submit to the faculty member Faculty Annual
Review Form attesting to the faculty member’s performance over the current academic year.

3. **Dean’s Review**

   In conducting annual reviews, the Dean shall rely on the completed Faculty Annual Review
Summary Report in conjunction with the other submissions listed above in Section A.
Documentation for Annual Review. The Dean may make reasonable requests for additional
documentation from a faculty member under review. In completing the Faculty Annual Review
Form, the Dean must comply with instructions as to timeline, metrics, requirements, and
procedures as set forth in this manual.

   Upon request by the Dean or the faculty member, the Dean will discuss with the faculty member
in a scheduled conference the content of the completed Dean’s Annual Review Form and the
faculty member’s progression towards achieving future milestones. At this meeting, the faculty
member will sign a statement attesting that they have been apprised of the content of the completed
Dean’s Annual Review Form. The faculty member will be given 10 business days to respond in
writing to the Dean’s Annual Review Form, with this response to be attached to the completed
Dean’s Annual Review Form. The Dean will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response,
noting changes, if any, in the completed Dean’s Annual Review Form made as a result of either
the conference or the faculty member’s written response. The specific time period for this response
is 10 business days from the faculty member’s response. The Dean’s acknowledgement also
becomes part of the official personnel records for the faculty member. Annual reviews are not
subject to discretionary review.

4. **Performance Remediation Plan**

   If the faculty member’s performance on the Annual Review is evaluated as “1 - Does Not Meet
Expectations” or “2 - Needs Improvement” on any of the three job responsibility categories, the
Dean and faculty member together shall develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to
improve the faculty member’s performance during the following year. The purpose of the PRP is
to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or
responsibilities. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the
PRP.
a. The components of a PRP plan must include the following:
b. clearly defined goals or outcomes;
c. an outline of activities to be undertaken;
d. a timetable;
e. available resources and support;
f. expectations for improvement; and
g. a monitoring strategy.

The PRP must be specific, reasonable, achievable within the time frame through the exercise of ordinary professional diligence, and reflect the essential job duties of the faculty member.

If the faculty member elects not to participate in the development of a PRP, the Dean will create an appropriate PRP. In the event of a disagreement between a Law Librarian faculty member and the Dean concerning the PRP, the plan will be brought before the Committee on Promotion described in the VII of this document. In the event of disagreement between any other type of non-tenure track faculty member and the Dean concerning the PRP, the plan will be brought before the Faculty Review Subcommittee or the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The Dean will meet with the faculty member twice in the fall semester and twice in the spring semester to review progress, document additional needs and available resources, and plan accomplishments to be achieved before the next scheduled meeting. After each meeting, the Dean will summarize the meeting in writing and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. The Dean must advise the faculty member in writing of the possible consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP during each meeting.

5. Annual Evaluation Immediately After Performance Remediation Plan

If the Dean evaluates a non-tenure track faculty member as “1 - Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2 - Needs Improvement” on any of the three job responsibility categories in the next consecutive annual evaluation, the Dean may propose a subsequent PRP as described in Section IV.F.4 above.

If the Dean evaluates a clinical faculty member with presumptively renewable contracts as “1 - Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2- Needs Improvement” on any evaluation category in two consecutive annual evaluations, the Dean will recommend a corrective structured review for professional development and planning. A recommendation for a corrective structured review for professional development and planning and the accompanying annual evaluation, must be reviewed by the PTR Committee. If the PTR Committee does not agree with the recommendation for a corrective structured review for professional development and planning, the PTR Committee should set forth its reasons for disagreement in a written recommendation and submit the recommendation to the Dean along with a request for reconsideration. If the Dean determines that, notwithstanding the PTR Committee’s recommendation, a corrective structured review for professional development and planning is warranted, the Dean must set forth in writing the reasons...
for the decision not to accept the Committee’s recommendation, and this statement, along with the Committee’s recommendation, will be included in the faculty member’s file.

6. Amendments to Faculty Review Documentation Templates

Templates for the Faculty Annual Review Summary Report, the Dean’s Annual Review Form, and Review Metrics for annual faculty review are core faculty governance documents and may be amended or changed only by vote of the College’s faculty using the applicable faculty governance procedures set forth in the College’s by-laws.

G. Terms of Appointment

These annual review rules shall not be applied in any way that violates the terms of a faculty member’s appointment, including but not limited to terms negotiated at the time of hire and confirmed in writing from the dean of the College of Law at the time of hire, the terms of administrative appointments, or benefits associated with an endowed chair or professorship.

H. The Limits of Quantitative Ratings

Quantitative ratings are useful in assessing satisfactory job performance. However, quantitative ratings alone do not provide a reliable indicator of effort or the quality of work product. Consequently, in any allocation of institutional resources among faculty—including but not limited to supplemental pay, salary increases, awards, honors, appointments, and workload reallocation—the Dean shall rely on a careful individualized assessment of both effort and quality.

I. Successful Annual Review Not a Guarantee of Promotion for NTT Faculty or of Presumptively Renewable Contracts for Clinical Faculty

While annual faculty reviews are considered as part of a faculty member’s record in promotion and structured reviews for professional development and planning, the ratings from annual evaluations do not necessarily translate to a promotion or structured review outcome. Annual reviews focus exclusively on past performance in a single academic year as a basis for evaluating satisfaction of minimum job requirements. By contrast, promotion and structured reviews for professional development and planning assess past performance over many years as a basis for predicting future performance characterized by the attainment of national and international recognition for excellence in a faculty member’s field of expertise. Moreover, whereas annual reviews rely on the dean’s assessment of job performance, promotion and structured reviews for professional development and planning require additional in-depth peer assessments by senior faculty of teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

V. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND STRUCTURED REVIEWS FOR CLINICAL FACULTY

A. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor
A clinical assistant professor is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to clinical associate professor in the fifth year of service. A maximum of three years' credit toward the minimum period may be allowed for service at another institution or within Georgia State University in a faculty rank. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing at the time of initial appointment and approved by the Provost.

B. Presumptively Renewable Annual Contracts

A clinical faculty member will be considered for continued employment based on a presumptively renewable annual contract in the fifth year of full-time service, as referenced in Section V.D.2.a. A maximum of three years' credit toward the minimum period may be allowed for service at another institution or within Georgia State University in a faculty type or rank. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing at the time of initial appointment and approved by the Provost. A clinical assistant professor should apply for promotion to clinical associate professor and the award of a presumptively renewable contract concurrently.

C. Promotion to Clinical Professor

A clinical associate professor is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to full Clinical Professor in the fifth year of service in rank. An earlier application for promotion in the fourth year of service in rank requires strong justification.

D. Promotion Standards

1. General

Each level of review for promotion entails a comprehensive assessment of a candidate’s performance, progress, and potential future performance with respect to teaching, research, and service, as appropriate to the particular job classification. Standards and expectations are applied with greater rigor at each successive rank. For newly appointed NTT faculty, teaching loads may be adjusted as needed to support both their ability to focus on their pedagogy and develop a professional agenda. Similarly, while NTT faculty are expected to engage in institutional and professional service, institutional demands, to the extent possible, should be assigned in a manner that does not undermine the development of their teaching and professional agenda.

2. Clinical Faculty

a) Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor; Presumptively Renewable Contracts

To qualify for promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in teaching. This will include an assessment, where appropriate, of (a) the quality of teaching; and (b) the development of effective teaching and training materials. In addition, the faculty member seeking promotion must demonstrate (1) a record of high quality research; and (2) a record of high quality
service at the clinic/program, law school, and university level commensurate with the
candidate’s experience and a record overall that shows unmistakable promise of continued
productivity. Promotion may, but need not, be based in part on scholarship and the
publication of scholarly research.

These same substantive standards apply to qualify for continued employment based on a
presumptively renewable contact following five years of full-time service.

b) Promotion to Clinical Professor

Attainment of Clinical Professor status is not simply the next step on the promotion ladder.
It reflects recognition that a clinical faculty member has attained a significant level of
achievement as a teacher and professionally engaged colleague. Both the quantity and quality
of the record required for this review should substantially surpass that required for the rank
of Clinical Associate Professor.

Specifically, to qualify for promotion to Clinical Professor, the faculty member must
demonstrate: 1) a sustained level of excellence and continued growth in teaching and
clinic/program responsibilities, including a demonstrated record of commitment to the
students and the quality of his or her pedagogy; 2) high quality research overall, focusing on
the time period since the candidate’s attainment of the rank of clinical associate professor,
that has achieved significant standing and recognition in the field for its high quality and its
contributions to the area of study; and 3) high quality service to the clinic/program, law
school, university, community and/or profession. Assessment of one’s application for
promotion to Clinical Professor entails not only a judgment about a faculty member’s record
to date but the ability to predict that the candidate will continue to perform at a professor
level on into the future.

E. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

1. Five Year Probationary Period

Clinical faculty shall serve a five-year probationary period during which time they will be
reviewed annually by the Promotion Committee (outlined in Section A.2. of Appendix I)
for reappointment and contract renewal based on the applicant’s teaching, research, and
service activities. This annual process requires the Committee to assess the NTT faculty’s
incremental and cumulative progress toward satisfying the standards for an award of a
presumptively renewable annual contract after the probationary period (Section V.D.2.b.).

2. Structured Reviews for Professional Development and Planning:

Clinical faculty members shall be reviewed during their third probationary year after
appointment to provide them with guidance on their progress in advance of their formal five-
year review. The procedure for this review shall follow the process set forth in Appendix
I. At least one clinical faculty member of higher rank will be appointed as part of the review
committee if possible.
Clinical faculty members who have successfully completed their five-year review shall undergo reviews thereafter every five years, unless the faculty member is promoted, in which case subsequent reviews will occur every five years after the promotion. The purpose of such a review is to examine the individual’s contributions and achievements since his or her last review and to assist the faculty member in developing professional goals for the next five years. The process to be used in years in which the candidate is not seeking promotion is attached as Appendix I. At least one clinical faculty member of the same rank or higher will be appointed as part of the review team if available. In years in which the candidate is seeking promotion, the process shall be governed by Appendix I of this document.

3. Five-Year Review and Continued Employment:

In the fifth year of a clinical faculty member’s probationary period, the faculty member will undergo a formal five-year review to determine if he or she will be eligible for continued employment and an annual contract that is presumptively renewable absent cause for non-renewal on specified grounds. No clinical faculty member may be reappointed beyond the probationary period without undergoing a successful five-year review and being found eligible for the award of presumptively renewable annual contracts.

A clinical faculty member who undergoes a successful five-year review shall be offered annual contracts that may cease only because of dismissal for good cause (see BOR Policy 8.3.9) or the closing or material modification of the clinical program in accordance with ABA Standard 405.

F. Procedure and Evaluation Process:

The procedure and evaluation process for the five-year review is outlined in Section V.J. of this document.

G. Reappointment After the Five-Year Evaluation Period:

Following a successful five-year review, a clinical faculty member will be subject to annual evaluation conducted as part of the Dean’s annual review of all faculty, and will be presumptively eligible for annual contract renewal absent cause for non-renewal on specified grounds.

H. Non-Renewal for Unsatisfactory Job Performance After the Five-Year Review Period:

If, after successful completion of the five year review period, the Dean seeks to dismiss or non-renew a clinical faculty member for good cause related to the faculty member’s job performance or fitness as a clinical teacher, the Dean shall notify the Chair of the Promotion Committee so that the committee can review the Dean’s assessment. For purpose of this review, the Promotion Committee shall consist of the tenured members of the faculty and those Clinical Faculty who hold a presumptively renewable annual contract at the same or higher rank than the clinical faculty member, if possible. The Chair of the Promotion...
Committee shall appoint a 3-person subcommittee consisting of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, one tenured professor and one clinical faculty member who holds a presumptively renewable annual contract at the same or higher rank than the Clinical Faculty member, if possible, to conduct a review of the clinical faculty member’s job performance and submit a written report to the Promotion Committee.

Following receipt of the report, the Promotion Committee will meet to consider whether good cause has been established to terminate the clinical faculty member and whether by majority vote to recommend to the Dean the renewal or non-renewal of his or her contract. The final decision on non-renewal shall rest with the Dean.

1. Notification of Renewal and Dean’s Review

After receiving the Committee’s recommendations, the Dean will timely notify all clinical faculty on the issue of their reappointment. In addition, each spring the Dean will meet with each clinical faculty member to review the faculty member’s performance and progress towards a five-year presumptively renewable contract, noting accomplishments, areas of strength, and any areas of concern. The Dean will conduct these reviews based on the reappointment dossier compiled by the Promotion Committee, and the annual report document that each faculty member is required to complete each year. The review will include discussion of any significant issues evident from the record or that surfaced during the Promotion Committee’s review.

I. The Promotion Process

1. Promotion Committee

In the case of applications for promotion, reappointment, or a presumptively renewable annual contract relating to clinical faculty (outlined in Appendix I), the Committee shall consist of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The Committee shall also consist of clinical faculty members with respect to promotion and reappointment issues concerning clinical faculty members who are of a lower rank than the voting member. If the voting member has a presumptively renewable contract, he or she is also eligible to vote on clinical faculty of the same rank who do not have this status.

2. Co-Chairs

The Committee shall be headed by two faculty co-chairs elected annually by majority vote of the faculty at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting in March or April of the academic year. The term of appointment, which is renewable, shall run through the ensuing academic year. Co-chairs must be tenured full professors. They shall convene meetings of the Committee, coordinate its proceedings, and serve as its representative with regard to all required and appropriate communications. The co-chairs also will serve as co-chairs of the Faculty Review Subcommittee.

3. Faculty Review Subcommittee
The college also will have a Faculty Review Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to consider promotion and five-year presumptively renewable contracts for clinical faculty. This Subcommittee will be comprised of five members of the full Promotion and Tenure Committee as follows: (1) two members appointed by the Dean; (2) one general member elected by the faculty; and (3) the two co-chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as one clinical faculty member appointed by the Dean, where possible. Clinical faculty members of the same or higher rank than that to which the candidate is seeking promotion are eligible to serve on the Subcommittee. The purpose of the Subcommittee is to aid the Promotion Committee in presiding over the review process. Under the leadership of the co-chairs, the Subcommittee’s responsibilities generally entail overseeing and managing the stages of the process as set out in the timeline in Appendix H.

The Subcommittee also will review each clinical candidate’s completed dossier under the applicable standards set forth in this document, and prepare a written report and recommendation to the full Promotion Committee. This report and recommendation is advisory only and is not binding on the full Committee, which is ultimately responsible for making a recommendation on each candidate to the Dean.

4. General Rules Governing Promotion Committee Meetings

1. Meetings of the Committee shall be preceded by five business days’ notice to all members eligible to vote on the matters raised at that meeting. When it is anticipated that a meeting will include a vote on reappointment or promotion, the Co-Chairs shall make every effort to schedule that meeting at a time when all faculty eligible to vote are able to attend.

2. A quorum for all purposes shall be 80% of the members eligible to vote on the particular matter. In the absence of such a quorum, the Promotion Committee may not act on that matter. Every effort shall be made to include faculty members who are on leave in reappointment and promotion decisions on which they are eligible to vote. However, any faculty member who is on leave and is unavailable to participate in any reappointment and promotion decision shall not be counted for quorum or voting purposes.

3. Voting shall be by secret ballot. In reappointment matters, a simple majority of yea and nay votes cast shall be sufficient, and in promotion matters, a two-thirds majority of yea and nay votes cast shall be sufficient to make a recommendation to the Dean. In promotion matters, when the number of members present and voting is not an integer multiple of three, the number of yea and nay votes cast closest to two-thirds shall be sufficient.

J. Procedures for Promotion Review

1. Notification and Calendar within the College

The formal review, recommendation and decision-making process within the College of Law will be conducted primarily during the fall semester of the academic year. The information
gathering process by the co-chairs and the candidates should begin the preceding spring and should conform generally to the calendar set forth in Appendix H.

2. **Contents of the Dossier**

All applications for promotion will be supported by a dossier that contains a record of the candidate’s professional achievements relating to teaching, research and service to the extent appropriate to the classification in question. The contents of the dossier will include:

1. Provided by the Candidate

   a. A current curriculum vita

   b. A statement that summarizes accomplishments and goals in teaching, research and service. This document should include:

      1) A statement of the candidate’s pedagogical goals and methods for each class currently taught. The candidate should submit evidence relating to teaching effectiveness, which may include, where relevant, peer assessments, the development of instructional materials or new courses/programs, innovative pedagogy, technology or methods of assessment, integration of skills and values, and evidence of student accomplishments;

      2) A statement about the candidate’s research, including evidence of recognition within one’s field, and the candidate’s existing record and plans going forward. If the candidate’s record includes multi-authored written articles or publications, the candidate should indicate his or her specific contributions to each article in question; and

      3) A statement about the candidate’s service.

   c. Reprints or other copies of written articles or publications, where applicable;

   d. Any other letters, statements, documents or information the candidate deems relevant and material.

2. Prepared or Solicited by the Committee or Subcommittee

   a. A statement of the clinical faculty member’s duties, responsibilities, and work load distribution;

   b. A written summary of the candidate’s student course evaluations;

   c. Faculty reviews of the candidate’s teaching based on class visitations;

   d. External reviews of the candidate’s research; and
e. Subcommittee Report that reviews the candidate’s record and makes a recommendation to the Promotion Committee in the case of clinical faculty.

3. Evaluation of Teaching

1. General

Evaluation of a candidate’s teaching will be based primarily on: class visits and faculty review of the candidate’s classes, student evaluations, the candidate’s statement of teaching goals and methods, and any submitted materials or other submissions evidencing teaching dedication, effectiveness or innovation. This evaluation will take into account information relating to the faculty member’s teaching load, student advisement, the creation of new courses, and where possible and practicable, teaching methods that integrate, or introduce students to, skills and professional values in their doctrinal courses.

2. Class Visitation and Faculty Review

Consistent with the practice for review of tenure-track faculty, the Chair of the Promotion Committee shall assign a team of two committee members to observe the teaching of a clinical faculty member who is the subject of reappointment, promotion, or a five-year review. Where possible, at least one of these evaluators should be a clinical faculty member of a higher rank to the candidate.

This two-member team shall visit the clinic or program, and, where applicable, observe its administration generally, observe small group teaching or a small class component of the clinic/program and review teaching materials.

Prior to each class visit, the two-person team will meet with the faculty member to discuss the subject matter and goals of the upcoming class. The faculty member will furnish a copy of any material to be discussed in the class to the members of the team. After the team has made its class visits but before any final evaluation report is written, the team members will meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations and the faculty member’s response.

The co-chairs will provide a copy of the visitation report(s) to the observed faculty member within ten business days of the second visit. Within five business days of receiving a copy of the visitation report(s), the observed faculty member may request that a second team be assigned for observation and report before any action is taken on the observed faculty member's reappointment, promotion, or presumptively renewable contract. The original visitation report shall be filed in the observed faculty member's portfolio in the Dean’s office, a copy being retained in a duplicate file kept by the co-chairs of the Promotion Committee during the period prior to the faculty decision on the member's candidacy for reappointment, promotion, or presumptively renewable contract.
3. Student Evaluations

The co-chairs or their designees on the Subcommittee are expected to review the student evaluations of a candidate’s classes during the reappointment or promotional period and prepare a summary report of the evaluations for the candidate’s dossier. A copy of this summary will be provided to the candidate for review and comment prior to its finalization, and the candidate will have the opportunity to place a responsive statement in the file within five business days of receipt of the summary.

In addition, co-chairs or their designees on the Subcommittee will collect the student evaluations of the candidate and make them available in a secure location for review by any faculty member eligible to vote on the promotion, reappointment, or presumptively renewable contract.

4. Evaluation of Research and External Reviews of Clinical Faculty

The Dean will solicit peer evaluations from experts in the candidate’s field addressing the candidate’s performance and record of research as defined in Section IV.C.1.B. A candidate’s dossier should be supported by no less than three external letters.

The names of the external reviewers should be drawn from lists of those recommended by the candidate and the Dean (who may consult with the co-chairs and the associate Deans). External reviewers should not have a close relationship with the candidate (e.g., co-author, co-worker). Accompanying each external review letter should be a brief resume or bio showing the reviewer’s accomplishments, standing in the field, and a statement of the nature of his/her relationship with the candidate.

External review letters shall be kept confidential from all persons other than those individuals involved in some aspect of the candidate’s promotion application.

5. Evaluation of Institutional and Professional Service

Evaluation of a candidate’s Institutional and Professional Service should consider: the nature and extent of the candidate’s service activities, the candidate’s engagement in an appropriate level of the faculty’s institutional responsibilities, the candidate’s capacity to assume leadership responsibilities, and the degree to which research has served to buttress the candidate’s teaching and enhance the candidate’s reputation among his peers.

To evaluate these factors, the committee will review the candidate’s own statement and solicit input from clinic/program directors (where applicable) and the chairs of faculty committees on which the candidate has served during the promotional period. The committee also may contact external constituencies associated with the candidate’s public or professional service activities and make all other inquiries as the committee deems appropriate.

K. Deliberation Procedures for the Committee, the Subcommittee, and the Dean Relating to Promotion
1. **Subcommittee Review**

In cases relating to the promotion or application for an award of a presumptively renewable contract for clinical faculty members, the Subcommittee will carefully review and meet to discuss the candidate’s dossier.

2. **Report**

Following its review and deliberations, the Subcommittee will prepare a written report of its assessment and recommendation. The report should assess the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, research and service based on the dossier and the standards contained in this Promotion Document. The purpose of the report is to aid the work of the Promotion Committee and is advisory only.

3. **Timing of Report**

The report must be completed and made available to the candidate no later than eight business days before the Promotion Committee meeting on the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response to the report within three business days of its receipt. The written response must be submitted to the Dean.

4. **Availability to Faculty**

The report, the candidate’s response (if any), and the candidate’s dossier must be made available to eligible faculty at least five business days before the Promotion Committee vote on the candidate.

5. **Promotion Committee Meeting on Candidates**

The Promotion Committee will meet to discuss and evaluate the merits of each candidate’s application for promotion in light of the dossier and the Subcommittee’s report and recommendation. The co-chairs of the Committee will preside. The Committee will make recommendations to the Dean on each candidate’s application.

6. **Notice to Candidates**

All candidates will receive notice in writing of the Committees’ recommendations and a copy of any report(s) that are made of the candidate’s credentials within the timeframe outlined in the calendar set forth in Appendix H. All candidates have the right to respond in writing to the Committees’ recommendations within three business days. The response must be submitted to the Dean. Copies of any such response will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels.

7. **Dean’s Review**
Upon receiving recommendations for promotion, the Dean will conduct a review of the candidate’s application based on the Promotion Committee’s recommendation and the candidate’s dossier. The Dean will make an independent assessment of whether to support the recommendation. In all instances of a positive recommendation, the Dean will notify the candidate and will forward the candidate’s record to the Provost for the next stage of review within the timeframe outlined in the calendar set forth in Appendix H.

Candidates that are not recommended by the Dean must receive a written decision and rationale no later than ten business days after the Dean’s decision.

8. **Provost’s Review**

The Provost will conduct an independent review of the materials forwarded by the Dean and any other related materials directly relevant to the clinical faculty member’s candidacy for promotion. The Provost will make a recommendation in each case, forward the recommendations to the president, and notify the Dean. Within three business days after receiving notice of the Provost’s recommendation, the Dean will notify the candidate of the Provost’s recommendation.

Before forwarding a negative recommendation to the president, the Provost will consult with the Dean. In response to the query from the Provost, the Dean may gather additional information from the candidate and other materials directly related to the clinical faculty member’s candidacy. The Dean will notify the candidate of his/her reply to the Provost.

9. **President’s Review**

The President will conduct an independent review of the candidate’s dossier and related materials and recommendations. The decision will be communicated to the Dean, who will notify the candidate within three business days after receiving notice of the president’s decision.

10. **Appeals**

Clinical faculty members may appeal a negative recommendation of the Dean to the Provost in the manner provided by the University’s Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Section VII. Appeals) within ten business days of receipt of the Dean’s decision.

Candidates may appeal to the president a negative recommendation by the Provost or a decision by the Provost rejecting the candidate’s appeal to the Provost in accordance with the University’s Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Section VII. Appeals).
VI. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND STRUCTURED REVIEWS OF LECTURERS AND ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

A. Timing Policies for Promotion

1. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

A Lecturer is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to senior Lecturer in the fifth year of service, to be effective at the beginning of the seventh year of service. A maximum of three years' credit toward the minimum period may be allowed for service at another institution or within Georgia State University in a faculty rank. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing and approved by the Provost.

2. Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer

A senior Lecturer is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to principal senior Lecturer in the fifth year of service in rank.

3. Promotion to Senior Academic Professional

An Academic Professional is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to senior Academic Professional in the fifth year of service in rank.

B. Promotion Standards

1. General

Promotion recommendations of Lecturers shall be based on demonstrated excellence in teaching and high quality service. It is necessary to meet the standards in both. Promotion decisions entail not only an evaluation of a candidate’s existing contributions and accomplishments, but a predictive assessment of the candidate’s commitment to continued excellence in teaching and high quality service.

Promotion recommendations of Academic Professionals shall be based on demonstrated excellence in service and, if applicable, high quality teaching and/or research. Promotion decisions entail not only an evaluation of a candidate’s existing contributions and accomplishments, but a predictive assessment of the candidate’s commitment to sustained excellence and continued growth in service and, if applicable, high quality teaching and/or research.
Each year, the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development will convene a meeting to explain promotion policies and answer questions about any and all phases of the promotion process. This meeting shall be open to all interested faculty members.

2. **Standards for Evaluation by Rank and Job Classification**

a) **General**

Each level of review for promotion entails a comprehensive assessment of a candidate’s performance, progress, and potential future performance with respect to teaching and service. A candidate must meet more rigorous standards and expectations at successive promotion levels.

b) **Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

To qualify for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in teaching. This will include an assessment of (a) the quality of pedagogy and instruction in the classroom; (b) the quality of feedback provided to students in written and oral assignments, where appropriate; (c) the development of effective teaching and training materials; and (d) the ability to work collaboratively and professionally with other faculty members, where appropriate. In addition, the faculty member seeking promotion must demonstrate a commitment to high quality service commensurate with the candidate’s experience and a record overall that shows unmistakable promise of continued productivity.

c) **Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer**

Attainment of Principal Senior Lecturer reflects recognition that a faculty member has attained a significant level of achievement as a teacher and professionally engaged colleague.

Specifically, to qualify for promotion to principal senior Lecturer, the faculty member must demonstrate: 1) a sustained high level of excellence and continued growth in teaching responsibilities, including a demonstrated record of commitment to the students and the quality of his or her pedagogy; and 2) regular and significant high quality service. Assessment of one’s application for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer entails not only a judgment about a faculty member’s record to date but the ability to predict that the candidate will continue to perform at a high level on into the future.

d) **Promotion to Senior Academic Professional**

Attainment of Senior Academic Professional reflects recognition that a faculty member has attained a significant level of achievement in the area of service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research.

Specifically, to qualify for promotion to senior Academic Professional, the faculty member must demonstrate a sustained high level of excellence and continued growth in service responsibilities. If applicable, the faculty member must also demonstrate high quality teaching and/or research.
Assessment of one’s application for promotion to Senior Academic Professional entails not only a judgment about a faculty member’s record to date but the ability to predict that the candidate will continue to perform at a high level on into the future.

C. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

1. Reappointment Review

All Lecturers are hired on an annual basis in accordance with Section 8.3.4.3 of the Board of Regents’ Policy Manual.

During the first five years of full-time employment at the College of Law, Lecturers shall be reviewed annually by the Promotion Committee (outlined in Section VI.D.1) in order to make a reappointment and contract recommendation to the Dean. These reviews shall consist of an evaluation of teaching excellence conducted by tenure-track or clinical faculty members based in part on in-class observations, the quality of written feedback provided to students, as well as a review of service activities.

Beginning in the sixth year of full-time service, the annual reappointment review need not include an in-class observation of the applicant’s teaching skills, with the exception of those years in which a Lecturer has applied for promotion or undergoes a review in Section VI.C.3. Notwithstanding this provision, the Dean and/or chairs of the Promotion Committee retain the discretion to require an in-class observation for any Lecturer as part of the reappointment process.

During the first five years of full-time employment at the College of Law, Academic Professionals shall be reviewed annually by the Promotion Committee (outlined in Section VI.D.1) in order to make a reappointment and contract recommendation to the Dean. These reviews shall consist of an evaluation of service excellence conducted by tenure-track or clinical faculty members (including the Center Director under whom the Academic Professional works, if applicable), based on a written report of the service activities accomplished and, if applicable, an in-class observation of the applicant’s teaching skills, the quality of assessment of student performance, and/or a written research review.

2. Criteria for Reappointment:

To qualify for reappointment, a Lecturer must establish that he or she is meeting the teaching and service goals identified in section IV.C.2. To qualify for reappointment, an Academic Professional must establish that he or she is meeting the service, teaching and/or research goals identified in section IV.C.3 and applicable to his or her specific appointment. Reappointment shall be at the sole discretion of the Dean or his or her representative.
All Lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have a presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary as follows:

For Lecturers with less than three years of full-time service, the College of Law will provide notice of non-reappointment as early as practicable.

For Lecturers with three or more, but less than six, years of full-time service, notice of non-reappointment must be made at least 30 calendar days prior to the College of Law’s first day of classes in the semester.

For Lecturers with six or more years of full-time employment, notice of non-reappointment will be made at least one hundred and eighty calendar days prior to the College of Law’s first day of classes in the semester.

Lecturers with six or more years of full-time service at the College of Law who have received timely notice of non-reappointment are entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with the appeal procedures contained in Section VIII of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

All Academic Professionals who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary at least three (3) months before the date of termination.

Previous years of service in positions other than the faculty positions with academic rank listed above shall not be included in the calculation to determine the schedule for notice of intention not to renew an Academic Professional’s contract.

3. Structured Reviews for Professional Development and Planning

Lecturers and Academic Professionals shall be reviewed during their third year of full-time employment to provide them with guidance on whether they are making progress toward promotion and to identify opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential in terms of their contribution to the University. The procedure for this review shall follow the process as set forth in the College’s Guidelines for Structured Reviews of Lecturers and Academic Professionals, attached as Appendix J. In their fifth year, the structured review is also the review for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Senior Academic Professional and will be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix J.

Once a Lecturer is promoted to Senior Lecturer, such reviews shall take place every five years of continued employment, unless he or she is promoted, in which case subsequent reviews will occur every five years after the promotion. The purpose of such a review is to examine the individual’s contributions and achievements since his or her last review and to assist the faculty member in developing professional goals for the next five years. In years in
which the Lecturer is seeking promotion, the process shall be governed by Section VI.D. of this document. Otherwise, the process to be used is attached at Appendix J.

Once promoted to Principal Senior Lecturer or Senior Academic Professional, such reviews shall take place every five years of continued employment. The purpose of such a review is to examine the individual’s contributions and achievements since his or her last review and to assist the faculty member in developing professional goals for the next five years.

D. The Promotion Process

1. Promotion Committee

In the case of applications for promotion or reappointment relating to Lecturers and Academic Professionals, the Committee shall consist of all tenured, tenure-track and clinical faculty members. Also serving on the Committee for promotion or reappointment relating to Lecturers shall be Lecturers above the current rank of the Lecturer applying for promotion or being reviewed for reappointment. Likewise, also serving on the Committee for promotion or reappointment relating to Academic Professionals shall be Academic Professionals above the current rank of the Academic Professional applying for promotion or being reviewed for reappointment, to the extent there are any such individuals.

2. Co-Chairs

The Committee shall be headed by the two faculty co-chairs elected annually by majority vote of the faculty at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting in March or April of the academic year. The term of appointment, which is renewable, shall run through the ensuing academic year. Co-chairs must be tenured full professors. They shall convene meetings of the Committee, coordinate its proceedings, and serve as its representative with regard to all required and appropriate communications. The co-chairs also will serve as co-chairs of the Faculty Review Subcommittee.

3. Faculty Review Subcommittee

The College will have a Faculty Review Subcommittee to consider promotion for Lecturers. This Subcommittee will be comprised of five members of the full Promotion and Tenure Committee as follows: (1) two members appointed by the Dean; (2) one general member elected by the faculty; and (3) the two co-chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as one Lecturer member appointed by the Dean, where possible. Lecturers of higher rank than that to which the candidate is seeking promotion are eligible to serve on the Subcommittee.

Likewise, the College also will have a Faculty Review Subcommittee to consider promotion for Academic Professionals. This Subcommittee will be comprised of five members of the full Promotion and Tenure Committee as follows: (1) two members appointed by the Dean; (2) one general member elected by the faculty; and (3) the two co-chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as one Academic Professional member appointed by the Dean, where possible. Academic Professionals of the higher rank than that to which the candidate is seeking promotion are eligible to serve on the Subcommittee.
The purpose of the Subcommittee is to aid the Promotion Committee in presiding over the review process. Under the leadership of the co-chairs, the Subcommittee’s responsibilities generally entail overseeing and managing the stages of the process as set out in the timeline in Appendix H.

The Subcommittee also will review each Lecturer’s or Academic Professional’s completed dossier under the applicable standards set forth in this document, and prepare a written report and recommendation to the full Promotion Committee. This report and recommendation is advisory only and is not binding on the full Committee, which is ultimately responsible for making a recommendation on each candidate to the Dean.

4. General Rules Governing Promotion Committee Meetings

1. Meetings of the Committee shall be preceded by five business days’ notice to all members eligible to vote on the matters raised at that meeting. When it is anticipated that a meeting will include a vote on reappointment or promotion, the Co-Chairs shall make every effort to schedule that meeting at a time when all faculty eligible to vote are able to attend.

2. A quorum for all purposes shall be 80% of the members eligible to vote on the particular matter according to the membership criteria defined in Section VI.D.1. In the absence of such a quorum, the Promotion Committee may not act on that matter. Every effort shall be made to include faculty members who are on leave in reappointment and promotion decisions on which they are eligible to vote. However, any faculty member who is on leave and is unavailable to participate in any reappointment or promotion decision shall not be counted for quorum or voting purposes.

3. Voting shall be by secret ballot. In reappointment matters, a simple majority of yea and nay votes cast shall be sufficient, and in promotion matters, a two-thirds majority of yea and nay votes cast shall be sufficient to make a recommendation to the Dean. In promotion matters, when the number of members present and voting is not an integer multiple of three, the number of yea and nay votes cast closest to two-thirds shall be sufficient.

E. Procedures for Promotion Review of Lecturers

1. Notification and Calendar within the College

The formal review, recommendation and decision-making process within the College of Law will be conducted primarily during the fall semester of the academic year. The information gathering process by the Faculty Review Subcommittee and the candidates should begin the preceding spring and should conform generally to the calendar set forth in Appendix H.

2. Contents of the Dossier

All applications for promotion will be supported by a dossier that contains a record of the candidate’s professional achievements relating to teaching and service. The contents of the dossier will include:
1. Provided by the Candidate

a. A current curriculum vita

b. A statement that summarizes accomplishments and goals in teaching and service, including:

1) A statement of the candidate’s pedagogical goals and methods for each course currently taught. The candidate should submit evidence relating to teaching effectiveness, which may include, where relevant, peer assessments, the development of instructional materials or new courses/programs, innovative pedagogy, technology or methods of assessment, integration of skills and values, and evidence of student accomplishments. In addition, the candidate should address, where appropriate, methods and examples of providing feedback to students on written assignments; and

2) A statement about the candidate’s institutional service and professional engagement. The candidate should address and/or provide examples, where appropriate, of the ability to work collaboratively and professionally with other faculty members in programs of study;

c. At the candidate’s discretion, copies of any letters, memoranda, etc. that document public service, professional engagement, leadership positions, awards, or other forms of professional recognition;

d. Any other letters, statements, documents or information the candidate deems relevant and material.

2. Prepared or Solicited by the Subcommittee

a. A written summary of the candidate’s student course evaluations; and

b. Faculty reviews of the candidate’s teaching based on class visitations.

3. Evaluation of Teaching

1. General

Evaluation of a candidate’s teaching will be based primarily on: class visits and faculty review of the candidate’s classes, student evaluations, the candidate’s statement of teaching goals and methods, and any submitted materials or other submissions evidencing teaching dedication, effectiveness or innovation.

2. Class Visitation and Faculty Review
The co-chairs of the Promotion Committee or their designees will assign two-person faculty teams to conduct class observations for all Lecturers: (1) in each of their first five years of employment; (2) in years in which a Lecturer has applied for promotion or is subject to a review identified in Section VI.C.3; and (3) as deemed necessary in the discretion of the Dean or co-chairs. Each faculty team will conduct observations of at least two full 75 minute classes of the same course.

3. Student Evaluations

The Faculty Review Subcommittee will review the student evaluations of a candidate’s classes during the promotional period and prepare a summary report of the evaluations for the candidate’s dossier. A copy of this summary will be provided to the candidate for review and comment prior to its finalization, and the candidate will have the opportunity to place a responsive statement in the file within five business days of receipt of the summary.

4. Evaluation of Service

Evaluation of a candidate’s service should consider: the nature and extent of the candidate’s service activities, the candidate’s engagement in an appropriate level of the faculty’s institutional responsibilities, the candidate’s capacity to assume leadership responsibilities, and other related information.

To evaluate these factors, the subcommittee will review the candidate’s own statement and solicit input from the Director of Lawyering Foundations or, in the case of a Lecturer who is not teaching in the Lawyering Foundations Program, the Director of the program in which the Lecturer teaches, the chairs of faculty committees on which the candidate has served during the promotional period, and other faculty where applicable. The committee also may contact external constituencies associated with the candidate’s public or professional service activities and make all other inquiries as the committee deems appropriate.

F. Procedures for Promotion Review of Academic Professionals

1. Notification and Calendar within the College

The formal review, recommendation and decision-making process within the College of Law will be conducted primarily during the fall semester of the academic year. The information gathering process by the Faculty Review Subcommittee and the candidates should begin the preceding spring and should conform generally to the calendar set forth in Appendix H.

2. Contents of the Dossier

All applications for promotion will be supported by a dossier that contains a record of the candidate’s professional achievements relating to service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research. The contents of the dossier will include:

1. Provided by the Candidate
a. A current curriculum vita
b. A statement that summarizes accomplishments and goals in service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research, including:

1) A statement that summarizes the candidate’s specific service responsibilities, the candidate’s accomplishments with respect to these responsibilities; and the candidate’s goals in the area of service. The candidate should submit evidence relating to job knowledge, productivity, accuracy and quality, adaptability, organizational skills, communication skills, initiative, professional relationships, supervisory skills, College of Law and University service, professional service, and community engagement;

2) A statement that summarizes accomplishments and goals in teaching, where applicable, including the candidate’s pedagogical goals and methods for each course currently taught. The candidate should submit evidence relating to teaching effectiveness, which may include, where relevant, peer assessments, the development of instructional materials or new courses/programs, innovative pedagogy, technology or methods of assessment, integration of skills and values, and evidence of student accomplishments. In addition, the candidate should address, where appropriate, methods and examples of providing feedback to students on written assignments;

3) A statement about the candidate’s research, where applicable, including evidence of recognition within one’s field, and the candidate’s existing record and plans going forward. If the candidate’s record includes multi-authored written articles or publications, the candidate should indicate his or her specific contributions to each article in question.

c. At the candidate’s discretion, copies of any letters, memoranda, etc. that document public service, professional engagement, leadership positions, awards, or other forms of professional recognition.

d. Any other letters, statements, documents or information the candidate deems relevant and material.

2. Prepared or Solicited by the Subcommittee

a. A statement of the Academic Professional’s duties, responsibilities, and work load distribution;
b. A written summary of the candidate’s student course evaluations, if applicable;
c. Faculty reviews of the candidate’s teaching based on class visitations, if applicable;
d. Internal reviews of the candidate’s research, if applicable; and
e. A Subcommittee Report summarizing the candidate’s record and making a recommendation to the Promotion Committee.
3. **Evaluation of Service**

Evaluation of a candidate’s service should consider the candidate’s College of Law and University service, professional service, and community engagement in light of his or her specific service responsibilities, and include any other evidence of effective service.

To evaluate these factors, the Subcommittee will review the candidate’s own statement and solicit input from the Center Director, the chairs of faculty committees on which the candidate has served during the promotional period, and other faculty where applicable. The Subcommittee also may contact external constituencies associated with the candidate’s public or professional service activities and make such other inquiries as it deems appropriate.

4. **Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)**

1. General

   Evaluation of a candidate’s teaching, if applicable, will be based primarily on: class visits and faculty review of the candidate’s classes, student evaluations, the candidate’s statement of teaching goals and methods, and any submitted materials evidencing teaching dedication, effectiveness or innovation.

2. Class Visitation and Faculty Review

   The co-chairs of the Promotion Committee or their designees will assign two-person faculty teams to conduct class observations for all Academic Professionals whose duties include teaching: (1) in each of their first five years of employment; (2) in years in which an Academic Professional has applied for promotion or is subject to a review identified in Section VI.C.3; and (3) as deemed necessary in the discretion of the Dean or co-chairs. Each faculty team will conduct observations of at least two full 75 minute classes of the same course.

3. Student Evaluations

   The Subcommittee will review the student evaluations of a candidate’s classes during the promotional period and prepare a summary report of the evaluations for the candidate’s dossier. A copy of this summary will be provided to the candidate for review and comment prior to its finalization, and the candidate will have the opportunity to place a responsive statement in the file within five business days of receipt of the summary.

5. **Evaluation of Research (if applicable)**

Evaluation of a candidate’s research, if applicable, should consider participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing;
engagement with academic and professional audiences; and leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees.

In evaluating research, the Subcommittee will also consider internal faculty evaluations of the candidate’s research as assigned by the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee.

G. Deliberation Procedures for the Committee and the Dean Relating to Promotion

1. Subcommittee Review

In cases relating to promotion, the Subcommittee will carefully review the candidate’s application and meet to discuss it upon completion of the dossier.

2. Report

Following its review and deliberations, the Subcommittee will prepare a written report of its assessment and recommendation. The report should assess the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching and service based on the dossier and the standards contained in this Promotion Document. The purpose of the report is to aid the work of the Promotion Committee and is advisory only.

3. Timing of Report

The report must be completed and made available to the candidate no later than eight business days before the Promotion Committee meeting on the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response to the report within three business days of its receipt. The written response must be submitted to the Dean.

4. Availability to Faculty

The report, the candidate’s response (if any), and the candidate’s dossier must be made available to faculty eligible to vote at least five business days before the Promotion Committee vote on the candidate.

5. Promotion Committee Meeting on Candidates

The Promotion Committee will meet to discuss and evaluate the merits of each candidate’s application for promotion in light of the dossier and the Subcommittee’s report and recommendation. The co-chairs of the Committee will preside. In accordance with the voting rules set forth in VII.D, the Committee will make a recommendation to the Dean on each candidate’s application.

6. Notice to Candidates
All candidates will receive notice in writing of the Committees’ recommendations and a copy of any report(s) that are made of the candidate’s credentials within the timeframe outlined in the calendar set forth in Appendix H. All candidates have the right to respond in writing to the Committees’ recommendations within three business days. The response must be submitted to the Dean. Copies of any such response will be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels.

7. **Dean’s Review**

Upon receiving recommendations for promotion, the Dean will conduct a review of the candidate’s application based on the Promotion Committee’s recommendation and the candidate’s dossier. The Dean will make an independent assessment of whether to support the recommendation. In all instances of a positive recommendation, the Dean will notify the candidate and will forward the candidate’s record to the Provost for the next stage of review within the timeframe outlined in the calendar set forth in Appendix H.

Candidates not recommended by the Dean must receive a written decision and rationale no later than ten business days after the Dean’s decision.

8. **Provost’s Review**

The Provost will conduct an independent review of the materials forwarded by the Dean and any other related materials directly relevant to the Lecturer’s or Academic Professional’s candidacy for promotion. The Provost will make a recommendation in each case, forward the recommendations to the President, and notify the Dean. Within three business days after receiving notice of the Provost’s recommendation, the Dean will notify the candidate of the Provost’s recommendation.

Before forwarding a negative recommendation to the President, the Provost will consult with the Dean. In response to the query from the Provost, the Dean may gather additional information from the candidate and other materials directly related to the Lecturer’s or Academic Professional’s candidacy. The Dean will notify the candidate of his/her reply to the Provost.

9. **President’s Review**

The President will conduct an independent review of the candidate’s dossier and related materials and recommendations. The decision will be communicated to the Dean, who will notify the candidate within three business days after receiving notice of the president’s decision.

10. **Appeals**

A Lecturer or Academic Professional may appeal a negative recommendation of the Dean regarding promotion to the Provost in the manner provided by the Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Section VII. Appeals) within ten business days of receipt of the Dean’s decision.
Candidates may appeal to the President a negative recommendation by the Provost or a decision by the Provost rejecting the candidate’s appeal to the Provost in accordance with the Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Section VII. Appeals).

**VII. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND STRUCTURED REVIEWS OF LAW LIBRARIAN FACULTY**

The College of Law’s ability to achieve its educational, academic, and professional missions requires a committed faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, research, and service. The College regularly assesses faculty achievement in these areas through reappointment and promotion reviews. This document sets forth the criteria, standards, and procedures for conducting such reviews of Law Librarians in the College of Law, who are non-tenure track faculty (“NTT”). The policies and procedures contained in this document must be read in conjunction with the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, as approved on March 24, 2022, and the bylaws and policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

As aptly noted in the University’s Promotion Manual, “[p]romotion decisions for NTT faculty are extremely important to the professional life of the faculty member and the institution.” This document is meant to safeguard these interests and afford Law Librarians with notice, fairness, and the opportunity and resources needed for successful promotion and ongoing professional development.

**A. Qualification for Appointment**

Law Librarians at Georgia State University College of Law Library must hold a Master’s degree in librarianship granted by a program accredited by the American Library Association. The degree in librarianship constitutes the librarian’s fundamental professional and academic credentials.

1. **Qualifications for Appointment in Specific Ranks**

1. **Law Librarian Instructor** requires completion of professional training, marked by the Master’s degree in Librarianship from a library school program accredited by the American Library Association or the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, and recommendations from references.

2. **Law Librarian Assistant Professor** requires a record of successful performance and evidence of ability to sustain a broad range of professional responsibility and activity. However, a librarian who has special competence required for the position under consideration, but who lacks previous experience at the professional level, may be appointed to the rank of Law Librarian Assistant Professor.
3. **Law Librarian Associate Professor** requires a record of substantial accomplishment, both in the librarian’s specific area of professional responsibility and in contributions to the profession.

4. **Law Librarian Professor** requires a record of outstanding accomplishment, both in job-related performance and in contributions to the profession.

**B. Support, Evaluation, and Reappointment**

1. **In General**

Upon the arrival of each newly hired law librarian, the Associate Dean for Library & Information Services (hereinafter Associate Dean) will designate a law librarian to serve as a mentor for the new law librarian. Mentors will provide support and guidance that will aid the new colleague in his or her professional development. At the same time, mentors are not meant to be the only source of communication, but to facilitate the faculty’s commitment to providing regular, constructive, and candid advice.

The College of Law Non-Tenure Review Manual will be presented to each new law librarian soon after employment begins. During the new law librarian’s orientation session with the Associate Dean, the Manual will be distributed and discussed. In addition, the Associate Dean will be responsible for reviewing the promotion process with the librarian and discussing opportunities and means to progress toward fulfilling the requirements.

Another source of support is provided by the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development. This office oversees a series of programs designed for junior faculty development and enrichment. Law librarians are encouraged to participate in these programs.

**C. Annual Review**

Law Librarians are evaluated by their direct supervisor on an annual basis for their performance and accomplishments in the three areas of teaching, service, and research. Librarians will also be evaluated according to the schedule for the entirety of their work toward promotion.

**D. Structured Reviews for Professional Development and Planning**

Law Librarians will receive a structured review during their second year of employment to provide them with guidance on their progress toward promotion and to identify opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential in terms of their contribution to the University. If a Law Librarian Instructor chooses to apply for promotion during the second year of employment, the structured review is also the review for promotion to Law Librarian Assistant Professor. Law Librarians will be reviewed every five years following a promotion, or earlier at a law librarian’s
request. If a Law Librarian is promoted, subsequent reviews will occur every five years after the promotion. The purpose of these reviews is to examine the individual’s contributions and achievements since his or her last review and to assist the Law Librarian in developing professional goals for the next five years.

Procedures for the structured review are in Appendix K of this document.

E. Timing Policies for Promotion

1. In General

A maximum of three years’ credit toward the minimum periods identified below may be allowed for service at another institution or within Georgia State University. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing at the time of the initial appointment and approved by the Provost.

2. Promotion from Law Librarian Instructor to Law Librarian Assistant Professor

A candidate is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to Law Librarian Assistant Professor beginning in the second year of service and no later than the fifth year of service. If promotion is not received after five years of service, a terminal appointment of one year will be granted.

3. Promotion from Law Librarian Assistant Professor to Law Librarian Associate Professor / Law Librarian Associate Professor to Law Librarian Professor

For promotion to all other ranks, candidates must wait a minimum of 4 years between applications for promotions at Georgia State University, other than from Law Librarian Instructor to Law Librarian Assistant Professor.

F. Promotion Standards

1. In General

Promotion recommendations of law librarians shall be based on demonstrated excellence in teaching and high quality institutional and professional service (as defined in §IV.C.4.b above). It is necessary to meet the standards in both of the areas. Promotion decisions entail not only an evaluation of a candidate’s existing contributions and accomplishments, but a predictive assessment of the candidate’s commitment to continued excellence and productivity in these areas. More rigorous standards and expectations are applied at successive promotion levels.

If a law librarian serves an additional role in the law school, such as IT Director, activities in that professional area, for example law school technology, which parallel the activities in law librarianship required for promotion will be considered as part of the promotion process.
Each year, the Associate Dean for Library and Information Services will convene a meeting to explain promotion policies and answer questions about any and all phases of the promotion process. This meeting shall be open to all interested Law Library faculty members.

2. Standards for Evaluation

a) Promotion from Law Librarian Instructor to Law Librarian Assistant Professor

To qualify for promotion from Law Librarian Instructor to Law Librarian Assistant Professor, the law librarian must demonstrate excellence in teaching (as defined in Section IV.C.4.b above) as well as high quality internal service (as defined in Section IV.C.4.c above) and high quality research, if performed (as defined in Section IV.C.4.d. above). The committee may look to AALL competencies for guidance.

Examples of activities that may be used to qualify for promotion to Law Librarian Assistant Professor include:

- Teaching as a guest lecturer in College of Law or University courses; creating, selecting, and managing catalog records according to national standards and accepted practices; or providing skilled and customized reference services
- Serving as a member of a Law Library committee, a College of Law Committee, or a University committee
- Attending internal or local meetings, trainings, or other continuing education opportunities

b) Promotion from Law Librarian Assistant Professor to Law Librarian Associate Professor

To qualify for promotion from Law Librarian Assistant Professor to Law Librarian Associate Professor, the law librarian must demonstrate excellence in teaching (as defined in Section II.C.4.b above), high quality internal and external service (as defined in Section IV.C.4.c above), high quality research, if performed (as defined in Section II.C.4.d. above). The committee may look to AALL competencies for guidance.

Examples of activities that may be used to qualify for promotion to Law Librarian Associate Professor include:

- Teaching as a guest lecturer or course instructor in College of Law or University courses; creating, selecting, and managing catalog records according to national standards and accepted practices; or providing skilled and customized reference services
- Serving as a member or leader of a committee in the Law Library, College of Law, or University, as well as in a professional association or organization
• Attending or presenting as a speaker at a local or regional professional meeting, webinar, or conferences; publishing book reviews or short articles in professional magazines or newsletters

c) Promotion from Law Librarian Associate Professor to Law Librarian Professor

Attainment of Law Librarian Professor status is not simply the next step on the promotion ladder. It reflects recognition that a law librarian has attained a national reputation for achievement and standing in the profession as a teacher, librarian, and professionally-engaged colleague. Both the quantity and quality of the record required for this review should substantially surpass that required for the rank of Law Librarian Associate Professor.

To qualify for promotion from Law Librarian Associate Professor to Law Librarian Professor, the law librarian must demonstrate teaching (as defined in Section IV.C.4.b above) which has a sustained level of competence and effectiveness that is evaluated as excellent with continued growth in the time period since the last promotion; high quality service (as defined in Section IV.C.4.c above) to the department, college and/or university, and/or to the professional and practice community; and high quality research (as defined in Section IV.C.4.d. above), if performed. The committee may look to AALL competencies for guidance.

Examples of activities that may be used to qualify for promotion to Law Librarian Professor include:

• Teaching courses in the College of Law or University, including proposing or planning new courses; creating, selecting, and managing catalog records according to national standards and accepted practices; or providing skilled and customized reference services

• Serving as a member or leader of a committee in the Law Library, College of Law, or University, as well as in a professional association or organization; this may also be demonstrated through librarian-mentorship activities including recruitment to the profession and supervision of library interns; service on an editorial or advisory board

• Producing scholarly publications such as articles in professional journals, whether or not peer-reviewed, authoring CALI lessons, book chapters, bibliographies, and serving as an editor for a newsletter or other publication; presenting as a speaker at a national meeting, webinar, or conference; taking workshops or courses in professional development

G. Law Library Committee on Promotion

1. Function
The Law Library Committee on Promotion will review the professional competence and contributions of the law librarian being considered for promotion. The Committee is responsible for recommending action regarding promotion to the Associate Dean.

2. Composition and Eligibility

The Committee, appointed by the Associate Dean, will be composed of four members: a College of Law Associate Dean (other than the Associate Dean for Library & Information Services), a non-library tenure track or non-tenure track College of Law faculty member, and two law librarians holding rank at or above the current rank of the librarian being considered for promotion. The Associate Dean will serve ex-officio. If there are not enough librarians holding rank at or above the current rank of the librarian being considered, then the Associate Dean in consultation with the Dean of the College of Law will appoint law librarian faculty members to round out the Committee. If there are not enough qualified law librarian faculty to round out the committee then committee members will be selected from the College of Law tenure track or non-tenure track faculty. Only persons who have been employed at Georgia State University Law Library at least one full year will be eligible to serve on the Committee. Persons serving on the Committee may not be considered for promotion during their tenure on the Committee. The Committee will be formed only during a fiscal year in which a law librarian will go up for promotion.

H. Procedures Relating to Promotion

1. Process

a) Provision of Notice

In the spring of each academic year (see calendar in Appendix H), law librarians who wish to be considered for promotion will give the Associate Dean a letter requesting consideration for promotion. After the Associate Dean appoints the Committee on Promotion, the letters are sent to the chair of the Committee.

b) Documentation

Documentation demonstrating a candidate’s readiness for promotion may come from any relevant source. All documentation of a candidate’s readiness for promotion should be organized into a dossier. A typical dossier includes the following components:

a. A letter of application that explains why the candidate believes that he/she is qualified for promotion;

b. A curriculum vitae;

c. Letters of recommendation, if applicable;
d. The candidate’s current job description and all evaluations from the promotion period under consideration, including College of Law or University teaching evaluations if applicable;

e. Highlights of the candidate’s professional experience;

f. A review of the candidate’s teaching (as defined in Section IV.C.4.b above) including job-related products produced such as original cataloging records, finding aids, instructional handouts, bibliographies, brochures, electronic products such as web pages and computer programs, policies drafted, etc.;

g. A review of the candidate’s service to the Law Library, University, and the profession (as defined in Section IV.C.4.c above) including committee activities, internal or external professional service, workshops or training presented, external evaluations from workshops or trainings, etc.;

h. A review of the candidate’s contribution to research (as defined in Section IV.C.4.d above), if performed, including continuing education courses, professional organization affiliations, contributions to research, and other creative activities.

Descriptions of items listed in §f-h above should include the charge of the committee, the goal of the workshop, the audience or potential impact of the publication, the candidate’s role in the committee, or how the activity is relevant to the Library, University, or the profession.

If the candidate desires, the following may be included:

i. Letters of appreciation;

j. Examples of work product.

Candidates may wish to consult with their supervisor and colleagues on the preparation of their dossier. Dossiers are returned to the candidate after the promotion process is completed.

References

Letters of recommendation are required for some promotions and optional for others, as outlined below. Letters of recommendation are part of the dossier, and it is the responsibility of the candidate to seek letters of recommendation and include them in the dossier. The letters of recommendation should address the candidate’s teaching, service, and research, (as defined in Section IV.C.4.d above) to the degree possible. Potential references to request letters of recommendation from include: co-presenters, co-authors, committee chairs, executive board members, past supervisors, librarians with similar job responsibilities, or other such colleagues.

(1) Promotion to Law Librarian Assistant Professor

Letters of recommendation are not required at this level.
Promotion to Law Librarian Associate Professor

A minimum of three external letters of recommendation are required. Promotion candidates should solicit letters from recommenders directly and letters should be sent to the candidate. Letter writers must state the nature of their relationship with the candidate. The candidate is responsible for including copies of the letters in the dossier.

Promotion to Law Librarian Professor

A minimum of five external letters of recommendation are required. The letters must be submitted with the dossier. Promotion candidates should solicit letters from recommenders directly and letters should be sent to the candidate. Letter writers must state the nature of their relationship with the candidate. The candidate is responsible for including copies of the letters in the dossier.

2. Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching (as defined in Section IV.C.4.b above) includes instruction in small groups in library sponsored programs, class visits as guest lecturer, and other similar tasks. The following may be considered in evaluating a candidate’s teaching in the promotion period:

- Sample work product, such as original cataloging, research guides, instructional handouts and bibliographies, brochures, electronic products such as web pages and computer programs, or other pertinent evidence of job performance
- Candidate’s statement of teaching goals and methods, student evaluations of teaching, or any evidence of teaching dedication, effectiveness, or innovation
- Supporting documents, such as syllabi, assignments, or workshop or program handouts
- Student advisement, teaching load, or creation of new courses
- Documentation of instruction, such as handouts, syllabi, or presentation materials

3. Evaluation of Service

Evaluation of a candidate’s service (as defined in Section IV.C.4.c above) should consider both internal and external service, with an expectation that a librarian performs an increasing level of external service as progressing through the ranks. Factors include: the nature and extent of the service activities, the candidate’s engagement in an appropriate level of institutional responsibility, and the candidate’s capacity to assume leadership responsibilities.

To evaluate these factors, the committee will review the candidate’s own statement; record of service including committee activities, workshops presented, publications, etc.; input from the Associate Dean; any letters of recommendation included in the dossier; and input from chairs of Law Library, College of Law, or University committees on which the candidate has served during the promotional period.

4. Evaluation of Research
Evaluation of a candidate’s research (as defined in Section IV.C.4.c above) should consider the candidate’s demonstrated commitment to professional and continuing education activities. Further, as a librarian progresses through the ranks, there is a heightened expectation that a librarian engage in scholarship activities that produce print or electronic publications such as books, book chapters, journal/magazine/newsletter articles, book reviews, bibliographies, blogs, CALI lessons, or born-digital publications.

When evaluating these contributions, the committee will consider the candidate’s chronological description of contributions to research and other creative activities, the candidate’s chronological description of professional activities including continuing education courses, citation frequency reports, input from the Associate Dean, and any letters of recommendation included in the dossier.

5. Decision

The Committee on Promotion, in strict confidence, will review all documentation, vote on all candidates, and forward written recommendations with supporting evidence to the Associate Dean. Voting will be by written ballot, and decisions will be determined by majority vote. In the case of a tie, each side will forward a written recommendation, with supporting evidence, to the Associate Dean. After the promotion procedures are completed, the chair will destroy all ballots. If a Committee member resigns or becomes unable to serve for the entire year, the Associate Dean will appoint a replacement.

It will forward in writing its recommendations, the vote of the Committee, and a paragraph of justification for each candidate to the Associate Dean. The candidate will receive a copy of the paragraph of justification outlining the Committee’s decision. Candidates have three business days from receipt of the recommendation in which to submit a written response to the Associate Dean.

The Associate Dean will review the documentation and notify the candidate in writing of his/her decision. The candidate will have three business days to submit a written response. The Associate Dean will also inform the Committee on Promotion of his/her recommendation regarding each candidate. The Associate Dean will forward the candidate’s file to the Dean of the College of Law for review.

6. Dean’s Review

Upon receiving a recommendation from the Associate Dean, the Dean will conduct a review of the candidate’s application and make an independent assessment of whether to support the recommendation. The Dean will forward the candidate’s record to the Provost for the next stage of review for all positive recommendations.

Candidates must receive a written decision and rationale no later than ten business days after the Dean’s decision.
7. **Appeals**

Candidates may appeal a negative recommendation of the Dean to the Provost in the manner provided by the University’s Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Section VII. Appeals) within ten business days of receipt of the Dean’s decision.

Candidates may appeal to the President a negative recommendation by the Provost or a decision by the Provost rejecting the candidate’s appeal to the Provost in accordance with the University’s Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Section VII. Appeals).

**VIII. AMENDMENTS**

Revisions or changes to this Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual may be made as follows:

1. **Portions of the Manual Governing Law Librarians**

Any GSU College of Law Librarian can suggest changes to this document. Any revisions must be approved by at least two thirds of the law librarians and be consistent with the University’s Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Board of Regent’s policies. Substantive changes also must be reviewed and approved by the Dean of the College of Law and the Provost.

2. **Portions of the Manual Governing Non-Tenure Track Faculty who are not Law Librarians**

Any faculty member can suggest changes to this document. Any revision may be approved at any meeting of the faculty by a majority present, provided that there is a quorum and that the proposed revision has been presented to the faculty at least seven days in advance of the meeting at which it is to be voted upon. All substantive changes must be reviewed and approved by the Provost.
APPENDIX A – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

Georgia State University College of Law
Faculty Annual Review Summary Report – Tenure-Track Faculty
(to be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Itemized Points (indicate type A or B)</th>
<th>A Points</th>
<th>B Points</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Rating (Likert scale 1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under Itemized Points, include any points carried over from previous years. Do not include points to be carried over to subsequent.

Specify here any points to be carried over to subsequent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category &amp; Type of Points to be Carried Over</th>
<th>Academic Year in Which Points were Earned</th>
<th>Number of Unused Points to be Carried Over to Subsequent Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1538 Comments:
Faculty Annual Review Questionnaire
(to be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean)

Please complete the following self-assessment questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide you an opportunity to highlight your most significant achievements during current academic year and to provide qualitative detail regarding those achievements.

1. Summarize your most significant scholarly achievements in during the current academic year, including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. Note if any of your research is supported by external funding. Report any awards you received related to your scholarship. Describe any aspects of your scholarship that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

2. Summarize your most significant achievements in teaching during the current academic year, including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. List all courses that you taught in 2020 by semester and indicate the credit hours for each one. Report any awards you received related to your scholarship. Describe any aspects of your scholarship that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

3. Summarize your most significant achievements in service to the College of Law, Georgia State University, or the legal profession during the current academic year, including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. List all your committee assignments and roles. Report any awards you received related to your teaching. Describe any aspects of your teaching that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

4. Summarize your most significant achievements in student success during the current academic year, including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. List all your committee assignments and roles. Report any awards you received related to your teaching. Describe any aspects of your teaching that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

5. Summarize any additional significant achievements during the current academic year that you would like to highlight that are not included elsewhere in this assessment. This may include service to the profession, media appearances, public service, legal practice, advocacy work, etc. Report any awards you received related to these activities. Describe any aspects of these activities that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

6. Did you provide any consulting related to funded research in the current academic year here at GSU on projects for which you are not listed as an investigator in Digital Measures? If so, please list the projects, a brief description of the research, any funding that it has received, and the approximate number of hours you spent consulting. (Any information about your own funded research should be discussed in response to Question 1 above.)
7. Did you provide any consulting related to non-funded research in the current academic year here at GSU? If so, please list the research, a brief description of the research, and the approximate number of hours you spent consulting.

8. Did you co-teach with any non-College of Law GSU colleagues in the current academic year? If so, please list the colleagues and courses or events with a brief description and the approximate number of hours you spent co-teaching.

9. Did you teach non-College of Law GSU students in the current academic year? If so, please list the courses or events with a brief description and the approximate number of hours you spent teaching.

10. Were you hired as part of the 2CI initiative or the Next Generation Program? If so, in what cluster or area of expertise were you hired and in what year?

11. How would you rate your performance in the current academic year? Did you meet all of the goals that you identified? If not, why not?

12. What are your primary goals in teaching, scholarship, and service for the coming academic year? Please be specific. What obstacles do you anticipate in achieving those goals? How might you overcome those obstacles?

13. Would you like to be considered for any College of Law, university, or external awards? A list of College of Law awards can be found at this link. A list of university awards can be found at this link. If you would like to be nominated for an award, please provide a summary of qualifications that could serve as the basis for a nomination and any other information about yourself or the award that would be helpful.

14. Please select the events below that you attended in the current academic year. (Select all that apply)

- [ ] [DATE] [EVENT]
- [ ] [DATE] [EVENT]
- [ ] [DATE] [EVENT]

List any additional College of Law or University events that you attended in the current academic year that are not listed including center events, faculty presentations and admissions events.
APPENDIX C – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW FORM

Georgia State University College of Law
Faculty Annual Review
(to be submitted by the Dean to the Provost)

Faculty Information

First Name:
Last Name:
Employee ID:
Job Title:
Rank:
Years in Rank:

Annual Workload Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction/Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Scholarly Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Administration/Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Instructions

In each category, the dean must evaluate performance during the past calendar year on the following scale:

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

The meaning of each qualifying term is determined by the disciplinary norms and expectations set by the College of Law for a given faculty job type, rank, and workload allocation.

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

When rating the faculty member’s performance in each workload area, the supervisor should consider pertinent student success activities for that area, as defined by the College of Law.
Annual Evaluation

Name of Dean:

Date of Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Administration/Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Overall Assessment

Below, supervisor should indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to the individual’s rank, tenure status and/or career stage, as applicable. Satisfactory progress is met when an individual earns a minimum rating of “3 – Meets Expectations” in all three workload areas. If the faculty member receives a rating of “1 – Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2 – Needs Improvement” in any of the categories, a Performance Remediation Plan must be completed in section 5 below.

Overall: Is the faculty member making satisfactory progress in all workload categories? Y/N

Comments:

750 words max
Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

If the supervisor rates the faculty member’s performance as “1 – Does Not Meet Expectations” or 2 – Needs Improvement” in any of the performance categories, the supervisor must provide a performance remediation plan, in consultation with the faculty member. The components of the PRP must include the following:

- clearly defined goals or outcomes,
- an outline of activities to be undertaken,
- a timetable,
- available resources and support,
- expectations for improvement, and
- a monitoring strategy.

The PRP may be entered in the text box below or uploaded as a Word document (750 words maximum).

Optional Faculty Written Response

The faculty member may submit a written response to this evaluation no more than 10 business days after receiving the evaluation (750 words maximum).
Supervisor Response to Faculty Written Response

The supervisor’s response to the faculty member’s written response (if any) must be entered below no more than 10 business days after receiving faculty member’s written response (750 words maximum).

750 words max

Signatures

Faculty Member
I certify that I have reviewed this written evaluation.

_______________________________  _________________
signature  date

Dean
I certify that I have reviewed this written evaluation

_______________________________  _________________
signature  date
APPENDIX D-ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR CLINICAL FACULTY

B. Metrics for Clinical Faculty

The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

(* = student success activities)

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Type B Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom instruction</td>
<td>student research supervision*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># credits for a course divided by the number of clinical faculty teaching that clinic, not including supervising attorneys = # points</td>
<td>(e.g. independent study, law review note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course release for external research funding, administrative appointment, service in externship program, or service as library director</td>
<td>heavy student organization supervision*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light student organization supervision*</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities
publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of a complete draft for publication and the publication date.

### Type A Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (&gt;10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application non-PI or not lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minor grant application PI or lead author
(<25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome) 2 points

pro bono writings, principal author (*)
(e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)
(student success activity if students are involved in drafting) 2 points

online new media series
(e.g. production of multi-episode podcast) 2 points

preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities
(must be pre-approved by dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over) 2 points

Type B Points

publication in professional or popular press
(e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest) 1 point

new CLE materials, published educational materials
(e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids) 1 point

academic or professional conference presentation 1 point

3. Service/Administration/Management

(see Appendix M for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

Type A Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type B Points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
<td>1 point for each organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(serving as a reference)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of reference*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program supervision*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional organization leadership position</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Requirements for Clinical Faculty in their First Year

Clinical faculty have an annual workload allocation of T 50% / R 10% / S 40%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a typical clinical faculty member must teach a clinic, externship, or equivalent activity in two semesters each academic year. After the first year of service, each clinical faculty member should either teach one additional course during the year or engage in equivalent activity.
- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead of counting those points in the year that they are earned.

In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, **individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category** as indicated in the following table.
D. Requirements for Clinical Faculty in their Second Year and Subsequent Years

Clinical faculty have an annual workload allocation of T 50% / R 10% / S 40%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a typical clinical faculty member must teach a clinic, externship, or equivalent activity in two semesters each academic year. After the first year of service, each clinical faculty member should either teach one additional course during the year or engage in equivalent activity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead of counting those points in the year that they are earned.

In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed / total points needed (A points + B points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 80%</td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 20 %</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E-ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR LECTURERS

A. Metrics for Lecturers

The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

* = student success activities

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Type B Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Lawyering Foundations course section</td>
<td>Development of new College of Law course offering or complete redesign of existing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points per semester</td>
<td># credit hours of new course = # points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching additional course offering</td>
<td>Development of new problem materials for Lawyering Foundations course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># credits = # points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course release for University or COL award or for external research funding</td>
<td>Development of instructional module for Lawyering Foundations course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time course release for other reason with dean’s approval</td>
<td>Development of instructional module or materials for another faculty member’s course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modification or enhancement of existing College of Law course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development and distribution of exercises for Lawyering Foundations course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 exercises = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student research supervision* (e.g. independent study, law review note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 student research supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heavy student organization supervision* (≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>light student organization supervision* (&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest lecturer in another faculty member’s course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic or professional conference presentation in area of teaching specialty
2 points

### Hosting academic or professional conference
2 points

### Academic or professional conference attendance related to teaching specialty
1 point

---

#### 2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities

*publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of a complete draft for publication and the publication date.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (&gt;10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application non-PI or not lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor grant application PI or lead author (&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono writings, principal author (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online new media series</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Service/Administration/Management

(see Appendix M for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic program administration</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All type A Research activities</td>
<td>points as allocated in tenure track Annual Review document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
<td>1 point per candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
<td>1 point for each organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement* (serving as a reference)</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of reference or recommendation*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program supervision*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member, committee chair role, or other formal leadership role in a professional association</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)

preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities
(must be pre-approved by dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over)
Completion of Assessments Examining Students’ Achievement of COL Learning Outcomes  1 point

Lawyering Foundations Program committee  1 point

All type B Research activities  points as allocated in tenure track Annual Review document

B. Requirements for Lecturers in their First Year

Lecturers have an annual workload allocation of T 90% / R 0% / S 10%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned.

In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 90%</td>
<td>12(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 10%</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Metrics for Lecturers in their Second Year and Subsequent Years

The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

* = student success activities
### 1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Lawyering Foundations course section</td>
<td>6 points per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching additional course offering</td>
<td># credits = # points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course release for University or COL award or for external research funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time course release for other reason with dean’s approval</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of new College of Law course offering or complete redesign of existing course</td>
<td># credit hours of new course = # points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new problem materials for Lawyering Foundations course</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of instructional module for Lawyering Foundations course</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of instructional module or materials for another faculty member’s course</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification or enhancement of existing College of Law course</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and distribution of exercises for Lawyering Foundations course</td>
<td>5 exercises = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student research supervision* (e.g. independent study, law review note)</td>
<td>1 student research supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy student organization supervision* (≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light student organization supervision* (&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturer in another faculty member’s course</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or professional conference presentation in area of teaching specialty</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting academic or professional conference</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or professional conference attendance related to teaching specialty</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities

- A publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of a complete draft for publication and the publication date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (≥10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (≥25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application non-PI or not lead author (≥25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor grant application PI or lead author (&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono writings, principal author (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online new media series (e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities (must be pre-approved by dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publication in professional or popular press (e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new CLE materials, published educational materials (e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Service/Administration/Management**

(see Appendix M for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Type B Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>peer review for journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>student advising*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic program administration</td>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All type A Research activities</td>
<td>student job placement* (serving as a reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>letter of reference or recommendation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>certificate program supervision*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board member, committee chair role, or other formal leadership role in a professional association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of Assessments Examining Students’ Achievement of COL Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyering Foundations Program committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All type B Research activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type A Points**
- high intensity committee: 3 points + 1 point for chair
- medium intensity committee: 2 points + 1 point for chair
- low intensity committee: 1 point + 1 point for chair
- academic program administration: 2 points
- All type A Research activities: points as allocated in tenure track Annual Review document

**Type B Points**
- peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report): 1 point per candidate
- peer review for journal: 1 point
- student advising*: 1 point for every 5 students
- advisor to student organization*: 1 point for each organization
- student job placement* (serving as a reference): 1 point for every 5 students
- letter of reference or recommendation*: 1 point
- student counseling, non-academic*: 1 point for every 5 students
- certificate program supervision*: 1 point
- Board member, committee chair role, or other formal leadership role in a professional association: 1 point
- pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement): 1 point
- Completion of Assessments Examining Students’ Achievement of COL Learning Outcomes: 1 point
- Lawyering Foundations Program committee: 1 point
- All type B Research activities: points as allocated in tenure track Annual Review document

**D. Requirements for Lecturers in their Second Year and Subsequent Years**
Lecturers have an annual workload allocation of T 90% / R 0% / S 10%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned.

In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, **individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category** as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 90%</td>
<td>12(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 10 %</td>
<td>3(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F-ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

A. Metrics for Academic Professionals

The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

* = student success activities

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom instruction</td>
<td># credits = # points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student research supervision*</td>
<td>(e.g. independent study, law review note, dissertation or thesis, revision for publication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guest lecture for another class or department</td>
<td>1 point per guest lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy student organization supervision*</td>
<td>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light student organization supervision*</td>
<td>(&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities

publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of a complete draft for publication and the publication date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Points per publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal</td>
<td>4 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&gt;10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal</td>
<td>3 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal</td>
<td>2 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication of chapter in academic or professional book,</td>
<td>4 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project,</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantial progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project,</td>
<td>2 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>3 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4 points per publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4 points per grant application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application non-PI or not lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points per grant application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor grant application PI or lead author (&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points per grant application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor grant application non-PI or not lead author</td>
<td>1 point per grant application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono writings, principal author (*) (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.) (student success activity if students are involved in drafting)</td>
<td>2 points per writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online new media series (e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)</td>
<td>2 points per production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities (must be pre-approved by dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over)</td>
<td>2 points per project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of tools or practical resources for translation or dissemination of research or legal information</td>
<td>2 points per resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high intensity qualitative or quantitative faculty research support</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type B Points**

| publication in professional or popular press (e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest) | 1 point per publication |
| media quotes or appearances | 1 point per 5 media quotes or appearances |
| new CLE materials, published educational materials (e.g. CALI lessons, study aids) | 1 point per material |
| academic or professional conference presentation or moderating | 1 point per presentation |

2. **Service/Administration/Management**

(see Appendix M for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>center/initiative/program management (administration/finances/communications, etc.)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee (COL, GSU, or USG)</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee (COL, GSU, or USG)</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee (COL, GSU, or USG)</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference/symposium/event/workshop/training development</td>
<td>1 point per event under four hours, 2 points per 4-8 hour event, 3 points per multi-day event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate or dual degree program management*</td>
<td>2 points per program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal management (*) (student success activity if it involves student editors)</td>
<td>2 points per journal issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
<td>1 point per review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal or non-profit research organization (Pew Trusts, Vera Institute, etc.)</td>
<td>1 point per review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruitment for admissions* (meeting with prospective students, attending admissions events, coordinating with Admissions, etc.)</td>
<td>2 points per event, 1 point for every 5 student meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy student organization supervision* (≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light student organization supervision* (&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor for moot court competition</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Points Calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement*</td>
<td>1 point for sharing jobs (not per job), 1 pt for every 3 reference letters, 1 pt each for each career panel or other networking activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(letter of reference, communicating job opportunities, coordinating with Professional Development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university program assessment and evaluation report</td>
<td>2 points per report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional organization leadership position</td>
<td>2 points per position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant administration (≥ 5 hours per semester)</td>
<td>2 points per grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation on hiring committees for faculty or staff</td>
<td>1 point per committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance and participation at key events (Miller lecture, orientation, honors day awards, graduation, Ben Johnson, etc.)</td>
<td>1 point per 3 events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation on NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association</td>
<td>1 point per role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
<td>1 point per 8 hours pro bono legal work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Requirements for Academic Professionals**

Academic professionals have an annual workload allocation of T 0% / R 0% / S 100%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead of counting those points in the year that they are earned.
- Academic professionals may earn points for any type of work included in other rubrics, in accordance with the responsibilities of their positions.
- Academic professional appointed at less than 100% FTE shall be evaluated accordingly, with a proportional reduction in minimum requirements.

In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, **individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category**
as well as the total number of points specified for the category as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0%</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 100 %</td>
<td>12(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. APPENDIX G-ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR LAW LIBRARIAN FACULTY

A. Metrics for Law Librarian Faculty

The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

*= student success activities

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full-time professional librarianship*</td>
<td>4 points per semester (including summer semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional librarianship while also teaching course(s) for credit</td>
<td>3 points per semester (including summer semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction – course*</td>
<td># credits = # points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction – guest lecture*</td>
<td>3 guest lectures = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library programming instruction,* includes instructional and outreach programs</td>
<td>3 programs = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of other professionals and staff</td>
<td>1 point for supervision (total FTE supervised = total points, if total is a fraction, round up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of GRAs* or student assistants*</td>
<td>1 point per 2 GRA appointments in academic year; 1 point per 1 FTE student assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New course proposal and preparation</td>
<td>1 point per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant course revision</td>
<td>1 point per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher system implementation, administration, or migration</td>
<td>2 points per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower system implementation, administration, or migration</td>
<td>1 point per</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Type B Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student research supervision*</td>
<td>1 student research supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. independent study, law review note)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student research support*</td>
<td>5 meeting per point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. individual training/guidance for faculty GRAs, extended student research appointments of 30-60 minutes on average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy student organization supervision*</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light student organization supervision*</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current awareness activities and trainings, includes vendor trainings for existing resources, product demonstrations, etc.</td>
<td>3 activities = 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type A Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (≥10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, including annotated bibliography, any length)</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update, annotated bibliography)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities**

Publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of a complete draft for publication and the publication date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Work</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward, introduction, or annotated bibliography</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s manual for textbook or treatise or casebook</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book or database review</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or professional presentation, includes conferences, webinars, and other scheduled programs</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major grant application non-PI or not lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor grant application PI or lead author (&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro bono writings, principal author (*) (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.) (student success activity if students are involved in drafting)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online new media series</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. Professional Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities (must be pre-approved by dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type B Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>newsletter editor</td>
<td>1 point per issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication in professional or popular press (e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new CLE materials, published educational materials (e.g. CALI lessons, teaching materials)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional conference presentation</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or professional roundtable facilitation</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial or advisory board membership</td>
<td>1 point per meeting or issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Service/Administration/Management

(see Appendix M for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

### Type A Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervising interns, students,* other</td>
<td>1 point per supervisee per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference management</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal management (*) (student success activity if it involves student editors)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event management, includes planning</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program management*</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External high intensity committee</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External medium intensity committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External low intensity committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type B Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
<td>1 point for each organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement* (serving as a reference, communicating job opportunities, coordinating with professional development)</td>
<td>1 point for sharing jobs (not per job), 1 point for every 3 reference letters, 1 point for each career panel or other networking activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of reference*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional organization leadership position, heavy (≥ 1 hour per week)</td>
<td>4 points per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional organization leadership position, light (&lt; 1 hour per week)</td>
<td>2 points per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant administration (≥ 5 hours per semester)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benching moot court*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance and participation at key events (e.g. Miller Lecture, orientation, honors day awards, graduation, Ben Johnson, etc.)</td>
<td>1 point for every 3 events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Requirements for Law Librarian Faculty in their First Year

Library faculty in their first year have an annual workload allocation of T 100% / R 0% / S 0%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned.
- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead of counting those points in the year that they are earned.
- A faculty member who takes a leave of absence or has an extended absence will have their workload allocation adjusted accordingly.

In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 100%</td>
<td>12(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>0(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 0%</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Requirements for Law Librarian Faculty in their Second Year and Subsequent Years

Requirements

Library faculty have a typical annual workload allocation of T 80% / R 0% / S 20%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity. Library faculty may adjust their workload by agreement with the Associate Dean for Library and Information Services.

- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned.
- A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead of counting those points in the year that they are earned.
- A faculty member who takes a leave of absence or has an extended absence will have their workload allocation adjusted accordingly.
In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 80%</td>
<td>13(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>0(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 20%</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 50%</td>
<td>11(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 30%</td>
<td>4(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 20%</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 60%</td>
<td>12(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>0(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 40%</td>
<td>6(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H-CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION REVIEW WITHIN THE COLLEGE

A. Clinical Faculty

The timeline identified below is intended as a general guide only. The specific dates for promotion in any given year will be governed by the schedule issued by the Office of the Provost.

March-April: Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development holds meeting regarding promotion policies for all interested faculty members. Co-chairs of the Promotion Committee notify faculty members who are eligible to apply for promotion in the following academic year and seek confirmation of whether they intend to move forward with their application.

April: Candidates intending to apply for promotion in the upcoming academic year notify the Co-Chairs of their plans to do so.

April/May: Co-chairs meet with each of these faculty candidates to review the evaluation process and the materials that must be included in a candidate dossier. Co-chairs will solicit names of potential external reviewers from each candidate.

May: Co-chairs will provide to the Dean a list of the names of all external reviewers who will be asked to provide evaluations of the candidate.

May/June: External reviewers will be solicited and confirmed by co-chairs. Reviewers will be asked to submit their written evaluations no later than September 15.

Early September: All external and internal reviews should be completed in the dossier.

Early September: Candidates’ written statements in support of their application for promotion are due.

Second Week in September: Candidate dossiers should be completed and made available to the Subcommittee.

Second Week in September – Second Week in October: The subcommittee should review the clinical candidate’s application and formulate its recommendation and written report.

Third week in October: The Subcommittee will provide clinical candidates with copies of its report within three business days. Candidates will have three business days to submit a written response.

Late October/early November: Completed candidate dossiers made available to full Promotion Committee
November: Full Promotion Committee meeting to discuss and vote on the candidates for promotion and reappointment. Candidates notified of Committee recommendations within three business days. Candidates will have three business days to submit a written response.

March: Dean completes written review of each candidate’s application and notifies the candidates. The Dean will forward all recommendations to the Provost for further review in accordance with timeline issued by her office.

B. Lecturers and Academic Professionals

The timeline identified below is intended as a general guide only. The specific dates for promotion in any given year will be governed by the schedule issued by the Office of the Provost.

March-April: Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development holds meeting regarding promotion policies for all interested faculty members. The Co-Chairs of the Promotion Committee notify Lecturers and/or Academic Professionals who are eligible to apply for promotion in the following academic year and seek confirmation of whether they intend to move forward with their application.

April: Lecturers intending to apply for promotion in the upcoming academic year notify the Co-Chairs and Director of Lawyering Foundations or, in the case of a Lecturer who is not teaching in the Lawyering Foundations Program, the Director of the program in which the Lecturer teaches of their plans to do so. Academic Professionals intending to apply for promotion in the upcoming academic year notify the Co-Chairs and their faculty supervisors of their plans to do so.

April/May: Co-chairs meet with each of these faculty candidates to review the evaluation process and the materials that must be included in a candidate dossier.

Early September: Candidates’ written statements in support of their application for promotion are due.

Second Week in September: Candidate dossiers should be completed and made available to the Subcommittee.

Second Week in September – Second Week in October: The subcommittee should review the candidate’s application and formulate its recommendation and written report.

Third week in October: The Subcommittee will provide candidates with copies of its report within three business days. Candidates will have three business days to submit a written response.

Late October/early November: Completed candidate dossiers made available to full Promotion Committee
November: Full Promotion Committee meeting to discuss and vote on the candidates for promotion and reappointment. Candidates notified of Committee recommendations within three business days. Candidates will have three business days to submit a written response.

March: Dean completes written review of each candidate’s application and notifies the candidates. The Dean will forward all positive recommendations to the Provost for further review in accordance with the timeline issued by her office.

C. Law Librarian Faculty

Calendar for Promotion Review Within the College

The timeline identified below is intended as a general guide only. The specific dates for promotion in any given year will be governed by the schedule issued by the Office of the Provost.

March-April: Associate Dean holds meeting regarding promotion policies for all interested law library faculty members.

April: Candidates intending to apply for promotion in the upcoming academic year notify the Associate Dean of their plans to do so.

Early October: Candidates’ written statements, dossier, and references (if applicable) in support of their application for promotion are due. Committee for Promotion is appointed.

Late October/early November: Promotion Committee meeting to discuss and vote on the candidates for promotion. Candidates and Associate Dean notified of Committee recommendations within three business days. Candidates will have three business days to submit a written response.

Late November/early December: Candidate notified of the Associate Dean’s recommendation. Candidate will have three business days from the date of notification to submit a written response.
2018 March: Dean completes written review of each candidate’s application, notifies the candidates, and forwards all recommendations to the Provost for further review.

2019

2020
APPENDIX I-Guidelines for Structured Reviews of Clinical Faculty

A. Guidelines for Structured Reviews of Clinical Faculty During the Probationary Period

1. Time of Review:

Each clinical faculty member will be reviewed in the Spring Semester of the faculty member's third academic year at the College of Law. This review will coincide with the annual spring reappointment process. In the case of persons with prior teaching credit at other institutions, the structured review will occur in the spring semester one full year prior to the first year in which they would first be eligible to seek promotion. A clinical faculty member hired with three years of probationary credit may waive this review with written approval of the Dean.

2. Reviewing Committee:

The Clinical Reviewing Committee shall be comprised of the Chairs of the Promotion Committee and two clinical faculty members (where possible) at the Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor levels.

3. Purpose of Review:

The review will provide each clinical faculty member with a clear idea of how adequately he or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and an award of a presumptively renewable annual contract. The review should identify strengths and accomplishments and pinpoint areas in need of improvement.

4. Scope of Review:

The Clinical Reviewing Committee will review the annual reports submitted by the faculty member to the Dean for the years in question and report on the faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The Committee will also review both the student evaluations and the annual faculty teaching evaluations of the clinical faculty candidate. No additional class visitation will be necessary for the structured review. The Committee will also consider internal faculty evaluations of the candidate's research as assigned by the Clinical Reviewing Committee, as well as any external letters that are available; provided that no external evaluation shall be required. The Committee will also interview the faculty member in order to gain information as to the faculty member's achievements and goals.

5. Report of the Committee:

The reports generated for all clinical faculty members under review from year to year will be uniform and in substantially the format which follows. The Clinical Reviewing Committee is to compile the report after the discussion at the Promotion Committee meeting. The report will be based on the review of annual reports (copies of which should be appended to the Clinical Reviewing Committee Report), faculty teaching evaluations, research reviews, the Promotion Committee discussion and the interview with the clinical faculty member. The clinical faculty
member will be given a copy of the draft report and be given the opportunity to suggest additions or corrections to the report. However, the content of the final report remains within the sole discretion of the Clinical Reviewing Committee.

**The form of the report shall be as follows:**

1. **Overview of the Review Period:** Listing of the faculty member’s activities for each semester (including summer semesters) during the period, limited to: full-time teaching at GSU College of Law; full-time teaching at another institution; research leaves (including whether paid or unpaid); reduced or expanded teaching loads; summer grants and summer teaching.

2. **Evaluations of Teaching:**
   - Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.
   - Brief description of any courses that were redesigned or developed by the faculty during the review period.
   - Brief description of teaching at any other institution or any other College within the University.
   - Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.
   - Student course evaluations.
   - Other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

3. **Research:** A list of significant participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; engagement with academic and professional audiences; leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees; and research on pedagogy, the scholarship of teaching and learning, law practice, substantive law or clinical practice, and/or other forms of research.

4. **University Service:** At the College or University levels including committees, task forces, advising student organizations, etc.

5. **Professional Service:** Participation in professional or academic meetings, conferences and workshops; advisory or drafting roles for public officials or entities, professional association participation and/or leadership roles, etc.

6. **Public and Community Service:** Including appointed or elective office, leadership roles in community organizations, etc.

7. **Grants and/or Fellowships Awarded**

8. **Awards and Honors**

9. **Other Evidence of Achievements**
10. Clinical Reviewing Committee Evaluation: the evaluation should discuss the clinical faculty member's progress toward promotion or an award of a presumptively renewable annual contract, including strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member. The suggestions for improvement should identify areas in which a clinical faculty member can improve performance in pursuit of promotion or an award of a presumptively renewable contract and reach their full potential as a faculty member of the University.

11. Current vita of clinical faculty member; copies of faculty member's annual reports for the review period; and copies of evaluations of classroom teaching based on annual class visitations that are conducted by other faculty members for the annual reappointment process.

6. Faculty Discussion of Report

Following the Clinical Reviewing Committee’s completion of the third year evaluation, the Committee shall make it available for review and discussion by the tenured faculty and clinical faculty members of a rank higher than the clinical faculty candidate. This review and discussion shall take place at the spring Promotion Committee meeting in the year of the review after a vote on renewal of the candidate's teaching contract.

7. Role of Faculty Member:

In addition to the clinical faculty member's consultative role in the review process, if the faculty member disagrees with any portion of the Committee report or the Dean's review, he or she may submit a written response which will be attached to the report and made a part thereof. The faculty member is to be given fifteen business days to prepare the response prior to submission of the report to the Dean and prior to the submission of the Dean's review.

8. Role of the Dean:

The Dean is to provide promptly a written review of the Clinical Reviewing Committee report, copies of which are to be submitted to the Committee and the clinical faculty member.

B. Guidelines for Structured Review of Clinical Faculty with a Presumptively Renewable Annual Contract.

1. Time of Review:

Each clinical member of the faculty will be reviewed in the spring semester of the fifth anniversary of the academic year in which the faculty member's most recent promotion or award of a presumptively renewable contract became effective. Subsequent reviews will occur on every fifth anniversary of the first review unless interrupted by a further review for promotion or leave of absence.

2. Reviewing Committee:

The review will be conducted by committee of three Full Professors. Two Full Professors will be elected by the full Promotion Committee each spring to serve on the review committee for all
five-year structured reviews scheduled for the upcoming academic year. The third member of each reviewing committee will be appointed by the individual faculty member who is being reviewed. No faculty member who has been the subject of a five-year structured review within the previous two years shall serve on a Committee to conduct a review of any member of the Committee which reviewed such faculty member.

3. Purposes:

There are two purposes to the five-year review of clinical faculty: first, to assess and summarize the faculty member's contributions and achievements since his or her last review; and second, to assist the faculty member in creating a statement of professional goals for the next five years. The review is intended to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the University and College of Law.

4. Review Process:

The review period will cover the years since the faculty member's last review or, in case of initial reviews, the years since the last promotion decision regarding the faculty member. There are six stages to the review:

1. Summary of Review Period: The faculty member will prepare a report listing:

   ➢ Teaching:
   • semester by semester, the courses taught by the faculty member during the review period, including courses taught at other institutions;
   • Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.
   • Brief description of any courses that were redesigned or developed by the faculty during the review period.
   • Brief description of teaching at any other institution or any other College within the University.
   • Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.
   • Student course evaluations;
   • Other evidence of teaching effectiveness and/or growth in the classroom.
   ➢ any paid or unpaid leaves of absence for research or other purposes;
➢ research activities completed by the faculty member or in progress during the review period;

➢ committee and other administrative assignments in the College of Law and service at the University or professional level;

➢ any awards or grants, including summer research grants, received;

➢ a summary of the faculty member's contributions to professional organizations and public service;

➢ a draft of the faculty member's professional plans for the next five years; and

➢ any other information the faculty member deems relevant to the review period.

5. Report of the Committee

Using the clinical faculty member’s report as well as other sources of information, the Committee will compile its own report.

The form of the report shall be as follows:

a. Overview of the Review Period: Listing of the faculty member's activities for each semester (including summer semesters) during the period, limited to: full-time teaching at GSU College of Law; full-time teaching at another institution; research leaves (including whether paid or unpaid); reduced or expanded teaching loads; summer grants and summer teaching.

b. Evaluation of Teaching:

The College of Law is dedicated to maintaining the highest levels of classroom performance and teaching standards. Apart from any review process, faculty members are encouraged to continually improve their teaching through ongoing, long term collaboration with other faculty and responsiveness to student comments.

In evaluating teaching proficiency, the Committee shall consult, in addition to the candidate’s report:

The Faculty, particularly those teaching related courses or upper division courses for which the reviewed faculty member teaches prerequisites;
The Dean and Associate Dean concerning any complaints or reports they may have received from students and alumni;

Any earlier written reports of classroom visitations;

Course syllabi;

Students enrolled in the faculty member’s course(s);

Student evaluation forms; and

Any other evidence reflective of teaching proficiency.

c. Research: a list of significant participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; interactive engagement with academic and professional audiences; leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees; research on pedagogy, the scholarship of teaching and learning, law practice, substantive law or clinical practice; and any other relevant activities.

d. University Service: at the College or University levels including committees, task forces, advising student organizations, etc.

e. Professional Service: participation in professional or academic meetings, conferences and workshops; advisory or drafting roles for public officials or entities, professional association participation and/or leadership roles, etc.

f. Public and Community Service: including appointive or elective office, leadership roles in community organizations, etc.

g. Grants and/or Fellowships Awarded

h. Awards and Honors

i. Other Evidence of Achievements

j. Committee Evaluation: Evaluation by the Committee discussing a faculty member's strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member.

If the Committee believes there may be a teaching problem, at least two members of the Committee shall visit the faculty member's classes. The Committee shall review any potential problems with the faculty member and identify how to address such problems.
k. Current vita of faculty member; copies of faculty member's annual reports for the review period; and copies of any evaluations of classroom teaching.

6. **Faculty Member’s Report:**

Within ten business days of receiving a copy of the Committee's Summary of the Review Period, the faculty member shall submit a report to the Committee including: any corrections or additions to the Committee's report. The Committee shall incorporate any additional relevant information provided by the clinical faculty member in its Summary of the Review Period.

7. **Meeting:**

The Committee shall meet with the clinical faculty member to discuss the report and the faculty member's plans for the next five years. The Committee should share their general assessment of the clinical faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service and the clinical faculty member's five-year plan.

8. **Faculty Member’s Professional Plan:**

Within one week after meeting with the Committee, the clinical faculty member will send the Committee a final statement of his or her professional plan for the next five years. The statement should cover current projects and responsibilities and whether the faculty member plans to continue them, as well as new projects and specific research, teaching, and service goals for the next five years. The clinical faculty member's plan also should address any deficiencies in research, teaching, or service that were raised by the Committee. If the Committee identified significant deficiencies in teaching, the clinical faculty member will include in his or her five-year plan a specific course of action for addressing the identified deficiencies.

9. **Committee Report to the Dean:**

The Committee shall send to the Dean its Summary of the Review Period and the clinical faculty member's five-year professional plan.

For each clinical faculty member, the Committee shall prepare a written review summarizing the strengths and accomplishments or weaknesses and plans for improvement in teaching, scholarship and service. The Committee may incorporate relevant sections of the Summary of Review Period and the clinical faculty member's professional plan where relevant to its summary.

10. **Role of the Dean:**

The Dean is to provide promptly a written review of the Committee report, copies of which are to be submitted to the Committee and the faculty member.

11. **Role of Faculty Member:**
In addition to the clinical faculty member's consultative role in the review process, if the faculty member disagrees with any portion of the Committee report or the Dean's review, he or she may submit a written response which will be attached to the report and made a part thereof. The clinical faculty member is to be given ten business days to prepare the response prior to submission of the report to the Dean and prior to the submission of the Dean's review and the Committee report to the Provost.

12. **Impact of Review**

1. The results of the review will be linked to rewards and professional development. Clinical faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements. This may include merit pay increases, and study and research leave opportunities.

2. When a clinical faculty member’s review reflects that he or she has not met or maintained the standards of teaching, research, and service expected of that rank of professor, the Dean will work with the clinical faculty member to create a formal plan for faculty development that identifies clearly defined goals and outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, timetables, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. This procedure will be conducted pursuant to Section IV.F.4 of this document.
APPENDIX J-Guidelines for Structured Reviews of Lecturers and Academic Professionals

A. Guidelines for Third-Year Structured Reviews of Lecturers and Academic Professionals

1. Time of Review:

Each Lecturer and Academic Professional will be reviewed in the Spring Semester of the faculty member's third academic year at the College of Law. This review will coincide with the annual spring reappointment process. In the case of persons with probationary credit based upon their experience at other institutions, the structured review will occur in the spring semester one full year prior to the first year in which they would first be eligible to seek promotion. A Lecturer or Academic Professional hired with three years of probationary credit may waive this review with written approval of the Dean.

2. Reviewing Committee:

The Lecturer Reviewing Committee shall be comprised of a Co-Chair of the Promotion Committee or a designee, the Director of Lawyering Foundations or, in the case of a Lecturer who is not teaching in the Lawyering Foundations Program, the Director of the program in which the Lecturer teaches, and two Lecturers (where possible) of higher rank than the candidate under review. The Academic Professional Reviewing Committee shall be comprised of a Co-Chair of the Promotion Committee or a designee, the Director of the Center to which the Academic Professional is assigned, and two Academic Professionals (where possible) of higher rank than the candidate under review.

3. Purpose of Review:

The review will provide each Lecturer and Academic Professional with a clear idea of how adequately he or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion. The review should identify strengths and accomplishments and pinpoint areas in need of improvement.

4. Scope of Review:

The Lecturer Reviewing Committee will review the annual reports submitted by the faculty member to the Dean for the years in question and report on the faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching and service. The Lecturer Reviewing Committee will also review both the student evaluations and the annual faculty teaching evaluations of the Lecturer. No additional class visitation will be necessary for the structured review. The Lecturer Reviewing Committee will also interview the faculty member in order to gain information as to the faculty member's achievements and goals. The Academic Professional Reviewing Committee will review the annual reports submitted by the faculty member to the Dean for the years in question and report on the faculty member’s progress in the area of service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research. If teaching is required, the Committee will also review both the student evaluations and the annual faculty teaching evaluations of the Academic Professional. No additional class
visitation will be necessary for the structured review. If research is required, the Committee will also consider internal faculty evaluations of the candidate’s research as assigned by the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee. The Academic Professional Reviewing Committee will also interview the faculty member in order to gain information as to the faculty member's achievements and goals.

5. Report of the Lecturer Reviewing Committee:

The reports generated for all Lecturers under review from year to year will be uniform and in substantially the format which follows. The Lecturer Reviewing Committee is to compile a report based on a review of annual reports (copies of which should be appended to the Lecturer Reviewing Committee Report), faculty teaching evaluations, the Lecturer Reviewing Committee discussion and the interview with the Lecturer. The Lecturer will be given a copy of the draft report and be given the opportunity to suggest additions or corrections to the report. However, the content of the final report remains within the sole discretion of the Lecturer Reviewing Committee.

The form of the report shall be as follows:

1. Overview of the Review Period: Listing of the faculty member's activities for each semester (including summer semesters) during the period, limited to: full-time teaching at GSU College of Law; reduced or expanded teaching loads; and summer teaching.

2. Evaluations of Teaching:
   - Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.
   - Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.
   - Student course evaluations.
   - Other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

3. University Service: at the College and University levels including committees, task forces, advising student organizations, etc.

4. Professional Service: participation in professional or academic meetings, conferences and workshops; advisory or drafting roles for public officials or entities, professional association participation and/or leadership roles, etc.

5. Public and Community Service: including appointed or elective office, leadership roles in community organizations, etc.

6. Other Evidence of Achievements

7. Lecturer Reviewing Committee Evaluation: the evaluation should discuss the faculty member's progress toward promotion, including strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member. The suggestions for improvement should
identify areas in which the faculty member can improve performance in pursuit of promotion and/or reach their full potential as a faculty member of the University.

8. Current vita of Lecturer; copies of faculty member's annual reports for the review period; and copies of evaluations of classroom teaching based on annual class visitations that are conducted by other faculty members for the annual reappointment process.

6. Report of the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee:

The reports generated for all Academic Professionals under review from year to year will be uniform and in substantially the format which follows. The Academic Professional Reviewing Committee is to compile a report based on a review of annual reports (copies of which should be appended to the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee Report) and the interview with the Academic Professional. If applicable, the Committee also will review faculty teaching evaluations and/or research reviews. The Academic Professional will be given a copy of the draft report and be given the opportunity to suggest additions or corrections to the report. However, the content of the final report remains within the sole discretion of the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee.

The form of the report shall be as follows:

1. Overview of the Review Period: Listing of the faculty member's activities for each semester (including summer semesters) during the period, limited to: service responsibilities and, if applicable, teaching at GSU College of Law; reduced or expanded teaching loads; and summer teaching.

2. Evaluations of Service, as appropriate to the faculty member’s duties and responsibilities:

   ➢ A statement of the academic center’s mission, if applicable, and the candidate’s specific service responsibilities.
   ➢ Evidence of knowledge, skills, and abilities as they relate to performing job requirements;
   ➢ Evidence of work successfully accomplished while maintaining standards and meeting deadlines;
   ➢ Evidence of professionalism and thoroughness of the work produced;
   ➢ Evidence of committee and other administrative assignments in the College of Law and service at the University level;
   ➢ Evidence of contributions to professional organizations and public service;
   ➢ Evidence of community engagement in fulfilling the mission and meeting the needs of the center, College and/or University;
   ➢ Other evidence of effective service.

3. Evaluations of Teaching (if applicable):
➢ Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.

➢ Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.

➢ Student course evaluations.

➢ Other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

4. Research (if applicable): A list of participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; engagement with academic and professional audiences; and leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees and/or any other relevant activities.

5. Other Evidence of Achievements

6. Academic Professional Reviewing Committee Evaluation: the evaluation should discuss the faculty member's progress toward promotion, including strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member. The suggestions for improvement should identify areas in which the faculty member can improve performance in pursuit of promotion and/or reach their full potential as a faculty member of the University.

7. Current vita of Academic Professional; copies of faculty member's annual reports for the review period; and, if applicable, copies of evaluations of classroom teaching based on annual class visitations that are conducted by other faculty members for the annual reappointment process.

7. Faculty Discussion of Report

Following the Lecturer Reviewing Committee’s or the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee’s completion of the third year structured review, the Committee shall make it available for review and discussion by the full Promotion Committee, which consists of tenure-track and clinical faculty members. This review and discussion shall take place at the spring Promotion Committee meeting in the year of the review, after a vote on renewal of the candidate’s contract.

8. Role of Faculty Member:

In addition to the Lecturer’s or Academic Professional’s consultative role in the review process, if the faculty member disagrees with any portion of the Committee report, he or she may submit a written response which will be attached to the report and made a part thereof. The faculty member is to be given three business days to prepare the response prior to submission of the report to the Dean and prior to the submission of the Dean's review.

9. Role of the Dean:
The Dean will review the Lecturer Reviewing Committee report or the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee report and, as necessary, consult with the Lecturer or Academic Professional on his or her progress toward promotion.

B. Guidelines for Subsequent Structured Reviews of Senior Lecturers, Principal Senior Lecturers, and Senior Academic Professionals

1. Time of Review:

Each Lecturer will be reviewed in the spring semester of the fifth anniversary of the academic year in which the faculty member's most recent promotion became effective. Subsequent reviews will occur on every fifth anniversary of the first review unless interrupted by a further review for promotion or leave of absence. Each Academic Professional will be reviewed in the spring semester of the fifth anniversary of the academic year in which the faculty member's promotion became effective. Subsequent reviews will occur on every fifth anniversary of the first review unless interrupted by a leave of absence.

2. Reviewing Committee:

In years in which the candidate is seeking a promotion, the structured review will be conducted by the Faculty Review Subcommittees referenced in Section VI.D.3 of this document. In all other circumstances, the review shall be conducted by the Lecturer Reviewing Committee or the Academic Professional Reviewing Committee.

3. Purposes:

There are two purposes to the five-year review of Lecturers and Academic Professionals: first, to assess and summarize the faculty member's contributions and achievements since his or her last review; and second, to assist the faculty member in creating a statement of professional goals for the next five years. The review is intended to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the University and College of Law.

4. Review Process for Lecturers:

The review period will cover the years since the faculty member's last review or, in case of initial reviews, the years since the last promotion decision regarding the faculty member. In the case of five-year reviews that also constitute a request for promotion, the review shall follow the format identified in Section VI.E in this document. In all other years, the five year reviews will take place as follows.

h. Summary of Review Period: The faculty member will prepare a report listing:

- Teaching:
  - semester by semester, the courses taught by the faculty member during the review period;
- Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.

- Brief description of any courses that were redesigned or developed by the faculty during the review period.

- Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.

- Student course evaluations;

- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness and/or growth in the classroom.

➢ committee and other administrative assignments in the College of Law and service at the University or professional level;

➢ a summary of the faculty member’s contributions to professional organizations and public service;

➢ a draft of the faculty member’s professional plans for the next five years; and

➢ any other information the faculty member deems relevant to the review period.

2. Report of the Committee

Using the faculty member’s report as well as other sources of information, the Committee will compile its own report.

The form of the report shall be as follows:
a. Overview of the Review Period: Listing of the faculty member’s activities for each semester (including summer semesters) during the period, limited to: full-time teaching at GSU College of Law.

b. Evaluation of Teaching:

The College of Law is dedicated to maintaining the highest levels of classroom performance and teaching standards. Apart from any review process, faculty members are encouraged to continually improve their teaching through ongoing, long term collaboration with other faculty and responsiveness to student comments.

In evaluating teaching proficiency, the Committee shall consult, in addition to the candidate’s report:

The Faculty, particularly those teaching related courses or upper division courses for which the reviewed faculty member teaches prerequisites;

The Dean and Associate Dean concerning any complaints or reports they may have received from students and alumni;

Any earlier written reports of classroom visitations;

Course syllabi;

Students enrolled in the faculty member’s course(s);

Student evaluation forms; and

Any other evidence reflective of teaching proficiency.

c. University Service: at the College or University levels including committees, task forces, advising student organizations, etc.

d. Professional Service: participation in professional or academic meetings, conferences and workshops; advisory or drafting roles for public officials or entities, professional association participation and/or leadership roles, etc.

e. Public and Community Service: including appointive or elective office, leadership roles in community organizations, etc.

f. Awards and Honors
g. Other Evidence of Achievements

h. Committee Evaluation: Evaluation by the Committee discussing a faculty member’s strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member.

If the Committee believes there may be a teaching problem, at least two members of the Committee shall visit the faculty member’s classes. The Committee shall review any potential problems with the faculty member and identify how to address such problems.

i. Current vita of faculty member; copies of faculty member’s annual reports for the review period; and copies of any evaluations of classroom teaching.

5. Faculty Member’s Report:

Within ten business days of receiving a copy of the Committee’s Summary of the Review Period, the faculty member shall submit a report to the Committee including: any corrections or additions to the Committee’s report. The Committee shall incorporate any additional relevant information provided by the faculty member in its Summary of the Review Period.

6. Meeting:

The Committee shall meet with the Lecturer to discuss the report and the faculty member’s plans for the next five years. The Committee should share their general assessment of the faculty member’s contributions in the areas of teaching and service and the Lecturer’s five-year plan.

7. Faculty Member’s Professional Plan:

Within one week after meeting with the Committee, the faculty member will send the Committee a final statement of his or her professional plan for the next five years. The plan should address any deficiencies in teaching or service that were raised by the Committee. If the Committee identified significant deficiencies in teaching, the Lecturer will include in his or her five-year plan a specific course of action for addressing the identified deficiencies.

8. Committee Report to the Dean:

The Committee shall send to the Dean its Summary of the Review Period and the Lecturer’s five-year professional plan.

C. Review Process for Academic Professionals:

The review period will cover the years since the faculty member’s last review or, in case of initial reviews, the years since the last promotion decision regarding the faculty member. In the case of five-year reviews that also constitute a request for promotion, the review shall follow the format identified in Section VI.F. of this document. In all other years, the five year reviews will take place as follows.
1. **Summary of Review Period:**

The faculty member will prepare a report listing, as appropriate:

- **Service:**
  - A statement of the academic center’s mission, if applicable, and the candidate’s specific service responsibilities.
  - Evidence of knowledge, skills, and abilities as they relate to performing job requirements;
  - Evidence of work successfully accomplished while maintaining standards and meeting deadlines;
  - Evidence of professionalism and thoroughness of the work produced;
  - Evidence of committee and other administrative assignments in the College of Law and service at the University level;
  - Evidence of contributions to professional organizations and public service;
  - Evidence of community engagement in fulfilling the mission and meeting the needs of the center, College and/or University;
  - Other evidence of effective service.

- **Teaching (if applicable):**
  - Semester by semester listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.
  - Brief description of any courses that were redesigned or developed by the faculty during the review period.
  - Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.
  - Student course evaluations.
  - Other evidence of teaching effectiveness and/or growth in the classroom.

- **Research (if applicable):**
  - A list of participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; engagement with academic and professional audiences; and leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees and/or any other relevant activities.

- **Other information the faculty member deems relevant to the review period.**
2. **Report of the Committee**

Using the faculty member’s report as well as other sources of information, the Committee will compile its own report.

**The form of the report shall be as follows:**

a. **Overview of the Review Period:** Listing of the faculty member's activities for each semester (including summer semesters) during the period, limited to: service responsibilities and, if applicable, teaching or research responsibilities at GSU College of Law.

b. **Service:**

- A statement of the academic center’s mission, if applicable, and the candidate’s specific service responsibilities.
- Evidence of knowledge, skills, and abilities as they relate to performing job requirements;
- Evidence of work successfully accomplished while maintaining standards and meeting deadlines;
- Evidence of professionalism and thoroughness of the work produced;
- Evidence of committee and other administrative assignments in the College of Law and service at the University level;
- Evidence of contributions to professional organizations and public service;
- Evidence of community engagement in fulfilling the mission and meeting the needs of the center, College and/or University;
- Other evidence of effective service.

**Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable):**

The College of Law is dedicated to maintaining the highest levels of classroom performance and teaching standards. Apart from any review process, faculty members are encouraged to continually improve their teaching through ongoing, long term collaboration with other faculty and responsiveness to student comments.

In evaluating teaching proficiency, the Committee shall consult, in addition to the candidate’s report:

- The Faculty, particularly those teaching related courses or upper division courses for which the reviewed faculty member teaches prerequisites;
The Dean and Associate Dean concerning any complaints or reports they may have received from students and alumni;

Any earlier written reports of classroom visitations;

Course syllabi;

Students enrolled in the faculty member’s course(s);

Student evaluation forms; and

Any other evidence reflective of teaching proficiency.

c. **Research (if applicable):** A list of participation in symposia and conferences; formal presentations; practice-focused and professionally oriented writing; engagement with academic and professional audiences; and leadership roles in the profession and on professional committees and/or any other relevant activities.

e. Awards and Honors

f. Other Evidence of Achievements

g. Committee Evaluation: Evaluation by the Committee discussing a faculty member’s strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member.

If teaching is required and the Committee believes there may be a teaching problem, at least two members of the Committee shall visit the faculty member's classes. The Committee shall review any potential problems with the faculty member and identify how to address such problems.

h. Current vita of faculty member; copies of faculty member's annual reports for the review period; and, if applicable, copies of any evaluations of classroom teaching.

3. **Faculty Member's Report:**

Within ten business days of receiving a copy of the Committee's Summary of the Review Period, the faculty member shall submit a report to the Committee including: any corrections or additions to the Committee's report. The Committee shall incorporate any additional relevant information provided by the faculty member in its Summary of the Review Period.

4. **Meeting:**
The Committee shall meet with the Academic Professional to discuss the report and the faculty member's plans for the next five years. The Committee should share their general assessment of the faculty member's contributions in the areas of service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research and the Academic Professional’s five-year plan.

5. **Faculty Member's Professional Plan:**

Within one week after meeting with the Committee, the faculty member will send the Committee a final statement of his or her professional plan for the next five years. The plan should address any deficiencies in service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research that were raised by the Committee. If the Committee identified significant deficiencies, the Academic Professional will include in his or her five-year plan a specific course of action for addressing the identified deficiencies.

6. **Committee Report to the Dean:**

The Committee shall send to the Dean its Summary of the Review Period and the Academic Professional’s five-year professional plan.

D. **Role of Faculty Member:**

In addition to the Lecturer’s or Academic Professional's consultative role in the review process, if the faculty member disagrees with any portion of the Committee report or the Dean's review, he or she may submit a written response which will be attached to the report and made a part thereof. The Lecturer or Academic Professional is to be given ten business days to prepare the response prior to submission of the report to the Dean and prior to the submission of the Dean's review and the Committee report to the Provost.

E. **Role of the Dean:**

The Dean will review the Committee report and provide feedback to the Lecturer or Academic Professional where appropriate.

F. **Impact of Review**

1. The results of the review will be linked to rewards and professional development. Lecturers and Academic Professionals who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements.

2. When a Lecturer’s review reflects that he or she has not met or maintained the standards of teaching and service expected of that rank of Lecturer or, in the case of an Academic Professional, the review reflects that he or she has not met or maintained the standards of service and, if applicable, teaching and/or research expected of that rank of Academic Professional, the Dean will work with the faculty member to create a formal plan for faculty development that
identifies clearly defined goals and outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, timetables, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy.
A. Time of Review

Each law librarian will be reviewed in the Fall Semester of the law librarian’s second full academic year at the College of Law. Law librarians will also be reviewed every five years following a promotion and every five years thereafter, or earlier at the librarian’s request.

B. Reviewing Committee

The review will be conducted by a Committee, appointed by the Associate Dean, which will be composed of four members: an Associate Dean or College of Law Administrator (other than the Associate Dean for Library & Information Services), a non-library tenure track or non-tenure track College of Law faculty member, and two law librarians holding rank at or above the current rank of the librarian undergoing the structured review. The Associate Dean will serve ex-officio. If there are not enough librarians holding rank at or above the current rank of the librarian being considered, then the Associate Dean in consultation with the Dean of the College of Law will appoint law librarian faculty members to round out the Committee. If there are not enough qualified law librarian faculty to round out the committee then committee members will be selected from the College of Law tenure track or non-tenure track faculty.

C. Purpose of Review

The review will provide each law librarian with a clear idea of how adequately he or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion. The review should identify strengths and accomplishments and pinpoint areas in need of improvement in which law librarians may provide assistance to colleagues.

D. Scope of Review

The Committee will review the annual reports submitted by the law librarian to the Dean for the years in question and report on the law librarian’s progress in the areas of teaching, service, and research (as defined in §II.B. above). The Committee will conduct its evaluation in accordance with the guidance in §VIII.B.4-6. The Committee will also interview the Associate Dean to gain information as to the law librarian’s progress and the law librarian to gain information as to the law librarian’s achievements and goals.
E. Report of the Committee

The reports generated for all law librarians under review from year to year will be uniform and in substantially the format which follows. The report will be based on the review of annual reports (copies of which should be appended to the Committee Report), the interviews with the law librarian and Associate Dean, and the factors considered pursuant to VIII.B.4-6. The law librarian will be given a copy of the draft report and be given the opportunity to suggest additions or corrections to the report. However, the content of the final report remains within the sole discretion of the Committee. Copies of the Associate Dean’s review and of any reports from the Committee will be included in the law librarian’s personnel file in the library.

The form of the report shall be as follows:

a. Summary Recommendation of Committee: Taking into account the subsequent components, the Summary Recommendation shall include advice for the law librarian about what further preparation, if any, should be made for the law librarian to be ready to apply for promotion.

b. Evaluation of Teaching (as defined in §II.B.1 above): The evaluation should follow the guidance set forth in VIII.B.4.

c. Evaluation of Service (as defined in §II.B.2. above): The evaluation should follow the guidance set forth in VIII.B.5 above.

d. Evaluation of Research (as defined in §II.B.3 above): The evaluation should follow the guidance set forth in §VIII.B.6 above.

e. Detailed Recommendation of Committee: Evaluation by the Committee, reflecting its discussion of the candidate’s progress toward promotion, including strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the law librarian. The suggestions for improvement should, in the spirit of the Law Librarian Promotion and Reappointment Manual, identify areas in which a law librarian can change orientation and activity in pursuit of promotion.

f. Appendix: Copies of any documents considered by the Committee as evidence of the law librarian’s teaching, service, or research, shall be appended to the recommendation, including current vita of law librarian; copies of law librarian’s annual reports for the review period; and copies of applicable evaluations of classroom teaching.

F. Role of Law Librarian

In addition to the law librarian’s consultative role in the review process, he or she may submit a written response to the Committee report or the Associate Dean’s review which will be attached.
to the report and made a part thereof. The law librarian is to be given ten business days to prepare the response prior to submission of the report to the Associate Dean.

G. Role of the Associate Dean

The Associate Dean is to provide promptly a written review of the Committee report, copies of which are to be submitted to the Committee and the law librarian.
APPENDIX L-CLINICAL FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

On September 29, 2022, the College of Law passed the GSU College of Law Workload Policy. Recognizing that the equitable distribution of workload is a significant and complex issue, this document offers guidance to the faculty and Dean to assist in the uniform and equitable application of the Clinical Faculty Workload Policy.

A. General Expectations and Understandings:

The overall expectations for clinical faculty are outlined in the College of Law’s Clinical Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Manual, including standards for attaining presumptively renewable annual contracts and standards for promotion. Each clinical faculty member’s primary responsibility is teaching. Clinical faculty are also expected to engage in research and in service as defined in the College of Law’s Clinical Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Manual. This guidance recognizes that the type of teaching clinical faculty engage in goes beyond the classroom.

B. Teaching Workloads

1. Calculation of Teaching Credits

Following the first year of service as a member of the clinical faculty, the typical clinical faculty member is presumptively expected to teach in a clinic, externship program, or equivalent activity (collectively referred to as the “clinic”) for 2 semesters and to teach an additional course outside of the clinic (or other significant responsibility) for 1 semester. The presumption is that the courses in this standard teaching package will be taught during the fall and spring terms absent either significant administrative need or a request by the clinical faculty member.

Consideration will be given for a lighter load in the first year of teaching, with the goal of allowing a typical clinical faculty member in the first year of service to teach only in the clinic, externship program, or equivalent activity for 2 semesters during the Fall and Spring semesters of the first-year and without the expectation that the clinical faculty member teach an additional course outside of the clinic during the first year.

In determining whether a clinical faculty member has met or exceeded the workload expectation for teaching, the Dean should consider the following factors as relevant:
A. The number of students taught and supervised overall;
B. The number of credit hours taught;
C. The ratio of faculty to students taught and supervised;
D. Whether courses are co-taught with other faculty or adjuncts;
E. Whether the clinical faculty member is responsible for teaching and supervising students from other disciplines;
F. Whether the clinical faculty member is engaged in teaching at other Colleges or institutions;
G. Whether the nature of the program, course, or clinic requires an unusually high degree of collaboration or coordination with other entities, professions, institutions, Colleges or departments;
H. Whether the clinical faculty member is teaching courses and supervising students in the daytime and/or in the evening;
I. Whether the clinical faculty member is requested to teach a required course in order to help meet the curricular needs of the College of Law;
J. The degree to which intensive assessment practices are incorporated into the course;
K. The degree to which intensive experiential exercises are incorporated into non-clinical courses;
L. Whether the course is a new preparation for the instructor, particularly when requested by the institution;
M. The number of independent study credits supervised during the time period;
N. Whether the faculty member is responsible for other administrative duties for which he or she does not receive additional compensation and which do not fall under routine administration or service.

Whenever possible, clinical faculty members should be given the opportunity to teach their additional course in an area of professional interest.

C. Research

It is a clinical faculty member’s responsibility to pursue, and the College of Law’s responsibility to support, reasonable engagement in research activities in accordance with the research responsibilities as defined in the College of Law’s Clinical Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Manual.

The typical post-presumptively renewable annual contract clinical faculty member is expected to engage in reasonable research activity as it is defined in the College of Law’s Clinical Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Manual.
Research may, but need not, include the publication of scholarly articles.

- All pre-presumptively renewable annual contract clinical faculty members are expected to engage in research activity that meets the definition and requirements for promotion in the College of Law’s Clinical Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Manual. Research may, but need not, include the publication of scholarly articles.

In determining whether a faculty member has met or exceeded the research workload expectation overall, the Dean should consider the following, recognizing that the scope of research for clinicians as defined in the Clinical Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Manual is broad:

1. Whether the faculty member plays a leadership role in a professional community or committee;
2. Whether the activity is performed primarily for research purposes and not for compensation by an outside party, excluding honorariums and grants;
3. Whether the engagement is directly connected to the faculty member’s professional work;
4. Whether the research involves the creation of written scholarship;
5. Whether the activity involves legislation/rulemaking or commentary thereon;
6. Whether the faculty member plays a role in conference planning;
7. Whether the faculty member is engaged in local, national, or international speaking;
8. Whether the faculty member has provided testimony;
9. Whether the faculty member has authored or co-authored amicus briefs in litigation;
10. Whether the faculty member has engaged in professional committee service;
11. Whether the faculty member is a member of a Journal board or otherwise engages in editorial work;
12. Whether the faculty member provides trainings and CLEs;
13. Whether the faculty member is responsible for grants.

D. Service

2. **Focus of Policy**

There are many types of service to the law school, the University, the profession, and the community that are valuable to and recognized by GSU College of Law. However, service to the College of Law and University will
be given priority in evaluating service workload so that all clinical faculty members have the opportunity to contribute in an equitable way to faculty governance at the College of Law.

3. Service to the Law School and/or University

1. A typical clinical faculty member will serve as a member of two committees in the law school, the University, or the University System every year.

2. A typical pre-presumptively renewable annual contract clinical faculty member will have limited service assignments, when possible, until presumptively renewable annual contract status is achieved. In particular, a clinical faculty member in the first year of service should normally be expected to serve on only one committee.

In determining whether a clinical faculty member has met or exceeded the workload expectation for service, the Dean should consider the following factors as relevant:

1. The time and contribution expected of any particular committee, assignment, or initiative, recognizing that some are more intensive than others;

2. Whether the clinical faculty member is significantly engaged in advisement or practice-related activities involving students or student organizations

E. Administration

Administrative work, outside of the administrative work that is an ordinary and necessary part of maintaining the clinic with which the faculty member is associated, is not required for all clinical faculty. However, some clinical faculty members may have administrative responsibilities. In determining whether a clinical faculty member has met or exceeded the clinical workload expectations, the Dean should consider if the clinical faculty member is responsible for significant administrative responsibilities related to a program or administrative role in the College of Law, such as overseeing a department, program, or other significant assignment, or supervising College of Law staff or other personnel.

VI. Exceeding Workload
In the event that the Dean determines that a faculty member has exceeded or is anticipated to exceed the workload in any of the areas described above, the Dean may consider the following items to address such overload:

A. Additional compensation for work exceeding the basic workload requirements;
B. A reduction in teaching responsibilities;
C. A reduction in service assignments; and/or
D. A reduction in administrative assignments.

F. Post-Clinical Job Security

Five years after obtaining clinical job security and every five years thereafter, a clinical faculty member may receive a one-semester release of teaching and service responsibilities if the faculty member proposes and the Dean approves a substantial research or teaching item.
### APPENDIX M – Committee Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Classification</th>
<th>Time Requirement</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>≥ 2 hours per week on average in any semester</td>
<td>a recruitment committee, ABA self-study committee, curriculum committee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>promotion and tenure committee, assessment committee, admissions committee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workload policy committee, honor code committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>&lt; 2 hours per week on average in any semester</td>
<td>faculty development committee, speakers committee, Dean’s advisory committee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>academic success committee, post-tenure review committee, faculty appeals committee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>student affairs committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>≤ 3 hours per semester</td>
<td>faculty advisement/mentoring, judicial clerkship advisement, LLM committee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clinics committee, University senators group, University committees or boards,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>awards committee, technology committee, scholarships committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for the purposes of annual review metrics, the term “committee” shall refer to both standing and ad hoc committees.
APPENDIX N – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF ACADEMICAFFAIRS AND THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR STUDENT SUCCESS PROGRAMS & STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

A. Metrics for the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Success Programs & Strategic Enrollment Management

The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

(* = student success activities)

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom instruction</td>
<td># credits = # points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course release for University or COL award or for external research funding</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-time course release for other reason with Dean’s approval</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student research supervision* (e.g. independent study, law review note)</td>
<td>1 student research supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy student organization supervision* (≥ 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light student organization supervision* (&lt; 30 minutes per week on average)</td>
<td>1 student org. supervision = 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities**

(publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of a complete draft for publication and the publication date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (&gt;10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application non-PI or not lead author</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic program administration</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student services administration</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Service/Administration/Management

(see Appendix I for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
<td>1 point for each organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of reference*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program supervision*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Requirements for the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Success Programs & Strategic Enrollment Management

The associate Dean of academic affairs and associate Dean for student success programs & strategic enrollment management have an annual workload allocation of T 0% / R 0% / S 100%.

The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

1. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a typical tenured faculty member must teach no fewer than 48 credits within that faculty member’s 5-year review period.

2. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead of counting those points in the year that they are earned.
In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, **individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category as well as the total number of points specified for the category** as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0%</td>
<td>5(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 100 %</td>
<td>14(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>