



College of Law  
Georgia State University  
Tenure Track Faculty Review Manual

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....   | <b>1</b> |
| <b>II. ANNUAL REVIEW</b> .....   | <b>1</b> |
| <b>A. Documentation for Annual Review</b> .....                                  | <b>1</b> |
| <b>B. Timing of Annual Review</b> .....  | <b>2</b> |
| <b>C. Workload Expectations for Tenure-Track Faculty</b> .....                   | <b>2</b> |
| 1. <i>Teaching</i> .....   | 2        |
| 2. <i>Research and Scholarship</i> .....   | 3        |
| 3. <i>Service to the Law School/University/System/Community</i> .....            | 3        |
| 4. <i>Administration</i> .....   | 4        |
| 5. <i>Tenured Faculty</i> .....  | 4        |
| 6. <i>Pre-Tenured Faculty</i> .....  | 5        |
| 7. <i>Annual Review Metrics</i> .....  | 5        |
| 8. <i>Summer Assignments</i> .....   | 6        |
| <b>D. Procedures</b> .....   | <b>6</b> |
| 1. <i>Workload Distribution</i> .....  | 6        |
| 2. <i>Faculty Submission</i> .....   | 6        |
| 3. <i>Dean’s Review</i> .....  | 6        |
| 4. <i>Performance Remediation Plan</i> .....                                     | 7        |
| 5. <i>Annual Evaluation Immediately After Performance Remediation Plan</i> ..... | 8        |
| 6. <i>Amendments to Faculty Review Documentation Templates</i> .....             | 8        |
| <b>E. Terms of Appointment</b> .....   | <b>8</b> |
| <b>F. The Limits of Quantitative Ratings</b> .....                               | <b>8</b> |
| <b>G. Successful Annual Review not a Guarantee of Promotion or Tenure</b> .....  | <b>9</b> |
| <b>III. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE</b> .....                           | <b>9</b> |
| <b>A. Timing Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure</b> .....         | <b>9</b> |
| 1. <i>Reappointment</i> .....  | 9        |
| 2. <i>Promotion to Associate Professor of Law</i> .....                          | 9        |
| a. <i>Pre-tenure</i> .....   | 9        |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| b. With tenure.....   | 10        |
| 3. <i>Tenure</i> .....  | 10        |
| 4. <i>Promotion to Professor of Law</i> .....   | 10        |
| <b>B. Promotion and Tenure Standards .....</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| 1. <i>General</i> .....   | 10        |
| 2. <i>Specific Standards</i> .....  | 11        |
| a. Teaching.....  | 11        |
| b. Scholarship.....   | 11        |
| c. Service and Professional Engagement .....  | 12        |
| d. Composite Measure Across the Faculty .....   | 13        |
| 3. <i>Standards for Evaluation by Rank and For Tenure</i> .....                         | 13        |
| a. General .....  | 13        |
| b. Promotion to Associate Professor.....  | 14        |
| c. Tenure .....   | 14        |
| d. Promotion to Professor .....   | 15        |
| <b>E. Role of Committees in the Promotion and Tenure Process.....</b>                   | <b>15</b> |
| 1. <i>Promotion and Tenure Committee</i> .....  | 15        |
| 2. <i>Co-Chairs</i> .....   | 16        |
| 3. <i>Faculty Review Subcommittee</i> .....   | 16        |
| 4. <i>General Rules Governing Promotion and Tenure Committee Meetings</i> .....         | 17        |
| <b>F. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review .....</b>                              | <b>17</b> |
| 1. <i>Notification and Calendar within the College</i> .....                            | 17        |
| 2. <i>Contents of the Dossier</i> .....   | 17        |
| a. Provided by the Candidate .....  | 17        |
| b. Prepared or Solicited by the Subcommittee .....                                      | 18        |
| 3. <i>Evaluation of Teaching</i> .....  | 18        |
| a. General .....  | 18        |
| b. Class Visitation and Faculty Review .....  | 19        |
| c. Student Evaluations.....   | 19        |
| 4. <i>Evaluation of Scholarship and External Reviews</i> .....                          | 19        |
| 5. <i>Evaluation of Institutional and Professional Service</i> .....                    | 20        |
| <b>G. Deliberation Procedures for the Committee, the Subcommittee and the Dean.....</b> | <b>21</b> |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Subcommittee Review.....  | 21        |
| 2. Report.....   | 21        |
| 3. Timing of Report .....  | 21        |
| 4. Availability to Faculty.....  | 21        |
| 5. Promotion and Tenure Committee Meeting on Candidates .....                | 21        |
| 6. Dean’s Review .....   | 21        |
| 7. Notice to Candidates.....   | 22        |
| <b>H. Support, Evaluation, and Reappointment of Pre-Tenure Faculty .....</b> | <b>22</b> |
| 1. Support.....  | 22        |
| 2. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment .....                                 | 22        |
| a. Committee Review .....  | 22        |
| b. Standards.....  | 22        |
| c. Dossier.....  | 22        |
| d. Notification of Renewal and Dean’s Review.....                            | 23        |
| <b>I. Pre-Tenure Review .....</b>  | <b>23</b> |
| 1. Time of Review .....  | 23        |
| 2. Reviewing Committee.....  | 23        |
| 3. Purposes of Review .....  | 24        |
| 4. Scope of Review .....   | 24        |
| 5. Report of the Committee .....   | 24        |
| 6. Faculty Discussion Report.....  | 25        |
| 7. Role of Faculty Member.....   | 26        |
| 8. Role of the Dean.....   | 26        |
| <b>J. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review within the College .....</b>  | <b>26</b> |
| <b>K. Amendments.....</b>  | <b>27</b> |
| <b>IV. POST-TENURE REVIEW .....</b>  | <b>27</b> |
| <b>A. Purpose.....</b>   | <b>27</b> |
| <b>B. Timeline.....</b>  | <b>28</b> |
| <b>C. Areas of Evaluation.....</b>   | <b>28</b> |
| <b>D. Composition of the PTR Committee .....</b>                             | <b>29</b> |
| <b>E. Submission of PTR Package by the Faculty Member.....</b>               | <b>30</b> |
| <b>F. The PTR Committee Review Process .....</b>                             | <b>30</b> |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1. <i>The Committee’s Overall PTR Assessment</i> .....   | 30        |
| 2. <i>Content of the PTR Committee Report</i> .....  | 31        |
| 3. <i>Timing of Delivery of Draft and Final PTR Committee Reports &amp; Faculty Member’s Rights to Rebut and Object</i> .....  | 31        |
| <b>G. Responsibilities of the Dean</b> .....   | <b>32</b> |
| <b>H. Outcomes and Consequences of Post-Tenure Review</b> .....  | <b>33</b> |
| 1. <i>Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</i> .....   | 33        |
| 2. <i>Review of PIP Completion</i> .....   | 33        |
| <b>I. Due Process Following an Unsuccessful PIP</b> .....  | <b>35</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT</b> .....   | <b>36</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE</b> .....  | <b>38</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX C – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW FORM</b> .....   | <b>40</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX D – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY</b> ...   | <b>44</b> |
| <b>A. Metrics for Tenure-Track Faculty</b> .....   | <b>44</b> |
| 1. <i>Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision</i> .....   | 44        |
| 2. <i>Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities</i> .....  | 44        |
| 3. <i>Service/Administration/Management</i> .....  | 46        |
| <b>B. Requirements for Pre-Tenured Faculty</b> .....   | <b>47</b> |
| 1. <i>First Year on Tenure Track</i> .....   | 47        |
| 2. <i>Second Year on Tenure Track</i> .....  | 48        |
| 3. <i>Third Year on Tenure Track to Tenure</i> .....   | 48        |
| <b>C. Requirements for Tenured Faculty</b> .....   | <b>48</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX E – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR STUDENT SUCCESS PROGRAMS &amp; STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT</b> ..... | <b>50</b> |
| <b>A. Metrics for the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Success Programs &amp; Strategic Enrollment Management</b> .....                         | <b>50</b> |
| 1. <i>Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision</i> .....   | 50        |
| 2. <i>Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities</i> .....  | 51        |
| 3. <i>Service/Administration/Management</i> .....  | 52        |
| <b>B. Requirements for the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Success Programs &amp; Strategic Enrollment Management</b> .....                    | <b>53</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX F – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND CENTER DIRECTORS</b> .....   | <b>55</b> |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>A. Metrics for the Associate Dean for Research &amp; Faculty Development and Center Directors.....</b>          | <b>55</b> |
| 1. <i>Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision.....</i>  | <i>55</i> |
| 2. <i>Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities.....</i>   | <i>56</i> |
| 3. <i>Service/Administration/Management.....</i>   | <i>57</i> |
| <b>B. Requirements for the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development and Center Directors.....</b>       | <b>58</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX G – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE DIRECTOR OF THE TRIAL PRACTICE ADVOCACY PROGRAM.....</b>             | <b>60</b> |
| <b>A. Metrics for the Director of the Trial Advocacy Program.....</b>  | <b>60</b> |
| 1. <i>Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision.....</i>  | <i>60</i> |
| 2. <i>Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities.....</i>   | <i>60</i> |
| 3. <i>Service/Administration/Management.....</i>   | <i>62</i> |
| <b>B. Requirements for the Director of the Trial Advocacy Program.....</b>   | <b>63</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX H – TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES.....</b>  | <b>65</b> |
| <b>A. Compliance with the Teaching Workload Expectations.....</b>  | <b>65</b> |
| <b>B. Compliance with Research and Scholarship Workload Expectations.....</b>                                      | <b>66</b> |
| <b>C. Compliance with Service Workload Policy.....</b>   | <b>67</b> |
| <b>D. Modification, Reallocation or Redistribution of Workload and/or Granting of Additional Compensation.....</b> | <b>68</b> |
| <b>E. Examples of Scholarly Work.....</b>  | <b>69</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX I – COMMITTEE CLASSIFICATIONS.....</b>   | <b>72</b> |

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This manual sets forth the rules governing review of tenure-track faculty in the College of Law.  
3 These rules cover annual job-performance evaluation, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and  
4 post-tenure review. All rules in this manual conform to requirements described in the University  
5 System of Georgia Academic Affairs Handbook and the Georgia State University Promotion and  
6 Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors.

7 The College of Law faculty periodically review and amend this manual. Under university  
8 requirements, any revisions must be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Manual  
9 Review Committee and approved by the provost. The governing review of a faculty member are  
10 those in the version of the college manual effect on January 31 of the calendar year in which the  
11 review of the candidate commences.

12 The standards set forth in this manual require that each faculty member make significant  
13 contributions to the College of Law, the University, and the legal profession, though teaching,  
14 scholarship, and service. The specific balance of these requirements will differ based on a faculty  
15 member's position, rank, and seniority, and it may vary across time. In every form and stage of  
16 review, the standards emphasize the College of Law's longstanding commitment to ensuring  
17 student success.

18 **II. ANNUAL REVIEW**

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

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

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

32 **A. Documentation for Annual Review**

33 Each faculty member will annually submit to the Dean the following documentation as the basis  
34 for the annual review:

- 35 1. a completed Faculty Annual Review Summary Report (see Appendix A),

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

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

44 **B. Timing of Annual Review**

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

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| January 15 | faculty are notified by the Dean to submit documentation for annual review |
| March 1    | faculty member submits documentation for annual review                     |
| April 1    | Dean submits draft of Faculty Annual Review Form to faculty member         |
| April 15   | Dean meets with faculty member upon request of either to discuss draft     |
| May 1      | faculty member resubmits draft to Dean with comments if desired            |
| May 10     | faculty member and Dean sign the written evaluation                        |

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

49 **C. Workload Expectations for Tenure-Track Faculty**

50 Annual review of faculty performance promotes the efficient and equitable distribution of  
 51 workload among teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative responsibilities. (For specific  
 52 examples of work that qualifies as teaching, scholarship, or service, as well as guidance for the  
 53 Dean in allocating workload among faculty members, see Appendix H – Tenure-Track Faculty  
 54 Workload Guidelines.)

55 *1. Teaching*

56 The College of Law teaches its students to be critical readers, analytical thinkers, proficient writers,  
 57 informed, active citizens, civic and policy leaders, and creative, ethical lawyers. To achieve this



58 goal, the college offers a variety of learning experiences to its students, including traditional  
59 curriculum taught in the classroom; courses in lawyering process; specialized seminars; legal  
60 research, writing, and other lawyering skills; clinical education; externships; moot court and mock  
61 trial programs; and other coursework designed to further students' academic success. Teaching  
62 and advising students in these different programs require a significant amount of work by  
63 dedicated faculty. Law faculty members with teaching expectations perform all or virtually all this  
64 work themselves, without the help of teaching assistants. Because the college operates part-time  
65 evening, part-time day, and full-time day/evening programs of instruction, it is necessary to offer  
66 these learning experiences during the day and in the evening, and faculty are expected to teach in  
67 the day as well as in the evening. This places a significant burden on faculty and resources.

## 68 *2. Research and Scholarship*

69 Scholarship is at the core of the mission of the College of Law. The expectation is that through  
70 engaged scholarship, pre-tenured and tenured faculty will gain expertise and national and  
71 international recognition in their fields and will contribute to the body of legal scholarship that  
72 informs lawyers, judges, legislators, policymakers, and legal and other academics. This  
73 scholarship is crucial to the creation, understanding, and reform of the law and policies of the state  
74 of Georgia, the United States, and the international community. Articles published in law reviews  
75 (including online journals and law reviews) remain one of the primary means of research and  
76 scholarship for law professors. However, research and scholarship may take many forms, as  
77 described below in Section III. Promotion and Tenure and in Tenured Faculty Workload Policy  
78 Guidelines (see Appendix H).

79

80 This workload policy recognizes that the research, development, and publication of legal  
81 scholarship is a time-consuming endeavor, and that faculty who are expected to produce research  
82 and scholarship must have the time and opportunity to engage in scholarship on an ongoing basis.

## 83 *3. Service to the Law School/University/System/Community*

84 For the College of Law to function properly, faculty members spend significant time serving on  
85 internal and external committees that reflect the law school's commitments to shared governance,  
86 academic freedom, and faculty direction of academic programs and policies, as well to professional  
87 service. In addition to committee service within the college and its departments, law faculty  
88 members also serve on the University Faculty Senate and university committees and system-wide  
89 committees. Time expended on these committee assignments is substantial, particularly for the  
90 chairs of the committees. Service to the law school also includes work done in support of students  
91 and their success, including necessary work such as advising students, advising the many law  
92 school student organizations, and participating in other activities that contribute to student success.

93 External service, including service to the academe, legal profession, and community, is another  
94 important mission of the College of Law. Faculty are in a unique position to enrich the profession  
95 and serve the community. External service varies greatly and includes but is not limited to,  
96 refereeing for academic journals and presses; reviewing articles and promotion and tenure files of  
97 candidates at another colleges or institutions; engaging in public interest and pro bono efforts,  
98 serving on non-profit boards, professional organizations, or government advisory councils;  
99 offering affordable continuing legal education; participating in local and state concerns; and  
100 informing policy at the national and international level.

101 All faculty are expected to engage in service. To further the goals and mission of the COL, the  
102 quality and quantity of these important contributions must be considered in determining a proper  
103 workload for each faculty member.

#### 104 *4. Administration*

105 Given the breadth and depth of the various academic programs and support of students offered by  
106 the COL, many faculty members perform considerable administrative work. Some faculty  
107 members perform administrative duties that are properly recognized and considered as service in  
108 the faculty promotion and reappointment or promotion and tenure documents governing the faculty  
109 types.

110 COL faculty members may, through their appointments or other arrangements with the Dean,  
111 Provost, or the President of the University, be expected to perform administrative duties as part of  
112 their regular duties. For example, law faculty members serve as Dean, Associate Deans, and  
113 program directors. Any adjustment to a faculty member's workload or additional compensation on  
114 the basis of these administrative duties must take into account the demands of these additional  
115 administrative responsibilities.

#### 116 *5. Tenured Faculty*

117 In the absence of a modification, reallocation, or redistribution, the typical tenured faculty member  
118 is expected to:

- 119 a. Teach 48 credits (or equivalent) over the course of five academic years, not including  
120 summers, unless granted a course release;
- 121 b. Engage in substantial research and scholarship activity equivalent to that required to  
122 produce at least three articles every five years; and
- 123 c. Perform significant service every year in at least two committees (or equivalent) in the law  
124 school, the University, or the University System.

125 The Dean may grant a modification, reallocation, or redistribution of workload and/or additional  
126 compensation for tenured faculty who have, or propose to have, teaching overloads, significantly  
127 higher than expected research or scholarship productivity, or significant service overloads, and/or  
128 who are assigned significant administrative responsibilities.

129 For tenured faculty who fail to meet workload expectations in any area, the Dean may grant a  
130 modification, reallocation, or redistribution in workload (*e.g.*, additional teaching and/or service  
131 responsibilities) as a remedy for failure to meet workload expectations.

#### 132 *6. Pre-Tenured Faculty*

133 In the absence of a modification, reallocation, or redistribution, the typical pre-tenured faculty  
134 member is expected to:

- 135 a. Teach 5-10 credits in the first year of employment;
- 136 b. Teach 8-10 credits (or equivalent) per academic year, after the first year, until tenure is  
137 achieved;
- 138 c. Engage in substantial research activity sufficient to achieve an award of tenure as identified  
139 in the Promotion and Tenure Document for tenure-track faculty members; and
- 140 d. Have limited committee assignments each year, when possible, until tenure is achieved.

141 Pre-tenured faculty are not expected to teach overloads or have significant service overloads. In  
142 the event an overload in a semester is unavoidable, the Dean may grant a reduction in workload in  
143 a subsequent semester during the pre-tenure period.

#### 144 *7. Annual Review Metrics*

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

- 147 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 148 2 – Needs Improvement
- 149 3 – Meets Expectations
- 150 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 151 5 – Exemplary

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

154

155 8. *Summer Assignments*

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

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

163 **D. Procedures**

164 1. *Workload Distribution*

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

173 2. *Faculty Submission*

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

177 3. *Dean's Review*

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

184 Upon request by the Dean or the faculty member, the Dean will discuss with the faculty member  
185 in a scheduled conference the content of the completed Dean's Annual Review Form and the  
186 faculty member's progression towards achieving future milestones. At this meeting, the faculty  
187 member will sign a statement attesting that they have been apprised of the content of the completed

188 Dean's Annual Review Form. The faculty member will be given 10 business days to respond in  
189 writing to the Dean's Annual Review Form, with this response to be attached to the completed  
190 Dean's Annual Review Form. The Dean will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response,  
191 noting changes, if any, in the completed Dean's Annual Review Form made as a result of either  
192 the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response  
193 is 10 business days from the faculty member's response. The Dean's acknowledgement also  
194 becomes part of the official personnel records for the faculty member. Annual reviews are not  
195 subject to discretionary review.

#### 196 *4. Performance Remediation Plan*

197 If the faculty member's performance on the Annual Review is evaluated as "1 - Does Not Meet  
198 Expectations" or "2 -Needs Improvement" on any of the three job responsibility categories, the  
199 Dean and faculty member together shall develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to  
200 improve the faculty member's performance during the following year. The purpose of the PRP is  
201 to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or  
202 responsibilities. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the  
203 PRP.

- 204 a. The components of a PRP plan must include the following:
- 205 b. clearly defined goals or outcomes;
- 206 c. an outline of activities to be undertaken;
- 207 d. a timetable;
- 208 e. available resources and support;
- 209 f. expectations for improvement; and
- 210 g. a monitoring strategy.

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

213 If the faculty member elects not to participate in the development of a PRP, the Dean will create  
214 an appropriate PRP. In the event of a disagreement between a tenured or pre-tenured faculty  
215 member and the Dean concerning the PRP, the plan will be brought before the PTR Committee  
216 (see below in section IV.D. Composition of PTR Committee) for mediation and resolution. In the  
217 event of a disagreement between a non-tenure track faculty member and the Dean concerning the  
218 PRP, the plan will be brought before the Faculty Review Subcommittee (see below in section  
219 III.E.3. Faculty Review Subcommittee) or the Promotion and Tenure Committee (see below in  
220 section II.E.1 Promotion and Tenure Committee).

221 The Dean will meet with the faculty member twice in the fall semester and twice in the spring  
222 semester to review progress, document additional needs and available resources, and plan  
223 accomplishments to be achieved before the next scheduled meeting. After each meeting, the Dean

224 will summarize the meeting in writing and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete  
225 the PRP. The Dean must advise the faculty member in writing of the possible consequences for  
226 failure to meet the expectations of the PRP during each meeting.

227 *5. Annual Evaluation Immediately After Performance Remediation Plan*

228 If the Dean evaluates a non-tenure track or pre-tenured faculty member as “1 - Does Not Meet  
229 Expectations” or “2 - Needs Improvement” on any of the three job responsibility categories in the  
230 next consecutive annual evaluation, the Dean may propose a subsequent PRP as described in  
231 Section 1(B) above.

232 If the Dean evaluates a tenured faculty member as “1 - Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2- Needs  
233 Improvement” on any evaluation category in two consecutive annual evaluations, the Dean will  
234 recommend a corrective post-tenure review. A recommendation for a corrective post-tenure  
235 review, and the accompanying annual evaluation, must be reviewed by the PTR Committee. If the  
236 PTR Committee does not agree with the recommendation for a corrective post-tenure review, the  
237 PTR Committee should set forth its reasons for disagreement in a written recommendation and  
238 submit the recommendation to the Dean along with a request for reconsideration. If the Dean  
239 determines that, notwithstanding the PTR Committee’s recommendation, a corrective post-tenure  
240 review is warranted, the Dean must set forth in writing the reasons for the decision not to accept  
241 the Committee’s recommendation, and this statement, along with the Committee’s  
242 recommendation, will be included in the faculty member’s file.

243 *6. Amendments to Faculty Review Documentation Templates*

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

248 **E. Terms of Appointment**

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

253 **F. The Limits of Quantitative Ratings**

254 Quantitative ratings are useful in assessing satisfactory job performance. However, quantitative  
255 ratings alone do not provide a reliable indicator of effort or the quality of work product.  
256 Consequently, in any allocation of institutional resources among faculty—including but not

257 limited to supplemental pay, salary increases, awards, honors, appointments, and workload  
258 reallocation—the Dean shall rely on a careful individualized assessment of both effort and quality.

### 259 **G. Successful Annual Review not a Guarantee of Promotion or Tenure**

260 While annual faculty reviews are considered as part of a faculty member’s record in promotion  
261 and tenure reviews, the ratings from annual evaluations do not necessarily translate to a promotion  
262 or tenure review outcome. Annual reviews focus exclusively on past performance in a single  
263 academic year as a basis for evaluating satisfaction of minimum job requirements. By contrast,  
264 promotion and tenure reviews assess past performance over many years as a basis for predicting  
265 future performance characterized by the attainment of national and international recognition for  
266 excellence in a faculty member’s field of expertise. Moreover, whereas annual reviews rely on the  
267 Dean’s assessment of job performance, promotion and tenure reviews require additional in-depth  
268 peer assessments by senior faculty of teaching, scholarship, and service, and assessments by  
269 distinguished external reviewers of scholarly contribution.

## 270 **III. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

271 The College of Law’s ability to achieve its educational, academic and professional missions  
272 requires a committed faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship and service. The  
273 college regularly assesses faculty achievement in these areas through reappointment and  
274 promotion and tenure reviews. This section sets forth the criteria, standards and procedures for  
275 conducting such reviews of College of Law faculty. The policies and procedures contained in this  
276 document must be read in conjunction with the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure  
277 Manual, as approved in January 2012, and the bylaws and policies of the Board of Regents of the  
278 University System of Georgia.

279 As aptly noted in the University’s Promotion and Tenure Manual, “promotion and tenure decisions  
280 are extremely important to the life of the institution,” and “are also among the most important  
281 events in a faculty member’s professional life.” This document is meant to safeguard these interests  
282 and afford faculty members notice, fairness, and the opportunity and resources needed for  
283 successful promotion and tenure review and ongoing professional development.

### 284 **A. Timing Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure**

#### 285 *1. Reappointment*

286 During their pre-tenure years, faculty members will be reviewed annually to determine their  
287 eligibility for reappointment. This review requires an assessment of the faculty member’s  
288 incremental and cumulative progress toward satisfying the standards for tenure and promotion  
289 noted above.

#### 290 *2. Promotion to Associate Professor of Law*

##### 291 a. Pre-tenure

292 An assistant professor is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to associate professor  
293 in the fourth year of service. Earlier application in the third year requires a showing of highly  
294 exceptional achievement. A promotion awarded under these time periods would not come with  
295 tenure.

296 b. With tenure

297 An assistant professor may elect to be considered for promotion to associate professor and the  
298 award of tenure concurrently. These concurrent applications would ordinarily occur in the fifth or  
299 sixth year of service.

300 *3. Tenure*

301 Tenure may be awarded upon completion of a probationary period of at least five (5) years of  
302 service. A maximum of three years' credit toward the minimum period may be allowed for service  
303 in full-time tenure-track faculty positions at other institutions. Such credit for prior service shall  
304 be defined in writing at the time of initial appointment and approved by the president.

305 A candidate for promotion and tenure may relinquish some or all probationary credit received,  
306 with the approval of the Dean. When a candidate with probationary credit is first eligible for  
307 consideration for promotion and tenure, he/she must notify the Dean if he/she will keep or  
308 relinquish some or all of the awarded credit.

309 The maximum time that may be served as a tenure track faculty member without the award of  
310 tenure is seven (7) years. However, a maximum of two (2) years' suspension of the probationary  
311 period may be granted due to a leave of absence based on birth or adoption of a child, or serious  
312 disability or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member. Such interruption  
313 must be approved by the president.

314 *4. Promotion to Professor of Law*

315 An associate professor is eligible to apply and be considered for promotion to full professor in the  
316 fifth year of service in rank. An earlier application for promotion in the fourth year of service in  
317 rank requires strong justification. A candidate hired initially as an associate professor may elect to  
318 apply for promotion to full professor and the award of tenure concurrently. These concurrent  
319 applications would ordinarily occur in the fifth or sixth year of service in rank.

## 320 **B. Promotion and Tenure Standards**

321 *1. General*

322 Promotion and tenure recommendations of tenure track and tenured faculty shall be based on  
323 demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and institutional and professional service. It is  
324 necessary to meet the standards in each of these three areas. Promotion and tenure decisions entail  
325 not only an evaluation of a candidate's existing contributions and accomplishments, but a



326 predictive assessment of the candidate's commitment to continued excellence and productivity in  
327 these areas.

328 Each year, the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development will convene a meeting to  
329 explain promotion and tenure policies and answer questions about any and all phases of the  
330 promotion and tenure process. This meeting shall be open to all interested faculty members.

## 331 *2. Specific Standards*

### 332 a. Teaching

333 Central to the mission of the College of Law is educating students in the study of law and preparing  
334 them for entry into the legal profession. To achieve this mission the College of Law faculty is  
335 committed to teaching excellence. Accordingly, demonstrated excellence, commitment, and  
336 effectiveness in teaching will be a necessary component of promotion and tenure review.

337 Faculty members may be effective teachers in different ways, and it is not possible to define each  
338 of the essential components of teaching effectiveness. The following factors, however, are  
339 extremely important: ability to communicate; enthusiasm for teaching and for engagement with  
340 students; effective preparation for class; breadth and depth of relevant knowledge; thoughtful  
341 organization of both individual class sessions and overall course organization; ability to motivate  
342 students to engage with the subject matter of the course; and availability to students beyond the  
343 classroom environment for advisement and other academic purposes. Equally important are a  
344 faculty member's efforts to integrate professional values and skills with knowledge and doctrine,  
345 establish clear course objectives, and devise effective methods of assessing student achievement.

346 Assessment of teaching quality is based on three primary, though not exclusive, sources of  
347 information: 1) faculty peer evaluations based on class visits, 2) student evaluations, and 3) the  
348 candidate's own statement of pedagogical goals and methodologies.

### 349 b. Scholarship

350 The central mission of the College of Law also requires a faculty committed to scholarly pursuits  
351 directed to academic and professional audiences. These pursuits should lead to publications that  
352 make important contributions to the development of the law, such as scholarship relating to  
353 doctrinal analysis and policy, law reform, legal practice, the improvement of legal institutions,  
354 legal education, and research that ventures beyond the law and offers empirical and  
355 interdisciplinary perspectives.

356 Engaging in such research is important for two reasons. First, scholarship is a critical component  
357 of effective teaching. Teaching informs scholarship and scholarship informs the important  
358 ingredients of good teaching: rigorous analysis, creativity, and the lifelong development and  
359 enhancement of one's area of expertise. Second, scholarship is about the study of problems that  
360 result in the dissemination of knowledge. It is not enough for faculty to acquire knowledge and

361 develop expertise if they do not apply it and share it both for further study within the academy and  
362 for the use and benefit of professional communities and institutions.

363 The quality of a candidate's scholarship, as judged by peers at this and other institutions, is thus a  
364 substantial factor in any promotion and tenure recommendation. Towards this end, it is a faculty  
365 member's responsibility to pursue, and the College of Law's responsibility to support, the  
366 development of a scholarly agenda that steadily gains significant recognition and standing in one's  
367 field of study. Factors relevant in demonstrating the recognition and impact of a faculty member's  
368 work include, without limitation, assessments in external review letters by peers in the field;  
369 invitations to present work at important conferences, workshops, symposia; citations to, or re-  
370 publication of, the candidate's work; scholarly and professional responses to articles; recognition  
371 of a candidate's work by scholarly, professional or governmental organizations; and impact on  
372 policy, practice or the development of the law.

373 Recognizing that legal journals are typically run by law students rather than academic peers, the  
374 quality of the candidate's scholarship is of primary importance in assessing whether standards  
375 under this section have been met. The identity of the journal in which a work of scholarship is  
376 published, although in some cases reflective of the particular distinction of the piece, is secondary.  
377 While the methodology and focus of legal scholarship varies widely, excellent work must  
378 demonstrate intellectual rigor, sophisticated analysis, and originality. Quality research that  
379 possesses these attributes may take a variety of forms, such as articles and essays in law reviews  
380 and other significant academic journals, books, book chapters, treatises, casebooks, high-quality  
381 professional journals, and the published results of grant-funded research. Relevant as well are  
382 quality publications resulting from law reform and policy work with government agencies,  
383 commissions, and task forces.

384 The use of online publication outlets also is becoming more prevalent as a form for discussion and  
385 dissemination of ideas among scholars and the professional community. As this trend advances,  
386 these vehicles also may be included in one's overall research portfolio, to be given weight  
387 commensurate with their length, scholarly content and rigor of the research outlet. Participation in  
388 forms of online publication also can serve to enhance a faculty member's visibility and the  
389 recognition of his or her work, much in the way it does through attendance at conferences and  
390 other forms of conventional networking.

### 391 c. Service and Professional Engagement

392 The success and effectiveness of the College of Law also requires the faculty to be engaged in the  
393 affairs of the law school and the university, and to contribute to the advancement of the legal  
394 profession and related academic/professional initiatives and organizations. With respect to the law  
395 school and university, faculty service includes such responsibilities as taking on an appropriate  
396 share of committee responsibilities, assisting and advising student organizations, attending an  
397 appropriate share of law school and faculty-related events, and performing other duties as assigned  
398 that relate to and further the mission of the college and university.

399 With respect to professional and academic activity, such engagement includes assuming leadership  
400 responsibilities in bar associations and other professional and academic organizations;  
401 participation in professional and academic meetings, conferences and workshops; and involvement  
402 in law reform, public policy, and pro bono work. These forms of professional and academic  
403 engagement not only serve to advance the college's connections to important constituencies, they  
404 further our teaching and research missions. They do so by reinforcing faculty efforts to be creative  
405 and relevant in their teaching and writing, and by helping to promote the recognition of their work  
406 among their academic peers.

#### 407 d. Composite Measure Across the Faculty

408 The College of Law is strongest as an institution when its faculty as a whole is contributing  
409 significantly to the education of our law students, the production of scholarship, and to serving the  
410 University, professional and other external communities. While every faculty member must satisfy  
411 standards in each of these areas to achieve promotion and tenure, this does not require every faculty  
412 member to make an identical contribution to each of these endeavors every year. Thus, the  
413 promotion and tenure review process should take into account each individual's strengths and  
414 consider his or her portfolio development over the course of the promotional period, assessing his  
415 or her unique ability to contribute to the law school's holistic mission of excellence in all areas.

### 416 3. *Standards for Evaluation by Rank and For Tenure*

#### 417 a. General

418 Each level of review for promotion and for tenure entails a comprehensive assessment of a  
419 candidate's performance, progress, and potential future performance with respect to teaching,  
420 scholarship and service. Standards and expectations are applied with greater rigor at successive  
421 levels of review. For pre-tenured faculty, teaching loads are adjusted to support both their ability  
422 to focus on their pedagogy and develop a research agenda and routine. Similarly, while pre-tenured  
423 faculty are expected to engage in institutional and professional service, institutional demands, to  
424 the extent possible, should be assigned in a manner that does not undermine the development of  
425 their teaching and scholarship.

426 With respect to scholarship expectations at each level of review, a faculty member's record should  
427 reflect the results of an ongoing and active research agenda that significantly contributes to the  
428 development of law or policy and that is consistent with the typical cycle necessary to produce a  
429 quality law review article or equivalent piece of legal or interdisciplinary scholarship. Given that,  
430 the quantitative expectations noted below reflect a productivity assumption, common in legal  
431 education, that faculty will produce at a rate that averages a quality publication per year, noting of  
432 course the need to make adjustments for books and other projects of different length and  
433 complexity.

434

435

436 b. Promotion to Associate Professor

437 Pre-tenure: To qualify for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor without  
438 tenure, the faculty member must demonstrate: 1) a high level of competence and effectiveness in  
439 teaching, or growth leading towards attaining such a level, including a demonstrated commitment  
440 to the students and the quality of his or her pedagogy; 2) a record of growing scholarly achievement  
441 and recognition in one's field, supported by publications of high quality; 3) a commitment to  
442 institutional and professional service at a level commensurate with the candidate's experience; and  
443 4) a record overall that shows unmistakable promise of tenure.

444 Quantitatively, achievement of the scholarship standard for pre-tenure promotion to Associate  
445 Professor normally will require the completion and external review of at least three significant  
446 articles in law reviews, academic journals or equivalent products of research of substantial quality  
447 and academic merit. This is meant as a guide and not as a precise formula. The larger point is that  
448 candidates for promotion are expected to present a publication record that reflects sustained output,  
449 evidenced by a body of scholarly work commensurate with experience and rank. In determining  
450 the components of a scholarly portfolio under review, a work may be included when it has been  
451 published or accepted for publication in time to be included in the external review process.

452 With tenure: To qualify for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor of Law  
453 with tenure, the faculty member must satisfy the standards for tenure.

454 c. Tenure

455 Because tenure represents a career-long commitment by the institution towards a faculty member,  
456 it carries with it the expectation of ongoing productivity and the continued pursuit of excellence  
457 on the part of a tenured faculty member. Thus, a tenure assessment under the standards that follow  
458 involves a judgment not only of a faculty member's performance to date but the likelihood of a  
459 continued upward trajectory in terms of work quality, scholarly productivity, teaching  
460 effectiveness, and professional growth.

461 To qualify for tenure, the faculty member must demonstrate: 1) a high level of competence in  
462 teaching, including a demonstrated record of commitment to the students and the quality of his or  
463 her pedagogy; 2) significant scholarly achievement supported by publications of high quality and  
464 which are recognized as contributing to the advancement and development of the candidate's area  
465 of research; and 3) significant service contributions institutionally and professionally.

466 Quantitatively, achievement of the scholarship standard for an award of tenure normally will  
467 require a body of work that consists of at least four externally reviewed, significant articles in law  
468 reviews, academic journals or equivalent products of research of substantial quality and academic  
469 merit. This is meant as a guide and not as a precise formula. The larger point is that candidates for  
470 tenure are expected to produce a body of work that reflects a sustained and ongoing scholarly  
471 engagement, evidenced by several examples of scholarly work commensurate with experience and  
472 rank. In determining the components of a scholarly portfolio under review, a work may be included

473 when it has been published or accepted for publication in time to be included in the external review  
474 process.

475 A candidate who seeks tenure combined with promotion to full professor must also satisfy all full  
476 professor standards.

#### 477 d. Promotion to Professor

478 Attainment of professor status is not simply the next step on the promotion ladder. It reflects  
479 recognition that a faculty member has attained a significant level of achievement and  
480 national/international standing in the profession as a scholar, teacher and engaged colleague. Both  
481 the quantity and quality of the record required for this review should substantially surpass that  
482 required for the rank of associate professor.

483 Specifically, to qualify for promotion to professor, the faculty member must demonstrate: 1) a  
484 sustained high level of competence and continued growth in teaching, including a demonstrated  
485 record of commitment to the students and the quality of his or her pedagogy; 2) sustained and  
486 significant scholarly achievement overall, focusing on the time period since the candidate's  
487 attainment of the rank of associate professor, that has achieved significant standing and recognition  
488 in the field for its high quality and its contributions to the area of study; and 3) regular and  
489 significant service both institutionally and professionally.

490 Achievement of the scholarship standard for promotion to professor will require a productivity  
491 record that reflects a continuing and active scholarly agenda during the current promotion review  
492 period. In addition, as with the tenure decision, assessment of one's application for promotion to  
493 professor entails not only a judgment about a faculty member's record to date but the ability to  
494 predict that the candidate will continue to perform at a professor level on into the future.

### 495 **E. Role of Committees in the Promotion and Tenure Process**

#### 496 *1. Promotion and Tenure Committee*

497 The Promotion and Tenure Committee (Committee) shall work with the Dean in a cooperative  
498 system of faculty evaluation and make recommendations to the Dean on matters of reappointment,  
499 promotion and tenure.

500 The Committee shall consist of all tenure-track faculty members in the College except as follows:

- 501 a. In cases of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, only those members of the  
502 Committee who hold the rank of Professor or Associate Professor shall participate;
- 503 b. In cases, of promotion to the rank of Professor, only those members of the Committee who  
504 hold the rank of Professor shall participate;

505 c. In cases where tenure is under consideration, only those members of the Committee who  
506 are tenured shall participate;

507 d. In cases of reappointment, only those persons who are tenured or who are not tenured but  
508 who are of higher rank than the rank of the person under consideration shall participate.

509 The Committee shall also consist of Clinical faculty members with respect to (1) all issues relating  
510 to lecturers; and (2) issues relating to clinical faculty members who are of a lower rank than the  
511 voting member. If the voting member has a presumptively renewable contract, he or she is also  
512 eligible to vote on clinical faculty of the same rank who do not have this status.

## 513 2. *Co-Chairs*

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

## 521 3. *Faculty Review Subcommittee*

522 The college also will have a Faculty Review Subcommittee (Subcommittee) for promotion and  
523 tenure but not reappointment cases. This Subcommittee will be comprised of five members of the  
524 full Promotion and Tenure Committee as follows:

- 525 a. two members appointed by the Dean;
- 526 b. one general member elected by the faculty; and
- 527 c. the two co-chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

528 The purpose of the Subcommittee is to aid the Promotion and Tenure Committee in presiding over  
529 the review process. Under the leadership of the co-chairs, the Subcommittee's responsibilities  
530 generally entail overseeing and managing the stages of the process as set out below in the timeline  
531 in Section III.J. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review within the College.

532 The Subcommittee also will review each candidate's completed dossier under the applicable  
533 standards set forth above in Section III.B. Promotion and Tenure Standards, and prepare a written  
534 report and recommendation to the full Promotion and Tenure Committee. This report and  
535 recommendation is advisory only and is not binding on the full Committee, which is ultimately  
536 responsible for making a recommendation on each candidate to the Dean.

537

538

539 4. *General Rules Governing Promotion and Tenure Committee Meetings*

- 540 a. Meetings of the Committee shall be preceded by five business days' notice to all members  
541 eligible to vote on the matters raised at that meeting. When it is anticipated that a meeting  
542 will include a vote on reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the Co-Chairs shall make every  
543 effort to schedule that meeting at a time when all faculty eligible to vote are able to attend.
- 544 b. A quorum for all purposes shall be 80% of the members eligible to vote on the particular  
545 matter according to the membership criteria defined in Section II.A.1. In the absence of  
546 such a quorum, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may not act on that matter. Every  
547 effort shall be made to include faculty members who are on leave in reappointment,  
548 promotion, and tenure decisions on which they are eligible to vote. However, any faculty  
549 member who is on leave and is unavailable to participate in any reappointment, promotion,  
550 or tenure decision shall not be counted for quorum or voting purposes.
- 551 c. In reappointment matters, a simple majority of yea and nay votes cast shall be sufficient,  
552 and in promotion and tenure matters, a two-thirds majority of yea and nay votes cast shall  
553 be sufficient to make a recommendation to the Dean. In promotion and tenure matters,  
554 when the number of members present and voting is not an integer multiple of three, the  
555 number of yea and nay votes cast closest to two-thirds shall be sufficient. All such voting  
556 shall be by secret ballot.

557 **F. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review**

558 *1. Notification and Calendar within the College*

559 The formal review, recommendation and decision-making process within the College of Law will  
560 be conducted primarily during the fall semester of the academic year. To meet the University  
561 deadline for the Dean to submit materials to the provost, the information gathering process by the  
562 co-chairs and the candidates should begin the preceding spring and should conform generally to  
563 the calendar set forth below in Section III.J. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review within  
564 the College.

565 *2. Contents of the Dossier*

566 All applications for promotion and tenure will be supported by a dossier that contains a record of  
567 the candidate's professional achievements relating to teaching, scholarship and service. The  
568 contents of the dossier will include:

569 a. Provided by the Candidate

570 1. A current curriculum vita

571 2. A statement that summarizes accomplishments and goals in teaching, scholarship, and  
572 service. This document should include:

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

579 ii. A statement about the candidate's scholarship record, including evidence of  
580 recognition within one's field, and the relationship between the candidate's existing  
581 record and plans going forward. If the candidate's record includes multi-authored  
582 works of scholarship, the candidate should indicate his or her specific contributions  
583 to each article in question; and

584 iii. A statement about the candidate's institutional service and professional  
585 engagement.

586 3. Reprints or other copies of scholarly writings that will comprise the scholarship review.

587 4. At the candidate's discretion, copies of any letters, memoranda, etc. that document public  
588 service, professional engagement, leadership positions, awards, or other forms of  
589 professional recognition,

590 5. Any other letters, statements, documents or information the candidate deems relevant and  
591 material.

592 b. Prepared or Solicited by the Subcommittee

593 1. A written summary of the candidate's student course evaluations;

594 2. Faculty reviews of the candidate's teaching based on class visitations;

595 3. External and internal reviews of the candidate's scholarship; and

596 4. Subcommittee Report that reviews the candidate's record and makes a recommendation to  
597 the Promotion and Tenure Committee

598 *3. Evaluation of Teaching*

599 a. General

600 Evaluation of a candidate's teaching will be based primarily on: class visits and faculty review of  
601 the candidate's classes, student evaluations, the candidate's statement of teaching goals and  
602 methods, and any submitted materials or other submissions evidencing teaching dedication,  
603 effectiveness or innovation. Relevant as well is information relating to the faculty member's  
604 teaching load, student advisement, the creation of new courses, supervision of independent study,



605 and where possible and practicable, teaching methods that integrate, or introduce students to, skills  
606 and professional values in their doctrinal courses.

#### 607 b. Class Visitation and Faculty Review

608 Class visitation and peer evaluation of a faculty member's classes are important vehicles for  
609 evaluating and promoting effective teaching. Annually, the co-chairs or their designees on the  
610 Subcommittee will assign two-person faculty teams to conduct class observations for all pre-  
611 tenured faculty as well as for candidates for promotion to professor.

612 Each faculty team will conduct observations of at least two full 75-minute classes of the same  
613 course. When a candidate is teaching different courses during the year, the two-person team will  
614 decide, after consultation with the faculty member, which course will be visited.

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

620 The co-chairs will promptly provide a copy of the visitation report(s) to the observed faculty  
621 member who may promptly request that a second team be assigned for observation and report  
622 before any action is taken on the observed faculty member's reappointment, promotion or tenure.  
623 The original visitation report shall be filed in the observed faculty member's portfolio in the Dean's  
624 office, a copy being retained in a duplicate file kept by the co-chairs of the Promotion and Tenure  
625 Committee during the period prior to the faculty decision on the member's candidacy for  
626 reappointment, promotion or tenure.

#### 627 c. Student Evaluations

628 The co-chairs or their designees on the Subcommittee are expected to review the student  
629 evaluations of a candidate's classes during the promotional period and prepare a summary report  
630 of the evaluations for the candidate's dossier. A copy of this summary will be provided to the  
631 candidate for review and comment prior to its finalization, and the candidate will have the  
632 opportunity to place a responsive statement in the file.

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

#### 636 4. *Evaluation of Scholarship and External Reviews*

637 To assist the Promotion and Tenure Committee in its assessment of a candidate's scholarship, the  
638 Dean will solicit peer evaluations, both internal and external, from experts in the candidate's field.

639 With respect to the number of external reviewers, a candidate's dossier generally should be  
640 supported by five external letters and at least two internal letters.

641 The names of the external reviewers should be drawn from lists of those recommended by the  
642 candidate and the Dean (who may consult with the co-chairs and the associate Deans). At least  
643 half of the external letters must come from reviewers on the Dean's list. External reviewers from  
644 academic institutions must hold the rank of associate or full professor and should be affiliated with  
645 research universities in which the emphasis on research and scholarship is of a rigor similar to  
646 aspirational peers in legal education. The primary consideration in selecting reviewers should be  
647 their reputation and standing in the candidate's field of expertise. In appropriate circumstances,  
648 external reviewers may be drawn from relevant non-academic, professional settings. External  
649 reviewers cannot be closely affiliated with the candidate (e.g., co-author, co-worker, dissertation  
650 chair). Accompanying each external review letter should be a brief resume or bio showing the  
651 reviewer's accomplishments, standing in the field, and past relationship, if any, with the candidate.

652 In communicating with the external reviewers, the Dean will provide the candidate's vita along  
653 with copies of the selected or multiple publications the reviewer has been asked to evaluate.  
654 External reviewers will be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of the scholarly work or  
655 works under review and the contributions it makes to the candidate's discipline.

656 External review letters shall be kept confidential from all persons other than those individuals  
657 involved in some aspect of the candidate's promotion or tenure application. Upon receipt of an  
658 external review, the co-chairs will provide a copy to the faculty member under consideration for  
659 promotion and tenure.

#### 660 *5. Evaluation of Institutional and Professional Service*

661 Evaluation of a candidate's Institutional and Professional Service should consider: the nature and  
662 extent of the candidate's service activities, the candidate's engagement in an appropriate level of  
663 the faculty's institutional responsibilities, the candidate's capacity to assume leadership  
664 responsibilities, and the degree to which professional engagement has served to buttress the  
665 candidate's teaching and scholarly activities and enhance the candidate's reputation among his  
666 peers.

667 To evaluate these factors, the committee will review the candidate's own statement and solicit  
668 input from the chairs of faculty committees on which the candidate has served during the  
669 promotional period. The committee also may contact external constituencies associated with the  
670 candidate's public or professional service activities and make all other inquiries as the committee  
671 deems appropriate.

672

673

674

675 **G. Deliberation Procedures for the Committee, the Subcommittee and the Dean**

676 *1. Subcommittee Review*

677 Once the candidate's dossier is complete, the Subcommittee will carefully review the candidate's  
678 application and meet to discuss it.

679 *2. Report*

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

685 *3. Timing of Report*

686 The report must be completed and made available to the candidate no later than 12 business days  
687 before the Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting on the candidate. The candidate may submit  
688 a written response to the report within seven business days of its receipt.

689 *4. Availability to Faculty*

690 The report, the candidate's response (if any), and the candidate's dossier must be made available  
691 to eligible faculty at least 5 business days before the Promotion and Tenure Committee vote on the  
692 candidate.

693 *5. Promotion and Tenure Committee Meeting on Candidates*

694 The Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet to discuss and evaluate the merits of each  
695 candidate's application in light of the dossier and the Subcommittee's report and recommendation.  
696 The co-chairs of the Committee will preside. In accordance with the voting rules set forth in  
697 Section III.E.4. General Rules Governing Promotion and Tenure Committee Meetings, the  
698 Committee will make recommendations to the Dean on each candidate's application.

699 *6. Dean's Review*

700 Upon receiving recommendations for promotion and tenure and reappointment, the Dean will  
701 conduct a review of the candidate's application based on the Promotion and Tenure Committee's  
702 recommendation and the candidate's dossier. The Dean will make an independent assessment of  
703 whether to recommend favorable action, and forward all positive recommendations for promotion  
704 and tenure to the provost, accompanied by the Dean's written letter in support of the  
705 recommendation and the candidate's file.

706 Candidates that are not recommended by the Dean must receive a written decision and rationale  
707 no later than ten working days after the Dean's decision. Candidates who are not recommended by

708 the Dean may appeal the Dean's decision to the provost in the manner provided by the University  
709 Promotion and Tenure Manual.

#### 710 *7. Notice to Candidates*

711 All candidates will receive timely notice in writing of the Committees' and the Dean's  
712 recommendations and a copy of any report(s) that are made of the candidate's credentials. All  
713 candidates have the right to respond in writing to these decisions. Copies of any such response will  
714 be included in the material reviewed at all higher levels.

### 715 **H. Support, Evaluation, and Reappointment of Pre-Tenure Faculty**

#### 716 *1. Support*

717 Upon the arrival of each newly hired pre-tenure faculty member, the Associate Dean for Research  
718 and Faculty Development will designate a member of the tenured faculty to serve as a mentor for  
719 the new faculty member. Faculty mentors will provide support and guidance that will aid the new  
720 colleague in the development of his or her teaching, scholarship and service. At the same time,  
721 faculty mentors are not meant to be the only source of communication, but to facilitate the faculty's  
722 commitment to providing regular, constructive and candid advice.

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

#### 726 *2. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment*

##### 727 a. Committee Review

728 Annually, each spring, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet to review the performance  
729 and progress of each pre-tenure faculty member and make a recommendation to the Dean in  
730 support of or against reappointment.

##### 731 b. Standards

732 This annual process requires the Committee to assess the pre-tenure faculty's incremental and  
733 cumulative progress toward satisfying the standards for promotion and tenure by the end of the  
734 probationary period. Thus, the promotion and tenure standards of Section C. of this document  
735 should guide faculty members in their planning and pacing during the pre-tenure period.  
736 Depending on the particular circumstances, the Committee may choose to recommend  
737 reappointment while also noting particular areas that need improvement.

##### 738 c. Dossier

739 All reappointment reviews will be supported by a dossier that contains a cumulative record of the  
740 faculty member's professional achievements relating to teaching, scholarship and service. The

741 contents of the dossier will be similar but not identical to that described in Section II.B. for  
742 promotion and tenure and will not include external reviews of scholarship.

743 d. Notification of Renewal and Dean's Review

744 After receiving the Committee's reappointment recommendations, the Dean will timely notify all  
745 pre-tenured faculty on the issue of their reappointment.

746 In addition, each spring the Dean will meet with each pre-tenure faculty member to review the  
747 faculty member's performance and progress towards tenure, noting accomplishments, areas of  
748 strength, and any areas of concern. The Dean will conduct these reviews based on the  
749 reappointment dossier compiled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the annual report  
750 document that each faculty member is required to complete each year. The review will include  
751 discussion of any significant issues evident from the record or that surfaced during the Promotion  
752 and Tenure Committee's review.

753 **I. Pre-Tenure Review**

754 Each pre-tenure faculty member will undergo a formal pre-tenure review during the spring of the  
755 third academic year of service. When a faculty member is hired with one or two years of  
756 probationary credit towards tenure and promotion, he or she also will undergo a pre-tenure review.  
757 A faculty member hired with three years of probationary credit may waive pre-tenure review with  
758 written approval of the Dean.

759 The pre-tenure review will be more substantial than annual reappointment review. Its purpose is  
760 to assess progress toward tenure, and provide tenure track faculty members with a constructive  
761 evaluation of their progress. The review should identify strengths and accomplishments and  
762 pinpoint areas in need of improvement in which tenured faculty may provide assistance to tenure  
763 track colleagues.

764 *1. Time of Review*

765 Each tenure track member of the faculty will be reviewed in the Spring Semester of the faculty  
766 member's third academic year at the College of Law. This review will coincide with the annual  
767 spring reappointment process. In the case of persons with prior teaching credit at other institutions,  
768 the cumulative review will occur in the spring semester one full year prior to the first year in which  
769 they would first be eligible to seek tenure. A faculty member hired with three years of probationary  
770 credit may waive pre-tenure review with written approval of the Dean.

771 *2. Reviewing Committee*

772 The review will be conducted by a Committee of three tenured faculty members. Two members of  
773 this committee will be elected by the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the same time the  
774 election for Chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is held. The third member of the  
775 Committee will be the newly elected Chair or Co-Chair of the Promotion & Tenure Committee.

776 *3. Purposes of Review*

777 The review will provide each tenure-track faculty member with a clear idea of how adequately he  
778 or she is progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure. The review should  
779 identify strengths and accomplishments and pinpoint areas in need of improvement in which  
780 tenured faculty may provide assistance to tenure track colleagues.

781 *4. Scope of Review*

782 The Committee will review the annual reports submitted by the faculty member to the Dean for  
783 the years in question and report on the faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching,  
784 scholarship, and service. The Committee will also review both the student evaluations and the  
785 annual faculty teaching evaluations of the tenure track candidate. No additional class visitation  
786 will be necessary for the cumulative review. The Committee will also consider internal faculty  
787 evaluations of the candidate's scholarship as well as any external letters that are available; provided  
788 that no external evaluation shall be required for pre-tenure review. The Committee will also  
789 interview the faculty member in order to gain information as to the faculty member's achievements  
790 and goals.

791 *5. Report of the Committee*

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

800 The form of the report shall be as follows:

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

806 b. Evaluations of Teaching:

807 i. Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the  
808 review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each  
809 course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.

- 810           ii.    Brief description of any courses that were redesigned or developed by the faculty  
811           during the review period.
- 812           iii.   Brief description of teaching at any other institution or any other College within the  
813           University.
- 814           iv.    Listing of any teaching awards or other recognition for teaching.
- 815           v.     Reference to student course evaluations;
- 816           vi.    Other evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- 817           c.    Scholarship: publications in press or published; manuscripts submitted; research in  
818           progress; grant applications pending.
- 819           d.    University Service: at the College or University levels including committees, task forces,  
820           advising student organizations, etc.
- 821           e.    Professional Service: including papers or presentations at conferences, advisory or drafting  
822           roles for public officials or entities, bar association participation and/or leadership roles,  
823           etc.
- 824           f.    Public and Community Service: including appointive or elective office, leadership roles in  
825           community organizations, etc.
- 826           g.    Grants and/or Fellowships Awarded
- 827           h.    Awards and Honors
- 828           i.    Other Evidence of Achievements
- 829           j.    Committee Evaluation: Evaluation by the Committee, reflecting the Promotion and Tenure  
830           Committee’s discussion of a faculty member’s progress toward promotion or tenure,  
831           including strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the  
832           faculty member. The suggestions for improvement should, in the spirit of the University  
833           Policy, identify areas in which a tenure track faculty member can change orientation and  
834           activity in pursuit of tenure.
- 835           k.    Current vita of faculty member; copies of faculty member’s annual reports for the review  
836           period; and copies of evaluations of classroom teaching based on annual class visitations  
837           that are conducted by other faculty members for the reappointment process in accordance  
838           with the College’s Promotion & Tenure document.

839    6. *Faculty Discussion Report*

840 Following the Committee's completion of the pre-tenure report, the Committee shall make it  
841 available for review and discussion by the tenured faculty. This review and discussion shall take  
842 place at the spring Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting in the year of the review after a vote  
843 on renewal of the candidate's teaching contract.

#### 844 *7. Role of Faculty Member*

845 In addition to the faculty member's consultative role in the review process, if the faculty member  
846 disagrees with any portion of the Committee report or the Dean's review, he or she may submit a  
847 written response which will be attached to the report and made a part thereof. The faculty member  
848 is to be given a reasonable opportunity to prepare the response prior to submission of the report to  
849 the Dean and prior to the submission of the Dean's review and the Committee report to the Provost.

#### 850 *8. Role of the Dean*

851 The Dean is to provide promptly a written review of the Committee report, copies of which are to  
852 be submitted to the Committee and the faculty member. The Dean is then to submit the report,  
853 along with the Dean's review, to the Provost of the University.

### 854 **J. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review within the College**

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

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

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

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

866 May: Co-chairs will provide to the Dean a list of the names of all external and internal reviewers  
867 who will be asked to provide evaluations of the candidates' scholarship. Reviewers will be asked  
868 to submit their written evaluations no later than Sept. 15.

869 Early September: All external and internal reviews of scholarship should be completed in in the  
870 dossier.

871 Early September: Candidates' written statements in support of their application for promotion or  
872 tenure are due.



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

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

877 Third week in October: The Subcommittee will provide the candidates with copies of its report.  
878 Candidates will have seven working days to submit a response.

879 Late October/early November: Completed candidate dossier made available to full Promotion and  
880 Tenure Committee.

881 November: Full Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting to discuss and vote on the candidates  
882 for promotion and tenure. Candidates notified of Committee recommendations.

883 December/January: Dean completes written review of each candidate’s application, notifies the  
884 candidates, and forwards all positive recommendations to the Provost for further review.

885 **K. Amendments**

886 These rules for reappointment, promotion, and tenure may be amended at any meeting of the  
887 faculty by a majority vote of the members present, provided there is a quorum and that the proposed  
888 amendment has been presented to the faculty at least seven days in advance of the meeting at which  
889 it is to be voted upon.

890 **IV. POST-TENURE REVIEW**

891 **A. Purpose**

892 The post-tenure review (“PTR”) process supports the further career development of tenured faculty  
893 members and promotes accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members  
894 after they have achieved tenure. PTR is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective  
895 than is usually provided by an annual review. The results of the PTR process will be linked to  
896 rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level  
897 should receive recognition for their achievements. This may include, but is not limited to, merit  
898 pay increases, workload reallocations, graduate research assistance, and study and research leave  
899 opportunities.

900 PTR facilitates faculty development and ensures intellectual vitality and competent levels of  
901 performance by all faculty throughout their professional careers. The goal is to maximize the  
902 efforts of tenured faculty to promote the effective performance of the College. The College  
903 recognizes that the granting of tenure for faculty is an important protection of free inquiry and  
904 open intellectual debate. PTR shall be conducted by a committee of peers elected by the faculty,  
905 and the guarantees of tenure and academic freedom shall be protected throughout the process.

906 The review should be both retrospective and prospective because it recognizes past contributions  
907 and identifies the means needed for continuous intellectual and professional growth, encouraging  
908 a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's  
909 career. It is recognized that, within the traditional mix of professional activities, different emphases  
910 may be appropriate at different stages in a faculty member's career. As a faculty development tool,  
911 PTR provides an opportunity to assist tenured faculty members in formulating a multi-year plan  
912 of professional growth and activity in teaching, scholarship, student success activities, and service  
913 based on their interests and the needs and mission of the College.

914 To assure professional competence, PTR provides an opportunity to assess the tenured faculty  
915 member's effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service (including student success activities  
916 that may be interwoven into each), and over a multi-year period. Assessment of professional  
917 activities over a relatively long timespan encourages faculty members to undertake projects and  
918 initiatives that do not readily lend themselves to annual or triennial evaluation. If the PTR  
919 Committee determines that the faculty member's performance either meets expectations, exceeds  
920 expectations, or is exemplary, the review will be determined a "Successful PTR Evaluation." The  
921 outcome of a Successful PTR Evaluation should include, where appropriate, recommendations for  
922 applicable recognition and reward for achievements. If the PTR Committee determines that the  
923 faculty member's performance does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the review will  
924 be determined an "Unsuccessful PTR Evaluation." The outcome of an Unsuccessful PTR  
925 Evaluation will be a Performance Improvement Plan ("PIP").

## 926 **B. Timeline**

927 All tenured faculty members who have rank and tenure must undergo PTR five (5) years after the  
928 award of tenure and subsequently every five (5) years, unless such period is interrupted by a further  
929 review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership  
930 promotion (e.g., Dean, Associate Provost), or for other acceptable reasons, discussed below.

931 A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for PTR before the five-year time limit.  
932 This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their  
933 colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual five-year  
934 cycle. Early PTR should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they  
935 were last evaluated for tenure or a previous PTR, whichever was the most recent. If the faculty  
936 member has a successful review, the next PTR shall be five years from the voluntary PTR date. If  
937 the faculty member is unsuccessful, the five-year PTR review date remains in place.

## 938 **C. Areas of Evaluation**

939 The evaluation must address the faculty member's accomplishments related to teaching,  
940 scholarship, and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each).  
941 Evaluative rubrics, and any changes to these rubrics, must be created jointly by faculty and

942 administrators and approved by a vote of the College’s tenured faculty using the applicable faculty  
943 governance procedures set forth in the College’s by-laws. Faculty undergoing PTR must receive a  
944 copy of rubrics used in the PTR process, if any, at least 30 days before the due date of their PTR  
945 Package. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to  
946 furthering the mission of the College through their teaching, scholarship, and service (including  
947 student success activities that may be interwoven into each). Contributions should be dated from  
948 previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous five-year period, or such  
949 shorter period consistent with this Manual.

950 Each faculty member will be reviewed, and their performance will be assessed, by reference to  
951 their differentiated workload allocations as set forth in their annual reviews. Where a faculty  
952 member has had multiple differentiated workload allocations during the applicable PTR period,  
953 the PTR Committee shall evaluate the faculty member’s aggregate performance over the period in  
954 a manner that takes into account how the faculty member performed the applicable workload  
955 expectations as they changed over time.

#### 956 **D. Composition of the PTR Committee**

957 The College faculty shall establish and at all times maintain a PTR Committee with the  
958 responsibility of conducting PTRs at the College. The composition of the PTR Committee and  
959 subcommittees thereof will be subject to the following provisions:

- 960 1. The PTR Committee must have four members, each of whom shall be a full Professor.  
961
- 962 2. The PTR Committee shall be elected by secret ballot vote of the College’s tenured faculty.  
963 The College may establish procedures for the PTR Committee election using the applicable  
964 faculty governance procedures set forth in the College’s by-laws. The Promotion and  
965 Tenure Committee shall conduct and be the final arbiter of the election.  
966
- 967 3. The Committee shall establish a 3-person subcommittee for each PTR with the exclusive  
968 responsibility of performing all the duties and responsibilities, and exercising all the rights,  
969 of the PTR Committee in connection with that particular PTR as set forth herein.  
970
- 971 4. If a faculty member has a joint appointment with budget sharing, then:  
972
  - 973 a. two of the subcommittee members for such faculty member shall be from the primary  
974 unit; and
  - 975
  - 976 b. at least one (1) member of the subcommittee shall be from the non-primary unit.  
977

- 978 5. Neither the Dean nor any other administrative faculty members shall be a member of the  
979 PTR Committee.  
980
- 981 6. The reviewed faculty member is entitled to remove one (1) person from the subcommittee  
982 without cause. If such right to remove is exercised, the third member of that reviewed  
983 faculty member's PTR subcommittee will be the PTR Committee member that was not  
984 initially assigned to the faculty member's PTR.

#### 985 **E. Submission of PTR Package by the Faculty Member**

986 The faculty member undergoing a PTR must submit the following materials to the PTR Committee  
987 (the "PTR Package"):

- 988 1. a statement that summarizes accomplishments and effectiveness in teaching, scholarship,  
989 and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each) over the  
990 previous five years and outlines goals for the next five years;  
991
- 992 2. a current curriculum vitae;  
993
- 994 3. the faculty member's teaching evaluations (only course evaluations from courses taught  
995 since the last promotion or post-tenure evaluation should be included);  
996
- 997 4. copies of the Dean's Annual Review Forms for the previous five (5) years; and  
998
- 999 5. a statement outlining goals for the next five (5) years.

1000

#### 1001 **F. The PTR Committee Review Process**

##### 1002 *1. The Committee's Overall PTR Assessment*

1003 The PTR Committee shall:

- 1004 a. examine the materials included in the PTR Package;  
1005
- 1006 b. determine whether the faculty member's *overall* performance during the applicable review  
1007 period (1) does not meet expectations; (2) needs improvement; (3) meets expectations; (4)  
1008 exceeds expectations; or (5) is exemplary (such determination, the "Overall PTR  
1009 Assessment"); and  
1010
- 1011 c. provide a written assessment of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service during  
1012 the 5-year PTR period that supports the Committee's Overall PTR Assessment and

1013 evaluates the faculty member’s strengths and achievements, providing suggestions (where  
1014 appropriate) as to areas of improvement (the “PTR Committee Report”).

1015 d. In making its Overall PTR Assessment, the PTR Committee shall conclusively presume  
1016 that a faculty member has, at a minimum, met expectations for purposes of a PTR if the  
1017 faculty member has been deemed to have met expectations, exceeded expectations, or  
1018 performed at an exemplary level with respect to each of the three evaluated categories of  
1019 job responsibilities in each of the annual reviews during the applicable review period and  
1020 the PTR Committee shall give the faculty member a Successful and positive PTR Report,  
1021 Assessment and Evaluation.

## 1022 *2. Content of the PTR Committee Report*

1023 In the event of a Successful PTR Evaluation, the PTR Committee Report shall contain a brief  
1024 narrative text explaining the PTR Committee’s Overall PTR Assessment and, if appropriate, shall  
1025 include commendation of positive aspects of performance and identify and recommend any  
1026 necessary improvements. The PTR Committee Report does not need to address the reviewed  
1027 faculty member’s statement outlining goals for the next five (5) years.

1028 The PTR Committee Report shall also include (a) a record of the PTR Committee’s vote by  
1029 numbers of votes in each of these categories (Yes, No, Abstain) (provided, however, that the names  
1030 of the PTR Committee members are not to be attached to each vote); (b) signatures of all members  
1031 of the PTR Committee; and (c) where appropriate, comments on faculty development and  
1032 resources appropriate for execution.

1033 For associate professors, comments on faculty development and resources should include activities  
1034 to enhance prospects for successful promotion.

1035 In the event of an Unsuccessful PTR Evaluation, the PTR Committee Report shall contain all the  
1036 materials required in a report concerning a Successful PTR Evaluation, but it shall also contain a  
1037 narrative text listing and critiquing all areas supporting the PTR Committee’s determination that  
1038 the reviewed faculty member merits an Unsuccessful PTR Evaluation.

## 1039 *3. Timing of Delivery of Draft and Final PTR Committee Reports & Faculty Member’s Rights to* 1040 *Rebut and Object*

1041 The PTR Committee shall provide a draft of the PTR Committee Report to the faculty member  
1042 no later than 15 days before delivering the final PTR Committee Report to the Dean, and the  
1043 faculty member shall have the right to rebut or raise objections to the contents of the draft PTR  
1044 Committee Report by writing to the PTR Committee (such writing, an “Initial PTR Rebuttal  
1045 Letter”). Following the expiration of this 15-day period, the PTR Committee shall promptly  
1046 transmit (1) the final PTR Committee Report (including any relevant supporting documentation)

1047 and (2) the Initial PTR Rebuttal Letter, if any, to the Dean. The PTR Committee shall provide a  
1048 copy of the final PTR Committee Report to the faculty member contemporaneously with the  
1049 submission of the same to the Dean. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a final  
1050 rebuttal letter to the PTR Report (a “Final PTR Rebuttal Letter”) during the 5-day period  
1051 following the submission of the final PTR Committee Report to the Dean, and any such Final  
1052 PTR Rebuttal Letter will be included in the faculty member’s file.

1053 **G. Responsibilities of the Dean**

1054 The Dean shall promptly review the PTR Committee Report upon receipt. In the case of an  
1055 Unsuccessful PTR Evaluation, the Dean must meet with the faculty member to discuss the results  
1056 of the PTR. The Dean shall also have the responsibility of transmitting the final PTR Committee  
1057 Report to the Provost. The Dean’s letter accompanying the transmission of the PTR Committee  
1058 Report (the “Dean’s Letter”) may contain the Dean’s comments on the Report. The Dean may  
1059 dissent from an Unsuccessful PTR evaluation. The Dean may not dissent from the PTR  
1060 Committee’s Overall PTR Assessment in any case involving a Successful PTR Evaluation unless  
1061 the Dean can document that the PTR Committee’s Overall PTR Assessment and Evaluation is  
1062 unfounded, arbitrary and capricious. However, under no circumstances, may the Dean dissent from  
1063 the Overall PTR Assessment if the faculty member has been deemed to have met expectations,  
1064 exceeded expectations, or performed at an exemplary level with respect to each of the three  
1065 evaluated categories of job responsibilities in each of the annual reviews during the applicable  
1066 review period.

1067 In the event of an Unsuccessful PTR Evaluation—i.e., when the PTR Committee has determined  
1068 that the faculty member’s performance has not met expectations or needs improvement—the letter  
1069 must also describe next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty  
1070 member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas  
1071 identified as unsatisfactory.

1072 The Dean shall provide a draft of the Dean’s Letter to the faculty member and the PTR Committee  
1073 no later than 10 days before transmitting the Dean’s Letter to the Provost, and the faculty member  
1074 shall have the right to rebut or raise objections to the contents of the draft Dean’s Letter in writing  
1075 (“Initial Objection Letter to Dean”). Following the expiration of this 10-day period, the Dean shall  
1076 promptly transmit (1) the final Dean’s Letter and (2) an Initial Objection Letter to Dean, if any, to  
1077 the Provost. The Dean shall provide a copy of the final Dean’s Letter to the PTR Committee and  
1078 the faculty member contemporaneously with the submission of the same to the provost. The faculty  
1079 member shall have the right to rebut or raise objections to the contents of the final Dean’s Letter  
1080 in writing to the Provost (“Final Rebuttal to Dean’s Letter”) during the 5-day period following the  
1081 submission of the final Dean’s Letter to the Provost, and any such Final Rebuttal to Dean’s Letter  
1082 will be included in the faculty member’s file. No further action is required by the Dean in  
1083 connection with the filing of a Final Rebuttal to Dean’s Letter.

1084 **H. Outcomes and Consequences of Post-Tenure Review**

1085 The results of a Successful PTR Evaluation should be linked to recognition or reward. The result  
1086 of an Unsuccessful PTR Evaluation is a PIP.

1087 *1. Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)*

1088 The PIP is used to remediate the documented deficiencies giving rise to an Unsuccessful PTR  
1089 Evaluation—i.e., where the PTR Committee has determined that the faculty member’s  
1090 performance has not met expectations or needs improvement. The Dean and the faculty member  
1091 shall work together to develop a PIP, in consultation with the PTR Committee, that is directed  
1092 toward the deficiencies found by the Committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the  
1093 PTR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards  
1094 remedying the deficiencies identified in the PTR, so as to scaffold faculty growth and development  
1095 and to strengthen future promotion possibilities. The PIP must contain the following:

- 1096 a. clearly defined goals or outcomes;
- 1097 b. an outline of activities to be undertaken;
- 1098 c. a timetable;
- 1099 d. available resources and support;
- 1100 e. expectations for improvement; and
- 1101 f. a monitoring strategy.

1102 The PIP’s goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the timeframe through the  
1103 exercise of ordinary professional diligence, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member.  
1104 The PIP must be approved by the Dean and the PTR Committee and submitted to the Office of  
1105 Faculty Affairs where permanent faculty files are housed. The Dean and the faculty member must  
1106 meet twice during each of the fall and spring semesters to review progress, document additional  
1107 needs/resources, and identify planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each  
1108 meeting, the Dean shall summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on  
1109 track to complete the PIP; this summary shall be provided to the faculty member and included in  
1110 the faculty member’s file. A faculty member shall receive written notice of the possibility of any  
1111 remedial actions when the PIP begins.

1112 *2. Review of PIP Completion*

1113 To fulfil its obligation to provide feedback to the Dean concerning the faculty member’s  
1114 completion of the PIP, the PTR Committee shall convene at the conclusion of the academic year  
1115 to review the faculty member’s progress in completing the PIP.

1116 The PTR Committee shall (1) review the faculty member’s progress as recorded by the Dean and  
1117 any information provided by the faculty member and (2) make a recommendation to the Dean  
1118 concerning whether the reviewed faculty member has successfully completed the PIP (such  
1119 recommendation, a “PIP Completion Recommendation”). In performing its review, the PTR  
1120 Committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person meeting is necessary, and it may  
1121 base its PIP Completion Recommendation solely on a review of the record (including the  
1122 summaries of any meetings with the Dean). In reviewing the record and preparing a PIP  
1123 Completion Recommendation, the PTR’s substantive inquiry is whether the reviewed faculty  
1124 member has successfully completed the PIP. A faculty member will have “successfully completed”  
1125 a PIP when the faculty member has remediated the deficiencies identified by the Committee in its  
1126 PTR Committee Report, or has made substantive progress towards their remediation. The PTR  
1127 Committee shall transmit its PIP Completion Recommendation to the Dean not later than two  
1128 weeks following the end of the academic year, with a contemporaneous copy to be provided to the  
1129 reviewed faculty member. The PIP Completion Recommendation will be included in the faculty  
1130 member’s file.

1131 After considering the PIP Completion Recommendation and its reasoning, the Dean shall, not later  
1132 than one week following the transmittal of the PIP Completion Recommendation, (1) determine  
1133 whether the faculty member has successfully completed the PIP and (2) provide notice to the PTR  
1134 Committee and the reviewed faculty member of such determination. In taking the Committee’s  
1135 feedback into account for this purpose, the Dean shall affirm the PIP Completion Recommendation  
1136 unless the Dean finds the PIP Completion Recommendation to be unfounded, arbitrary, and  
1137 capricious.

1138 The Dean’s assessment and determination of whether the faculty member has successfully  
1139 completed the PIP shall take the place of that year’s annual review. Failure to successfully  
1140 complete the PIP within the one-year time period subjects the faculty member to disciplinary  
1141 actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of workload, salary reduction, and  
1142 tenure revocation and dismissal.

1143 If the faculty member successfully completes the PIP, then the faculty member’s next PTR shall  
1144 take place on the regular five-year schedule.

1145 If the Dean and the PTR Committee determine that the faculty member has not successfully  
1146 completed the PIP, then the Dean shall, after consultation with the PTR Committee, recommend  
1147 appropriate remedial actions corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s  
1148 deficiencies. The Dean shall provide notice to the Provost, the President, the PTR Committee, and  
1149 the faculty member of the recommended remedial actions no later than five (5) days following the  
1150 date the Dean provided notice to the faculty member and the PTR Committee of the Dean’s  
1151 determination that the faculty member has not successfully completed the PIP. If the Dean  
1152 recommends remedial action, the faculty member may request due process as explained below.



1153 The President shall make the final determination on behalf of the University regarding any  
1154 appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the  
1155 University's final decision pursuant to the Board of Regents Policy on Applications for  
1156 Discretionary Review 6.26.

#### 1157 **I. Due Process Following an Unsuccessful PIP**

1158 Upon request by the faculty member, the PTR Committee shall review the materials that attest to  
1159 PIP progress and the proposed remedial action and make its recommendation.

1160 The faculty member has ten (10) business days from receiving the recommendation of the Dean to  
1161 request the PTR Committee's due process review as outlined below. Further, in the event that  
1162 either the Dean recommends, or the University proposes to take, remedial action involving actual  
1163 or constructive termination or revocation of tenure, the Dean and the PTR Committee will  
1164 coordinate to conduct a review process to ensure compliance with the requirements of the  
1165 College's accrediting agency, the American Bar Association, including the procedures described  
1166 in ABA 2021-2022 Standards for Approval of Law Schools, Standard 405 and Appendix 1. Upon  
1167 request to review the recommended remedial action by the faculty member, further due process  
1168 shall include the following:

1169 1. The PTR Committee shall review the recommendation of the Dean. The PTR Committee  
1170 may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The  
1171 recommendation of the PTR Committee may be based solely on a review of the record.  
1172 The PTR Committee shall issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member  
1173 within twenty (20) business days of the request for review by the faculty member.

1174 2. Within five (5) business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the PTR  
1175 Committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying them  
1176 of the decision.

1177 3. The faculty member may appeal to the President within five (5) business days of receiving  
1178 the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision shall be made within ten (10)  
1179 business days and should notify the faculty member of the decision and the process for  
1180 discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.

1181 4. If the remedial action taken by the President is dismissal, the faculty member may complete  
1182 their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution;  
1183 however, the semester during which a final decision is issued shall be the last semester of  
1184 employment in their current role.

1185 5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final  
1186 decision pursuant to Board of Regents policy on Applications for Discretionary Review  
1187 (6.26).

1188

1189 **APPENDIX A – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT**

1190 **Georgia State University College of Law**

1191 **Faculty Annual Review Summary Report – Tenure-Track Faculty**

1192 (to be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean)

| <b>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</b> | <b>Itemized Points (indicate type A or B)</b> | <b>A Points</b> | <b>B Points</b> | <b>Total Points</b> | <b>Rating (Likert scale 1-5)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>T</b> %                                    |   |                 |                 |                     |                                  |
| <b>R</b> %                                    |   |                 |                 |                     |                                  |
| <b>S</b> %                                    |   |                 |                 |                     |                                  |

1193 Under Itemized Points, include any points carried over from previous years. Do not include  
 1194 points to be carried over to subsequent.

1195 Specify here any points to be carried over to subsequent years.

| <b>Category &amp; Type of Points to be Carried Over</b> | <b>Academic Year in Which Points were Earned</b> | <b>Number of Unused Points to be Carried Over to Subsequent Years</b> |
|---|--|---|
|   |  |   |
|   |  |   |

1196 Request for Annual Workload Allocation for Next Review Period

| <b>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S)<br/>(%)</b> |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>T</b>  | <b>%</b> |
| <b>R</b>  | <b>%</b> |
| <b>S</b>  | <b>%</b> |

1197 Comments:

1198 **APPENDIX B – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE**

1199 **Georgia State University College of Law**

1200 **Faculty Annual Review Questionnaire**

1201 (to be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean)

1202 Please complete the following self-assessment questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire is  
1203 to provide you an opportunity to highlight your most significant achievements during current  
1204 academic year and to provide qualitative detail regarding those achievements.

1205 1. Summarize your most significant scholarly achievements in during the current academic year,  
1206 including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. Note if any of your research is  
1207 supported by external funding. Report any awards you received related to your scholarship.  
1208 Describe any aspects of your scholarship that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion  
1209 broadly defined.

1210 2. Summarize your most significant achievements in teaching during the current academic year,  
1211 including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. List all courses that you taught  
1212 in 2020 by semester and indicate the credit hours for each one. Report any awards you received  
1213 related to your scholarship. Describe any aspects of your scholarship that contribute to diversity,  
1214 equity and inclusion broadly defined.

1215 3. Summarize your most significant achievements in service to the College of Law, Georgia  
1216 State University, or the legal profession during the current academic year, including completed  
1217 projects and progress on unfinished projects. List all your committee assignments and roles.  
1218 Report any awards you received related to your teaching. Describe any aspects of your teaching  
1219 that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

1220 4. Summarize your most significant achievements in student success during the current academic  
1221 year, including completed projects and progress on unfinished projects. List all your committee  
1222 assignments and roles. Report any awards you received related to your teaching. Describe any  
1223 aspects of your teaching that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

1224 5. Summarize any additional significant achievements during the current academic year that you  
1225 would like to highlight that are not included elsewhere in this assessment. This may include  
1226 service to the profession, media appearances, public service, legal practice, advocacy work, etc.  
1227 Report any awards you received related to these activities. Describe any aspects of these  
1228 activities that contribute to diversity, equity and inclusion broadly defined.

1229 6. Did you provide any consulting related to funded research in the current academic year here at  
1230 GSU on projects for which you are not listed as an investigator in Digital Measures? If so, please  
1231 list the projects, a brief description of the research, any funding that it has received, and the  
1232 approximate number of hours you spent consulting. (Any information about your own funded  
1233 research should be discussed in response to Question 1 above.)

1234 7. Did you provide any consulting related to non-funded research in the current academic year  
1235 here at GSU? If so, please list the research, a brief description of the research, and the  
1236 approximate number of hours you spent consulting.

1237 8. Did you co-teach with any non-College of Law GSU colleagues in the current academic year?  
1238 If so, please list the colleagues and courses or events with a brief description and the  
1239 approximate number of hours you spent co-teaching.

1240 9. Did you teach non-College of Law GSU students in the current academic year? If so, please  
1241 list the courses or events with a brief description and the approximate number of hours you spent  
1242 teaching.

1243 10. Were you hired as part of the 2CI initiative or the Next Generation Program? If so, in what  
1244 cluster or area of expertise were you hired and in what year?

1245 11. How would you rate your performance in the current academic year? Did you meet all of the  
1246 goals that you identified? If not, why not?

1247 12. What are your primary goals in teaching, scholarship, and service for the coming academic  
1248 year? Please be specific. What obstacles do you anticipate in achieving those goals? How might  
1249 you overcome those obstacles?

1250 13. Would you like to be considered for any College of Law, university, or external awards? A  
1251 list of College of Law awards can be found at this [link](#). A list of university awards can be found  
1252 at this [link](#). If you would like to be nominated for an award, please provide a summary of  
1253 qualifications that could serve as the basis for a nomination and any other information about  
1254 yourself or the award that would be helpful.

1255 14. Please select the events below that you attended in the current academic year. (Select all that  
1256 apply)

1257  [DATE] [EVENT]

1258  [DATE] [EVENT]

1259  [DATE] [EVENT]

1260 List any additional College of Law or University events that you attended in the current  
1261 academic year that are not listed including center events, faculty presentations and admissions  
1262 events.

1263 **APPENDIX C – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW FORM**

1264 **Georgia State University College of Law**

1265 **Faculty Annual Review**

1266 (to be submitted by the Dean to the Provost)

1267 **Faculty Information**

1268 First Name:

1269 Last Name:

1270 Employee ID:

1271 Job Title:

1272 Rank:

1273 Years in Rank:

1274 **Annual Workload Allocation**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision          | % |
| Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities | % |
| Service/Administration/Management                 | % |

1275 **Rating Instructions**

1276 In each category, the Dean must evaluate performance during the past calendar year on the  
1277 following scale:

1278 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations

1279 2 – Needs Improvement

1280 3 – Meets Expectations

1281 4 – Exceeds Expectations

1282 5 – Exemplary

1283 The meaning of each qualifying term is determined by the disciplinary norms and expectations  
1284 set by the College of Law for a given faculty job type, rank, and workload allocation.

1285 Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the  
1286 above Likert Scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above Likert  
1287 Scale.

1288 When rating the faculty member’s performance in each workload area, the supervisor should  
1289 consider pertinent student success activities for that area, as defined by the College of Law.

1290 **Annual Evaluation**

1291 Name of Dean:

1292 Date of Evaluation:

| <b>Workload Area</b>                              | <b>Rating</b> |
|---|---------------|
| Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision          |               |
| Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities |               |
| Service/Administration/Management                 |               |

1293 Comments:

|               |
|---------------|
| 750 words max |
|---------------|

1294

1295 **Overall Assessment**

1296 Below, supervisor should indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress  
1297 toward the next level of review appropriate to the individual’s rank, tenure status and/or career  
1298 stage, as applicable. Satisfactory progress is met when an individual earns a minimum rating of  
1299 “3 – Meets Expectations” in all three workload areas. If the faculty member receives a rating of  
1300 “1 – Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2 – Needs Improvement” in any of the categories, a  
1301 Performance Remediation Plan must be completed in section 5 below.

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

1302 Comments:

|               |
|---------------|
| 750 words max |
|---------------|

1303

1304 **Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)**

1305 If the supervisor rates the faculty member’s performance as “1 – Does Not Meet Expectations”  
1306 or 2 – Needs Improvement” in *any* of the performance categories, the supervisor must provide a  
1307 performance remediation plan, in consultation with the faculty member. The components of the  
1308 PRP must include the following:

- 1309 • clearly defined goals or outcomes,
- 1310 • an outline of activities to be undertaken,
- 1311 • a timetable,
- 1312 • available resources and support,
- 1313 • expectations for improvement, and
- 1314 • a monitoring strategy.

1315 The PRP may be entered in the text box below or uploaded as a Word document (750 words  
1316 maximum).

750 words max

1317

1318 **Optional Faculty Written Response**

1319 The faculty member may submit a written response to this evaluation no more than 10 business  
1320 days after receiving the evaluation (750 words maximum).

1321

750 words max

1322



1323 **Supervisor Response to Faculty Written Response**

1324 The supervisor’s response to the faculty member’s written response (if any) must be entered  
1325 below no more than 10 business days after receiving faculty member’s written response (750  
1326 words maximum).

1327

|               |
|---------------|
| 750 words max |
|---------------|

1328 **Signatures**

1329 Faculty Member

1330 I certify that I have reviewed this written evaluation.

1331

1332 \_\_\_\_\_

1333 signature date

1334

1335 Dean

1336 I certify that I have reviewed this written evaluation

1337

1338 \_\_\_\_\_

1339 signature date

1340

1341 **APPENDIX D – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR TENURE-TRACK**  
 1342 **FACULTY**

1343 **A. Metrics for Tenure-Track Faculty**

1344 The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain  
 1345 activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category  
 1346 should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less  
 1347 central, to the category (B points).

1348 (\* = student success activities)

1349 *1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Type A Points   |  |
| classroom instruction   | # credits = # points                     |
| course release for University or COL award or for external research funding   | 3 points                                 |
| one-time course release for other reason with Dean’s approval                 | 3 points                                 |
| Type B Points   |  |
| student research supervision*<br>(e.g. independent study, law review note)    | 1 student research supervision = 1 point |
| heavy student organization supervision*<br>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 2 points    |
| light student organization supervision*<br>(< 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 1 point     |

1350 *2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities*

1351 (publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of  
 1352 a complete draft for publication and the publication date)

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Type A Points  |          |
| major publication in law review or academic journal<br>(>10K words, including footnotes) | 4 points |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| major publication in peer reviewed journal<br>(new research findings or theory, any length)   | 4 points   |
| minor publication in law review or academic journal<br>(<10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author's work, law update) | 2 points   |
| publication of chapter in academic or professional book,<br>including substantive forward or introduction   | 4 points   |
| academic or trade press book, multi-year project,<br>substantial progress<br>(monograph or coauthor)  | 2 points per chapter upon<br>completion of a chapter draft |
| academic or trade press book, multi-year project,<br>publication<br>(final editing & production)  | 2 points   |
| academic book, edited collection, editor<br>(editing)   | 3 points   |
| textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook<br>(first edition)   | 6 points   |
| textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook<br>(new edition or supplement)   | 4 points   |
| major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author<br>(>25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  | 4 points   |
| major grant application non-PI or not lead author<br>(>25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  | 2 points   |
| minor grant application PI or lead author<br>(<25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  | 2 points   |
| pro bono writings or reports, principal author<br>(e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)  | 2 points   |
| online new media series<br>(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 (including work on funded grants)<br>(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<br>(e.g. opinion piece)   | 1 point  |
| new CLE materials, published educational materials<br>(e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)  | 1 point  |
| academic or professional conference presentation   | 1 point  |

1353 3. *Service/Administration/Management*

1354 (see Appendix I for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 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   |
| Type B Points  |                               |
| peer review for retention or promotion<br>(teaching or scholarship, written report)            | 1 point                       |
| peer review for journal or non-profit research organization (e.g., Pew Trusts, Vera Institute) | 1 point                       |
| student advising*  | 1 point for every 5 students  |
| advisor to student organization*   | 2 point for each organization |
| student job placement*<br>(serving as a reference)   | 1 point for every 5 students  |

|  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| letter of reference*   | 1 point                         |
| student counseling, non-academic*  | 1 point for every 5 students    |
| certificate program supervision*   | 1 point for every 5 students    |
| NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association | 1 point for every 5 hours spent |
| pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)                           | 1 point for every 5 hours spent |

1355 **B. Requirements for Pre-Tenured Faculty**

1356 Pre-Tenured faculty have an annual workload allocation of T 33.3% / R 33.3% / S 33.3%. The  
 1357 following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity. They are applicable only  
 1358 after the first year of employment.

1359 a. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead  
 1360 of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a  
 1361 typical tenured faculty member must teach no fewer than 48 credits within that faculty  
 1362 member’s 5-year review period.

1363 b. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead  
 1364 of counting those points in the year that they are earned.

1365 In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and  
 1366 scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category*  
 1367 *as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following tables.

1368 *1. First Year on Tenure Track*

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 33.3%                                | 7(8)   | 6(7)                   | 5(5)                 | 4(4)                | 3(3)                         |
| R 33.3%                                | 1(2)   | 0(1)                   | 0                    | 0                   | 0                            |
| S 33.3 %                               | 0(3)   | 0(2)                   | 0                    | 0                   | 0                            |

1369

1370

1371 2. *Second Year on Tenure Track*

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 33.3%                                | 7(8)   | 6(7)                   | 5(6)                 | 4(4)                | 3(3)                         |
| R 33.3%                                | 1(2)   | 0(1)                   | 0                    | 0                   | 0                            |
| S 33.3 %                               | 4(5)   | 3(3)                   | 2(2)                 | 1(1)                | 0                            |

1372 3. *Third Year on Tenure Track to Tenure*

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 33.3%                                | 11(13)   | 10(11)                 | 9(9)                 | 8(8)                | 7(7)                         |
| R 33.3%                                | 4(6)   | 3(4)                   | 2(2)                 | 1(1)                | 0                            |
| S 33.3 %                               | 6(9)   | 5(7)                   | 4(5)                 | 3(4)                | 3(3)                         |

1373 **C. Requirements for Tenured Faculty**

1374 The College of Law endorses the concept of a differentiated workload policy for tenured faculty.  
 1375 Consequently, tenured faculty members may, by agreement with the Dean, adopt varying annual  
 1376 workload allocations between teaching, scholarship, and service from year to year. The following  
 1377 rules provide additional workload flexibility with a faculty member’s designated workload  
 1378 allocation to maximize productivity.

1379 For faculty with an annual workload allocation of T 33.3% / R 33.3% / S 33.3%:

1380 a. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead  
 1381 of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a  
 1382 typical tenured faculty member must teach no fewer than 48 credits within that faculty  
 1383 member’s 5-year review period.

1384 b. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead  
 1385 of counting those points in the year that they are earned.

1386

1387 In calculating a faculty member's Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and  
 1388 scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category*  
 1389 *as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following table.

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 40%                                  | 11 (14)  | 10 (12)                | 9 (10)               | 8 (8)               | 7 (7)                        |
| R 40%                                  | 5 (5)  | 4 (4)                  | 3 (3)                | 2 (2)               | 1 (1)                        |
| S 20%                                  | 6 (7)  | 5 (6)                  | 4 (4)                | 3 (3)               | 2 (3)                        |
| T 33.3%                                | 11 (13)  | 10 (11)                | 8 (10)               | 8 (8)               | 7 (7)                        |
| R 33.3%                                | 4 (6)  | 3 (4)                  | 2 (2)                | 1 (1)               | 0 (0)                        |
| S 33.3 %                               | 6 (9)  | 5 (7)                  | 4 (5)                | 3 (4)               | 3 (3)                        |
| T 50%                                  | 14 (17)  | 13 (15)                | 12 (13)              | 12 (12)             | 11 (11)                      |
| R 10%                                  | 2 (5)  | 1 (3)                  | 0 (1)                | 0                   | 0                            |
| S 40%                                  | 8 (12)   | 7 (10)                 | 6 (8)                | 5 (7)               | 4 (6)                        |
| T 20%                                  | 7 (10)   | 6 (8)                  | 5 (6)                | 4 (5)               | 4 (4)                        |
| R 50%                                  | 6 (10)   | 5 (8)                  | 4 (6)                | 3 (5)               | 2 (4)                        |
| S 30%                                  | 6 (9)  | 5 (7)                  | 4 (5)                | 3 (4)               | 3 (3)                        |

1390

1391

1392 **APPENDIX E – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE ASSOCIATE**  
 1393 **DEAN OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR**  
 1394 **STUDENT SUCCESS PROGRAMS & STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT**  
 1395 **MANAGEMENT**

1396 **A. Metrics for the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student**  
 1397 **Success Programs & Strategic Enrollment Management**

1398 The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain activities  
 1399 are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category should not be satisfied  
 1400 solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less central, to the category (B points).

1401 (\* = student success activities)

1402 *1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Type A Points   |  |
| classroom instruction   | # credits = # points                     |
| course release for University or COL award or for external research funding   | 3 points                                 |
| one-time course release for other reason with Dean’s approval                 | 3 points                                 |
| Type B Points   |  |
| student research supervision*<br>(e.g. independent study, law review note)    | 1 student research supervision = 1 point |
| heavy student organization supervision*<br>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 2 points    |
| light student organization supervision*<br>(< 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 1 point     |

1403

1404



1405 2. *Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities*

1406 (publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of  
 1407 a complete draft for publication and the publication date)

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| (>25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  |          |
| minor grant application PI or lead author<br>(<25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)   | 2 points |
| pro bono writings, principal author<br>(e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)  | 2 points |
| online new media series<br>(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<br><br>(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<br>(e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)   | 1 point  |
| new CLE materials, published educational materials<br>(e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)  | 1 point  |
| academic or professional conference presentation   | 1 point  |

1408 *3. Service/Administration/Management*

1409 (see Appendix I for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

|                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 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 | 6 points                     |
| student services administration | 6 points                     |

1410

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Type B Points   |                               |
| peer review for retention or promotion<br>(teaching or scholarship, written report)             | 1 point                       |
| 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*<br>(serving as a reference)  | 1 point for every 5 students  |
| letter of reference*  | 1 point                       |
| student counseling, non-academic*   | 1 point for every 5 students  |
| certificate program supervision*  | 1 point                       |
| NGO or government advisory council or board or<br>leadership role in a professional association | 1 point                       |
| pro bono legal work (including legal<br>representation or advisement)                           | 1 point                       |

1411 **B. Requirements for the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for**  
1412 **Student Success Programs & Strategic Enrollment Management**

1413 The associate Dean of academic affairs and associate Dean for student success programs &  
1414 strategic enrollment management have an annual workload allocation of T 0% / R 0% / S 100%.

1415 The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

1416 1. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead  
1417 of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a  
1418 typical tenured faculty member must teach no fewer than 48 credits within that faculty  
1419 member’s 5-year review period.

1420 2. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead  
1421 of counting those points in the year that they are earned.  
1422

1423 In calculating a faculty member’s Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and  
 1424 scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category*  
 1425 *as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following table.

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 0%                                   | 5(6)   | 3(3)                   | 0                    | NA                  | NA                           |
| R 0%                                   | 2(2)   | 1(1)                   | 0                    | NA                  | NA                           |
| S 100 %                                | 14(16)   | 13(14)                 | 12(12)               | 11(11)              | 10(10)                       |

1426

1427

1428 **APPENDIX F – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE ASSOCIATE**  
 1429 **DEAN FOR RESEARCH AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND CENTER**  
 1430 **DIRECTORS**

1431 **A. Metrics for the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development and Center Directors**

1432 The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain  
 1433 activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category  
 1434 should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less  
 1435 central, to the category (B points).

1436 (\* = student success activities)

1437 *1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Type A Points   |  |
| classroom instruction   | # credits = # points                     |
| course release for University or COL award or for external research funding   | 3 points                                 |
| one-time course release for other reason with Dean’s approval                 | 3 points                                 |
| Type B Points   |  |
| student research supervision*<br>(e.g. independent study, law review note)    | 1 student research supervision = 1 point |
| heavy student organization supervision*<br>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 2 points    |
| light student organization supervision*<br>(< 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 1 point     |

1438

1439

1440 2. *Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities*

1441 (publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of  
 1442 a complete draft for publication and the publication date)

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| (>25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  |          |
| minor grant application PI or lead author<br>(<25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)   | 2 points |
| pro bono writings, principal author<br>(e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)  | 2 points |
| online new media series<br>(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<br><br>(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<br>(e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)   | 1 point  |
| new CLE materials, published educational materials<br>(e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)  | 1 point  |
| academic or professional conference presentation   | 1 point  |

1443 *3. Service/Administration/Management*

1444 (see Appendix I for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

|                            |                              |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 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  |
| faculty development        | 4 points                     |
| center management          | 4 points                     |

| Type B Points  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| peer review for retention or promotion<br>(teaching or scholarship, written report)                | 1 point                       |
| 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*<br>(serving as a reference)   | 1 point for every 5 students  |
| letter of reference*   | 1 point                       |
| student counseling, non-academic*  | 1 point for every 5 students  |
| certificate program supervision*   | 1 point                       |
| NGO or government advisory council or<br>board or leadership role in a professional<br>association | 1 point                       |
| pro bono legal work (including legal<br>representation or advisement)                              | 1 point                       |

1445 **B. Requirements for the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development and Center**  
1446 **Directors**

1447 The associate Dean for research and faculty development and center directors have an annual  
1448 workload allocation of T 20% / R 30% / S 50%. The following rules provide workload flexibility  
1449 to maximize productivity.

- 1450 1. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead  
1451 of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a  
1452 typical tenured faculty member must teach no fewer than 48 credits within that faculty  
1453 member's 5-year review period.
- 1454 2. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead  
1455 of counting those points in the year that they are earned.



1456 In calculating a faculty member's Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and  
 1457 scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category*  
 1458 *as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following table.

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 20%                                  | 7(10)  | 6(8)                   | 5(6)                 | 4(5)                | 4(4)                         |
| R 30%                                  | 4(6)   | 3(4)                   | 2(2)                 | 1(1)                | 0                            |
| S 50 %                                 | 10(14)   | 9(12)                  | 8(10)                | 7(9)                | 6(6)                         |

1459

1460

1461 **APPENDIX G – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE DIRECTOR OF**  
 1462 **THE TRIAL PRACTICE /ADVOCACY PROGRAM**

1463 **A. Metrics for the Director of the Trial Practice/Advocacy Program**

1464 The below activities have been categorized as A and B points based on the premise that certain  
 1465 activities are core to the category (A points) and that the point total required for that category  
 1466 should not be satisfied solely by undertaking activities that are viewed as important, but less  
 1467 central, to the category (B points).

1468 (\* = student success activities)

1469 *1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Type A Points   |  |
| classroom instruction   | # credits = # points                     |
| course release for University or COL award or for external research funding   | 3 points                                 |
| one-time course release for other reason with Dean’s approval                 | 3 points                                 |
| Type B Points   |  |
| student research supervision*<br>(e.g. independent study, law review note)    | 1 student research supervision = 1 point |
| heavy student organization supervision*<br>(≥ 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 2 points    |
| light student organization supervision*<br>(< 30 minutes per week on average) | 1 student org. supervision = 1 point     |

1470 *2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities*

1471 (publication = print or online, a publication may be counted at any time between the acceptance of  
 1472 a complete draft for publication and the publication date)

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Type A Points                                       |          |
| major publication in law review or academic journal | 4 points |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (>10K words, including footnotes)   |   |
| major publication in peer reviewed journal<br>(new research findings or theory, any length)   | 4 points  |
| minor publication in law review or academic journal<br>(<10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author's work, law update) | 2 points  |
| publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction  | 4 points  |
| academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress<br>(monograph or coauthor)   | 2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft |
| academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication<br>(final editing & production)   | 2 points  |
| academic book, edited collection, editor<br>(editing)   | 2 points  |
| textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook<br>(first edition)   | 6 points  |
| textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook<br>(new edition or supplement)   | 4 points  |
| major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author<br>(>25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  | 4 points  |
| major grant application non-PI or not lead author<br>(>25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  | 2 points  |
| minor grant application PI or lead author<br>(<25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)  | 2 points  |
| pro bono writings, principal author<br>(e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)   | 2 points  |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| online new media series<br>(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<br>(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 |
| <b>Type B Points</b>   |          |
| publication in professional or popular press (e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)  | 1 point  |
| new CLE materials, published educational materials<br>(e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)  | 1 point  |
| academic or professional conference presentation   | 1 point  |

1473 3. *Service/Administration/Management*

1474 (see Appendix I for examples of high, medium, or low intensity committees)

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>Type A Points</b>  |                               |
| 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   | 6 points                      |
| <b>Type B Points</b>  |                               |
| peer review for retention or promotion<br>(teaching or scholarship, written report) | 1 point                       |
| 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*<br>(serving as a reference)   | 1 point for every 5 students |
| letter of reference*   | 1 point                      |
| student counseling, non-academic*  | 1 point for every 5 students |
| certificate program supervision  | 2 points                     |
| NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association | 1 point                      |
| pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)                           | 1 point                      |
| benching moot court  | 1 point                      |

1475 **B. Requirements for the Director of the Trial Practice/Advocacy Program**

1476 The director of the trial practice / advocacy program has an annual workload allocation of T 33%  
1477 / R 0% / S 66%. The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

1478 1. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for teaching from previous years instead  
1479 of counting points in the year that they are earned. Under the COL Workload Policy, a  
1480 typical tenured faculty member must teach no fewer than 48 credits within that faculty  
1481 member's 5-year review period.

1482 2. A faculty member may carry over Type A points for research from previous years instead  
1483 of counting those points in the year that they are earned.

1484

1485 In calculating a faculty member's Likert-scale ratings for the categories of teaching, research and  
 1486 scholarship, *individuals must earn the minimum number of A points specified for the category*  
 1487 *as well as the total number of points specified for the category* as indicated in the following table.

| Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%) | Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points)) |                        |                      |                     |                              |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|  | 5 Exemplary  | 4 Exceeds Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations | 2 Needs Improvement | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations |
| T 33.3%                                | 11(13)   | 10(11)                 | 9(9)                 | 8(8)                | 7(7)                         |
| R 0%                                   | 2(2)   | 1(1)                   | 0                    | NA                  | NA                           |
| S 66.6 %                               | 12(16)   | 11(14)                 | 10(12)               | 9(10)               | 8(8)                         |

1488  
 1489  
 1490  
 1491  
 1492  
 1493  
 1494  
 1495  
 1496  
 1497  
 1498  
 1499  
 1500  
 1501  
 1502  
 1503  
 1504  
 1505  
 1506  
 1507  
 1508

1509 **APPENDIX H – TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES**

1510 **Tenure-Track Faculty Workload Guidelines**

1511 The purpose of these Guidelines is to clarify and explain the Workload Expectations for Tenure-  
1512 Track Faculty set forth in the College of Law (COL) Tenure-Track Faculty Review Manual  
1513 Section II.A.

1514 According to the COL workload expectations, “In the absence of a modification, reallocation, or  
1515 redistribution, the typical tenured faculty member is expected to:

- 1516 a. Teach 48 credits (or equivalent) over the course of five academic years, not including  
1517 summers, unless granted a course release;
- 1518 b. Engage in substantial research activity equivalent to that required to produce at least three  
1519 scholarly articles every five years; and
- 1520 c. Perform significant service every year in at least two committees (or equivalent) in the law  
1521 school, the University, or the University System.”

1522 These Guidelines offer the faculty and the Dean examples of how to fulfill these expectations.  
1523 These Guidelines also provide relevant considerations in applying the Tenure-Track Faculty  
1524 Review Manual provisions regarding “modification, reallocation, or redistribution,” of the  
1525 workload expectations or “granting of additional compensation” in individual cases. The workload  
1526 expectations and these Guidelines allow for flexibility in the distribution and allocation of the  
1527 workload for an individual faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and  
1528 service.

1529 Faculty seeking approval of workload arrangements that deviate from the metrics stated in the  
1530 workload expectations or these Guidelines bear the burden of justifying those deviations. In  
1531 assessing a faculty member’s conformity with the workload expectations and these Guidelines, the  
1532 Dean shall take into account any awards, policies or practices that temporarily release a faculty  
1533 member from certain workload requirements, including, but not limited to, an authorized leave or  
1534 a course release.

1535 The Dean shall not apply the workload expectations or these Guidelines in any way that violates  
1536 the terms of a faculty member’s appointment, including, but not limited to, the terms of  
1537 administrative appointments or benefits associated with an endowed chair or professorship.

1538 **A. Compliance with the Teaching Workload Expectations**

1539 Conformity assessment with the teaching metric in the COL workload expectations may be  
1540 complicated by the fact that a 48-credit course load over five academic years, not including  
1541 summers, will result in variation from year-to-year in the number of credits taught. Typically, a  
1542 faculty member’s annual credit load will vary between 9 and 10 credits. Variation may be increased

1543 if a faculty member, with the approval of the Dean or Associate Dean of Academic Affairs,  
1544 increases his or her annual credit load in one year to lighten his or her annual credit load in a  
1545 subsequent year to dedicate additional time to non-teaching activities, such as significant research  
1546 and scholarship, service or administrative activities. Consequently, in assessing conformity with  
1547 the teaching metric, the Dean may calculate the average annual teaching load of a faculty member  
1548 over a longer period of time than the previous five years, or rely on a faculty member's running  
1549 five-year average, or employ a comparable method designed to ensure substantial conformity with  
1550 the metric and horizontal equity across the tenured faculty. A faculty member will not be adversely  
1551 evaluated on the basis of semesters in which the faculty member was released from teaching  
1552 obligations due to an authorized leave, course release, or other such legitimate grounds.

1553 Deviations from the teaching metric may be justified by reference to abnormally burdensome  
1554 teaching responsibilities. The workload expectations recognize that teaching takes many forms in  
1555 the College of Law, "including traditional curriculum taught in the classroom; courses in lawyering  
1556 process; specialized seminars; legal research, writing, and other lawyering skills; clinical  
1557 education; externships; moot court and mock trial programs and other coursework designed to  
1558 further students' academic success. In accessing conformity with the teaching metrics, and whether  
1559 there is a teaching overload, the Dean shall take into account the following factors:

- 1560 • first-time preparation of a course;
- 1561 • teaching courses outside of a faculty member's areas of expertise at the request of the  
1562 administration;
- 1563 • class enrollment;
- 1564 • student academic support responsibilities outside of classroom time;
- 1565 • burdensome class obligations, including preparation, assignment feedback, course  
1566 administration, quiz/exam review, paper development, or grading quizzes and/or exams;
- 1567 • the burden of non-classroom teaching obligations, such as supervising independent student  
1568 research, coaching moot court, coaching mock trial, or involvement with student  
1569 organizations and service projects; or
- 1570 • any awards received for teaching or other awards or grants that implicate a faculty  
1571 member's teaching load.

## 1572 **B. Compliance with Research and Scholarship Workload Expectations**

1573 Conformity assessment with the research and scholarship metric in the COL workload  
1574 expectations may be complicated by the fact that faculty members engage in, the COL encourages,  
1575 and the university recognizes, diverse types of scholarly work product that are published in a wide  
1576 variety of formats and venues. As a general rule, work product presented for fulfillment of the  
1577 research and scholarship metric in the COL workload expectations should be (but is not required



1578 to be) published and should advance knowledge within a recognized or emerging academic field  
1579 of inquiry.

1580 As a general matter, a tenured faculty member is expected to dedicate substantial and regular time  
1581 to research and scholarship, and a faculty member's overall scholarly productivity during the  
1582 course of a five-year cycle should reflect the effort that is comparable to the effort necessary to  
1583 produce three scholarly articles every five years. The COL promotion and tenure standards refer  
1584 to research and scholarship that makes "important contributions to the development of the law,  
1585 such as scholarship relating to doctrinal analysis and policy, law reform, legal practice, the  
1586 improvement of legal institutions, legal education, and research that ventures beyond the law and  
1587 offers empirical and interdisciplinary perspectives." Factors relevant in demonstrating the  
1588 recognition and impact of a faculty member's work include, without limitation, assessments in  
1589 external review letters by peers in the field; invitations to present work at important conferences,  
1590 workshops, symposia; citations to, or re-publication of, the candidate's work; scholarly and  
1591 professional responses to articles; recognition of a candidate's work by scholarly, professional or  
1592 governmental organizations; its impact on policy, practice or the development of the law; and any  
1593 awards received for research and scholarship.

1594 These Guidelines list categories and examples of work product that satisfy the research and  
1595 scholarship metric (see below section E. Examples of Scholarly Work). That list is not intended to  
1596 be, nor should be interpreted to be exclusive, and other types of work product may also satisfy the  
1597 research and scholarship metric of the COL workload expectations, e.g., amicus briefs, white  
1598 papers, government reports, articles in bar journals, etc. The faculty member seeking recognition  
1599 for these other types of work product bears the burden of persuading either the Dean or the Post-  
1600 Tenure Review Committee that such work product satisfies the research and scholarship metric. If  
1601 the Post-Tenure Review Committee finds that the faculty member's work product satisfies the  
1602 research and scholarship metric, then that finding of the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be  
1603 binding on the Dean. If the Post-Tenure Review Committee finds that such work product does not  
1604 satisfy the research and scholarship metric, however, that finding of the Post-Tenure Review  
1605 Committee is not binding on the Dean.

### 1606 **C. Compliance with Service Workload Policy**

1607 Compliance with the service metric in the COL workload expectations generally requires  
1608 significant service every year on at least two committees (or equivalent) in the COL, the university,  
1609 or the university system. In assessing conformity, and whether there is a significant service  
1610 overload, the Dean shall take into account the faculty member's contributions to the educational  
1611 mission and professional standing of the COL including, without limitation:

- 1612 • whether the faculty member served as chair of any committees;
- 1613 • the faculty member's responsibilities on each committee;
- 1614 • whether the faculty member directed or managed any COL programs;

- 1615 • the faculty member’s involvement in special projects in the law school, the university, or  
1616 the university system;
- 1617 • the faculty member’s contributions to COL’s administrative efforts, including, but not  
1618 limited to, student affairs, alumni affairs, fundraising, and faculty, student, or staff  
1619 recruitment;
- 1620 • the faculty member’s involvement in student success activities beyond what would be  
1621 considered teaching under the teaching Guidelines above, including teaching for the COL  
1622 during the summer semester;
- 1623 • whether the faculty member was the advisor to any student or student organization;
- 1624 • the faculty member’s service to the legal profession, the community, government, or other  
1625 entities and groups consistent with the mission of the COL or that advances the interests of  
1626 the institution; or
- 1627 • whether the faculty member has received any COL, university, professional, or community  
1628 awards for service.

1629 **D. Modification, Reallocation or Redistribution of Workload and/or Granting of Additional**  
1630 **Compensation**

1631 In consultation with the affected faculty, the Dean may modify, reallocate, or redistribute the  
1632 workload of a faculty member and/or grant additional compensation to a faculty member who  
1633 teaches an overload, has significantly higher research and scholarship productivity, has a  
1634 significant service overload, or has significant administrative responsibilities. The Dean may also  
1635 modify, reallocate, or redistribute the workload of a faculty member who fails to satisfactorily  
1636 meet workload expectations. In modifying, reallocating, or redistributing the workload  
1637 expectations of a faculty member or granting additional compensation, the following guidelines  
1638 apply:

- 1639 • Where a faculty member teaches an overload, the Dean may reduce or eliminate the  
1640 research and scholarship and/or service expected of that faculty member and/or grant  
1641 additional compensation to that faculty member.
- 1642 • Where a faculty member has a significant service overload, the Dean may reduce or  
1643 eliminate the teaching and/or research and scholarship expected of that faculty member or  
1644 grant additional compensation to that faculty member.
- 1645 • Where a faculty member has significantly higher research and scholarship productivity, the  
1646 Dean may reduce or eliminate the teaching and/or service expected of that faculty member  
1647 or grant additional compensation to that faculty member.

- 1648 • Where a faculty member has significant administrative responsibilities, the Dean may  
1649 reduce or eliminate the teaching, research and scholarship, or service expected of that  
1650 faculty member and/or grant additional compensation.
- 1651 • Where a faculty member fails to meet the research and scholarship expectations, the Dean  
1652 may reduce or eliminate the research and scholarship expected of that faculty member and  
1653 add additional teaching and/or service responsibilities as a remedy for failure to meet the  
1654 research and scholarship expectations.
- 1655 • Where a faculty member fails to meet the teaching or service expectations, the Dean may  
1656 add additional teaching and/or service responsibilities as a remedy for failure to meet  
1657 teaching or service expectations.

1658 **E. Examples of Scholarly Work**

1659 The following is a list of categories and examples of scholarly work product that satisfy the  
1660 scholarship metric.

1661 Law Review Articles

1662 Covey, Russell. "Rules, Standards, Sentencing, and the Nature of Law," California Law Review  
1663 (2016)

1664 Segall, Eric. "The Constitution According to Justices Scalia and Thomas: Alive and Kickin',"  
1665 Washington University Law Review (2014)

1666 Washington, Tanya. "In Windsor's Wake: Section 2 of DOMA's Defense of Marriage at the  
1667 Expense of Children," Indiana Law Review (2014)

1668 Online Law Review and Journal Articles

1669 Todres, Jonathan. "Human Trafficking and Film: How Popular Portrayals Influence Law and  
1670 Public Perception," 101 Cornell Law Review Online 1 (2015)

1671 Todres, Jonathan. "Can Mandatory Reporting Laws Help Child Survivors of Human Trafficking?"  
1672 2016 Wisconsin Law Review Forward 69 (2016)

1673 Sudeall, Lauren. "The Overreach of Limits on 'Legal Advice'," 131 Yale L. J. Forum 637 (2022)

1674 Washington, Tanya. "Fulton's Flaw: In the Constitutional Clash between Religious Liberty and  
1675 LGBTQ+ Rights, Foster Kids Are Neither Seen nor Heard." 60 Family Court Review 40 (2022)

1676 Specialty or Interdisciplinary Law Review Articles

1677 Williams, Jack. "Vets and Debts," American Bankruptcy Institute Law Review (2017)

- 1678 Tucker, Anne M. & Holly van den Toorn. “Will Swing Pricing Save Sedentary Shareholders?” 1  
1679 Columbia Business Law Review 130 (2018)
- 1680 Wolf, Leslie, Dame LA, Patel MJ, Williams BA, Austin JL. “Certificates of Confidentiality:  
1681 Protecting human subject research data in law and practice,” Minnesota Journal of Law, Science  
1682 & Technology (2013)
- 1683 Books
- 1684 Edmundson, William. *John Rawls: Reticent Socialist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,  
1685 2017)
- 1686 Lytton, Timothy. *Kosher: Private Regulation in the Age of Industrial Food* (Harvard University  
1687 Press, 2013)
- 1688 Saito, Natsu. *Meeting the Enemy: American Exceptionalism and International Law* (New York  
1689 University Press, 2010)
- 1690 Edited Volumes (First Editions or Significant Updates)
- 1691 Jonathan Todres & Shani M. King, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Children’s Rights Law*  
1692 (Oxford University Press, 2020)
- 1693 Paul Lombardo, editor. *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the*  
1694 *Human Genome Era* (Indiana University Press, 2011)
- 1695 Treatises (First Editions or Significant Updates)
- 1696 Gabel, Jessica. *Bloomberg Treatise of Bankruptcy Law* (2014).
- 1697 Christians, Allison, Donaldson, Samuel, & Postlewaite, Philip F. *United States International*  
1698 *Taxation* (2011).
- 1699 Radford, Mary. *Georgia Trusts and Trustees* (2011)
- 1700 Casebooks/Textbooks (First Editions or Significant Updates)
- 1701 Furrow, Barry and Fuse Brown, Erin, et al. *Law and Health Care Quality, Patient Safety, and*  
1702 *Liability* (2018)
- 1703 Shane, Peter, Bruff, Harold, Kinkopf, Neil. *Separation of Powers Law: Cases and Materials*  
1704 (2018)
- 1705 Hurst, Gregory, Williams, Jack, et al. *Cases and Materials on Corporations* (2014)

- 1706 Nutshells/Hornbooks
- 1707 Bronin, Sara and Rowberry, Ryan. *Historic Preservation Law in a Nutshell* (2018).
- 1708 Averill, Lawrence H. & Radford, Mary. *The Uniform Probate Code and the Uniform Trust Code*  
1709 *in a Nutshell* (2010).
- 1710 Juergensmeyer, Julian, Roberts, Tiffany. *Land Use Planning and Development Regulation Law*  
1711 (2003).
- 1712 Peer Reviewed Articles
- 1713 Scott, Charity. “Resolving Perceived Maternal-Fetal Conflicts Through Active Patient-Physician  
1714 Collaboration,” *American Journal of Bioethics* (2017).
- 1715 Lytton, Timothy. “Competitive Third-Party Regulation: How Private Certification Can Overcome  
1716 Constraints that Frustrate Government Regulation,” *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* (2014).
- 1717 Wolf LE, Patel MJ, Tarver BA, Austin JL, Dame LA, Beskow LM. “Certificates of  
1718 Confidentiality: Protecting Human Subject Research Data in Law and Practice,” *Journal of Law,*  
1719 *Medicine & Ethics* (2015).
- 1720 Book Chapters
- 1721 Landau, Michael. “State Sovereign Immunity and Intellectual Property Revisited,” in  
1722 *Entertainment, Publishing & the Arts* (Lindey, ed., 2016).
- 1723 Curcio, Andrea, Dogra, Nisha, & Ward, Theresa. “Using Existing Frameworks to Develop Ways  
1724 to Teach and Measure Law Students' Cultural Competence,” in *The Legal Profession: Education*  
1725 *and Ethics in Practice* (David A. Frenkel, ed., 2013).
- 1726 Cunningham, Clark. “Law School of the Future: Centre of Cutting-Edge Practice?” in *The Law of*  
1727 *the Future and the Future of Law: Volume II* (Sam Muller, et al., eds., 2012).
- 1728

1729 **APPENDIX I – COMMITTEE CLASSIFICATIONS**

|                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| high intensity committee   | ≥ 2 hrs per week on average in any semester   | e.g.,<br>a recruitment committee<br>ABA self-study committee<br>curriculum committee<br>promotion and tenure committee<br>assessment committee<br>admissions committee<br>workload policy committee<br>honor code committee                        |
| medium intensity committee | < 2 hours per week on average in any semester | e.g.,<br>faculty development committee<br>speakers committee<br>Dean’s advisory committee<br>academic success committee<br>post-tenure review committee<br>faculty appeals committee<br>student affairs committee                                  |
| low intensity committee    | ≤ 3 hours per semester                        | e.g.,<br>faculty advisement/mentoring<br>judicial clerkship advisement<br>LLM committee<br>clinics committee<br>University senators group<br>University committees or boards<br>awards committee<br>technology committee<br>scholarships committee |

1730 Note: for the purposes of annual review metrics, the term “committee” shall refer to both standing  
 1731 and ad hoc committees.