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APPENDIX I – COMMITTEE CLASSIFICATIONS
**I. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

**II. ANNUAL REVIEW**

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

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

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

**A. Documentation for Annual Review**

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

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

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

B. Timing of Annual Review

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

| 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                      |

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

C. Workload Expectations for Tenure-Track Faculty

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

1. Teaching

The College of Law teaches its students to be critical readers, analytical thinkers, proficient writers, informed, active citizens, civic and policy leaders, and creative, ethical lawyers. To achieve this
goal, the college offers a variety of learning experiences to its students, including traditional
curriculum taught in the classroom; courses in lawyering process; specialized seminars; legal
research, writing, and other lawyering skills; clinical education; externships; moot court and mock
trial programs; and other coursework designed to further students’ academic success. Teaching
and advising students in these different programs require a significant amount of work by
dedicated faculty. Law faculty members with teaching expectations perform all or virtually all this
work themselves, without the help of teaching assistants. Because the college operates part-time
evening, part-time day, and full-time day/evening programs of instruction, it is necessary to offer
these learning experiences during the day and in the evening, and faculty are expected to teach in
the day as well as in the evening. This places a significant burden on faculty and resources.

2. Research and Scholarship

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

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

3. Service to the Law School/University/System/Community

For the College of Law to function properly, faculty members spend significant time serving on
internal and external committees that reflect the law school’s commitments to shared governance,
academic freedom, and faculty direction of academic programs and policies, as well to professional
service. In addition to committee service within the college and its departments, law faculty
members also serve on the University Faculty Senate and university committees and system-wide
committees. Time expended on these committee assignments is substantial, particularly for the
chairs of the committees. Service to the law school also includes work done in support of students
and their success, including necessary work such as advising students, advising the many law
school student organizations, and participating in other activities that contribute to student success.
External service, including service to the academe, legal profession, and community, is another important mission of the College of Law. Faculty are in a unique position to enrich the profession and serve the community. External service varies greatly and includes but is not limited to, refereeing for academic journals and presses; reviewing articles and promotion and tenure files of candidates at another colleges or institutions; engaging in public interest and pro bono efforts, serving on non-profit boards, professional organizations, or government advisory councils; offering affordable continuing legal education; participating in local and state concerns; and informing policy at the national and international level.

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

4. Administration

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

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

5. Tenured Faculty

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

a. Teach 48 credits (or equivalent) over the course of five academic years, not including summers, unless granted a course release;

b. Engage in substantial research and scholarship activity equivalent to that required to produce at least three articles every five years; and

c. Perform significant service every year in at least two committees (or equivalent) in the law school, the University, or the University System.
The Dean may grant a modification, reallocation, or redistribution of workload and/or additional compensation for tenured faculty who have, or propose to have, teaching overloads, significantly higher than expected research or scholarship productivity, or significant service overloads, and/or who are assigned significant administrative responsibilities.

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

6. Pre-Tenured Faculty

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

a. Teach 5-10 credits in the first year of employment;

b. Teach 8-10 credits (or equivalent) per academic year, after the first year, until tenure is achieved;

c. Engage in substantial research activity sufficient to achieve an award of tenure as identified in the Promotion and Tenure Document for tenure-track faculty members; and

d. Have limited committee assignments each year, when possible, until tenure is achieved.

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

7. Annual Review Metrics

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

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

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

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

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

D. Procedures

1. Workload Distribution

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

2. Faculty Submission

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

3. Dean’s Review

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

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

4. Performance Remediation Plan

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

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

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

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

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

5. Annual Evaluation Immediately After Performance Remediation Plan

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

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

6. Amendments to Faculty Review Documentation Templates

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

E. Terms of Appointment

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

F. The Limits of Quantitative Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*1. Reappointment*

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

*2. Promotion to Associate Professor of Law*

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

b. With tenure

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

3. Tenure

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

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

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

4. Promotion to Professor of Law

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Standards

1. General

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

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

2. Specific Standards

a. Teaching

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

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

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

b. Scholarship

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

Engaging in such research is important for two reasons. First, scholarship is a critical component of effective teaching. Teaching informs scholarship and scholarship informs the important ingredients of good teaching: rigorous analysis, creativity, and the lifelong development and enhancement of one’s area of expertise. Second, scholarship is about the study of problems that result in the dissemination of knowledge. It is not enough for faculty to acquire knowledge and
develop expertise if they do not apply it and share it both for further study within the academy and
for the use and benefit of professional communities and institutions.

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

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

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

c. Service and Professional Engagement

The success and effectiveness of the College of Law also requires the faculty to be engaged in the
affairs of the law school and the university, and to contribute to the advancement of the legal
profession and related academic/professional initiatives and organizations. With respect to the law
school and university, faculty service includes such responsibilities as taking on an appropriate
share of committee responsibilities, assisting and advising student organizations, attending an
appropriate share of law school and faculty-related events, and performing other duties as assigned
that relate to and further the mission of the college and university.
With respect to professional and academic activity, such engagement includes assuming leadership responsibilities in bar associations and other professional and academic organizations; participation in professional and academic meetings, conferences and workshops; and involvement in law reform, public policy, and pro bono work. These forms of professional and academic engagement not only serve to advance the college’s connections to important constituencies, they further our teaching and research missions. They do so by reinforcing faculty efforts to be creative and relevant in their teaching and writing, and by helping to promote the recognition of their work among their academic peers.

d. Composite Measure Across the Faculty

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

3. Standards for Evaluation by Rank and For Tenure

a. General

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

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

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

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

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

c. Tenure

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

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

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

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

d. Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

E. Role of Committees in the Promotion and Tenure Process

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee

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

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

- In cases of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, only those members of the Committee who hold the rank of Professor or Associate Professor shall participate;
- In cases, of promotion to the rank of Professor, only those members of the Committee who hold the rank of Professor shall participate;
In cases where tenure is under consideration, only those members of the Committee who are tenured shall participate;

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

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

2. Co-Chairs

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

3. Faculty Review Subcommittee

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

a. two members appointed by the Dean;

b. one general member elected by the faculty; and

c. the two co-chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

F. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

1. Notification and Calendar within the College

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

2. Contents of the Dossier

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

a. Provided by the Candidate

1. A current curriculum vita

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

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

iii. A statement about the candidate’s institutional service and professional engagement.

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

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

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

b. Prepared or Solicited by the Subcommittee

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

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

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

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

3. Evaluation of Teaching

a. General

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

b. Class Visitation and Faculty Review

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

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

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

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

c. Student Evaluations

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

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

4. Evaluation of Scholarship and External Reviews

To assist the Promotion and Tenure Committee in its assessment of a candidate’s scholarship, the Dean will solicit peer evaluations, both internal and external, from experts in the candidate’s field.
With respect to the number of external reviewers, a candidate’s dossier generally should be supported by five external letters and at least two internal letters.

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

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

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

5. Evaluation of Institutional and Professional Service

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

To evaluate these factors, the committee will review the candidate’s own statement and solicit input from the chairs of faculty committees on which the candidate has served during the promotional period. The committee also may contact external constituencies associated with the candidate’s public or professional service activities and make all other inquiries as the committee deems appropriate.
G. Deliberation Procedures for the Committee, the Subcommittee and the Dean

1. Subcommittee Review

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

2. Report

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

3. Timing of Report

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

4. Availability to Faculty

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

5. Promotion and Tenure Committee Meeting on Candidates

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

6. Dean’s Review

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

Candidates that are not recommended by the Dean must receive a written decision and rationale no later than ten working days after the Dean’s decision. Candidates who are not recommended by
the Dean may appeal the Dean’s decision to the provost in the manner provided by the University Promotion and Tenure Manual.

7. Notice to Candidates

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

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

1. Support

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

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

2. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

a. Committee Review

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

b. Standards

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

c. Dossier

All reappointment reviews will be supported by a dossier that contains a cumulative record of the faculty member’s professional achievements relating to teaching, scholarship and service. The
contents of the dossier will be similar but not identical to that described in Section II.B. for promotion and tenure and will not include external reviews of scholarship.

d. Notification of Renewal and Dean’s Review

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

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

I. Pre-Tenure Review

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

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

1. Time of Review

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

2. Reviewing Committee

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

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

4. Scope of Review

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

5. Report of the Committee

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

The form of the report shall be as follows:

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

b. Evaluations of Teaching:

i. Listing of courses taught by the faculty member in the College of Law for the review period, including the approximate number of students enrolled in each course and any independent study courses supervised by the faculty member.
ii. Brief description of any courses that were redesigned or developed by the faculty during the review period.

iii. Brief description of teaching at any other institution or any other College within the University.

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

v. Reference to student course evaluations;

vi. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

c. Scholarship: publications in press or published; manuscripts submitted; research in progress; grant applications pending.

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

e. Professional Service: including papers or presentations at conferences, advisory or drafting roles for public officials or entities, bar association participation and/or leadership roles, etc.

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

g. Grants and/or Fellowships Awarded

h. Awards and Honors

i. Other Evidence of Achievements

j. Committee Evaluation: Evaluation by the Committee, reflecting the Promotion and Tenure Committee’s discussion of a faculty member’s progress toward promotion or tenure, including strengths and achievements and suggestions as to areas of improvement for the faculty member. The suggestions for improvement should, in the spirit of the University Policy, identify areas in which a tenure track faculty member can change orientation and activity in pursuit of tenure.

k. Current vita of faculty member; copies of faculty member’s annual reports for the review period; and copies of evaluations of classroom teaching based on annual class visitations that are conducted by other faculty members for the reappointment process in accordance with the College’s Promotion & Tenure document.

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

7. Role of Faculty Member

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

8. Role of the Dean

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

J. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review within the College

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

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

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

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

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

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

Early September: Candidates’ written statements in support of their application for promotion or tenure are due.
Second Week in September: Candidate dossiers should be completed and made available to the Subcommittee.

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

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

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

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

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

K. Amendments

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

IV. POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Purpose

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

PTR facilitates faculty development and ensures intellectual vitality and competent levels of performance by all faculty throughout their professional careers. The goal is to maximize the efforts of tenured faculty to promote the effective performance of the College. The College recognizes that the granting of tenure for faculty is an important protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. PTR shall be conducted by a committee of peers elected by the faculty, and the guarantees of tenure and academic freedom shall be protected throughout the process.
The review should be both retrospective and prospective because it recognizes past contributions and identifies the means needed for continuous intellectual and professional growth, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member’s career. It is recognized that, within the traditional mix of professional activities, different emphases may be appropriate at different stages in a faculty member’s career. As a faculty development tool, PTR provides an opportunity to assist tenured faculty members in formulating a multi-year plan of professional growth and activity in teaching, scholarship, student success activities, and service based on their interests and the needs and mission of the College.

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

B. Timeline

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

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

C. Areas of Evaluation

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

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

D. Composition of the PTR Committee

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

1. The PTR Committee must have four members, each of whom shall be a full Professor.

2. The PTR Committee shall be elected by secret ballot vote of the College’s tenured faculty. The College may establish procedures for the PTR Committee election using the applicable faculty governance procedures set forth in the College’s by-laws. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall conduct and be the final arbiter of the election.

3. The Committee shall establish a 3-person subcommittee for each PTR with the exclusive responsibility of performing all the duties and responsibilities, and exercising all the rights, of the PTR Committee in connection with that particular PTR as set forth herein.

4. If a faculty member has a joint appointment with budget sharing, then:

   a. two of the subcommittee members for such faculty member shall be from the primary unit; and

   b. at least one (1) member of the subcommittee shall be from the non-primary unit.
5. Neither the Dean nor any other administrative faculty members shall be a member of the PTR Committee.

6. The reviewed faculty member is entitled to remove one (1) person from the subcommittee without cause. If such right to remove is exercised, the third member of that reviewed faculty member’s PTR subcommittee will be the PTR Committee member that was not initially assigned to the faculty member’s PTR.

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

The faculty member undergoing a PTR must submit the following materials to the PTR Committee (the “PTR Package”):

1. a statement that summarizes accomplishments and effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service (including student success activities that may be interwoven into each) over the previous five years and outlines goals for the next five years;

2. a current curriculum vitae;

3. the faculty member’s teaching evaluations (only course evaluations from courses taught since the last promotion or post-tenure evaluation should be included);

4. copies of the Dean’s Annual Review Forms for the previous five (5) years; and

5. a statement outlining goals for the next five (5) years.

**F. The PTR Committee Review Process**

1. *The Committee’s Overall PTR Assessment*

The PTR Committee shall:

a. examine the materials included in the PTR Package;

b. determine whether the faculty member’s *overall* performance during the applicable review period (1) does not meet expectations; (2) needs improvement; (3) meets expectations; (4) exceeds expectations; or (5) is exemplary (such determination, the “Overall PTR Assessment”); and

c. provide a written assessment of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service during the 5-year PTR period that supports the Committee’s Overall PTR Assessment and
evaluates the faculty member’s strengths and achievements, providing suggestions (where appropriate) as to areas of improvement (the “PTR Committee Report”).

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

2. Content of the PTR Committee Report

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

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

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

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

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

The PTR Committee shall provide a draft of the PTR Committee Report to the faculty member no later than 15 days before delivering the final PTR Committee Report to the Dean, and the faculty member shall have the right to rebut or raise objections to the contents of the draft PTR Committee Report by writing to the PTR Committee (such writing, an “Initial PTR Rebuttal Letter”). Following the expiration of this 15-day period, the PTR Committee shall promptly transmit (1) the final PTR Committee Report (including any relevant supporting documentation)
and (2) the Initial PTR Rebuttal Letter, if any, to the Dean. The PTR Committee shall provide a copy of the final PTR Committee Report to the faculty member contemporaneously with the submission of the same to the Dean. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a final rebuttal letter to the PTR Report (a “Final PTR Rebuttal Letter”) during the 5-day period following the submission of the final PTR Committee Report to the Dean, and any such Final PTR Rebuttal Letter will be included in the faculty member’s file.

G. Responsibilities of the Dean

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

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

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

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

1. Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

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

   a. clearly defined goals or outcomes;

   b. an outline of activities to be undertaken;

   c. a timetable;

   d. available resources and support;

   e. expectations for improvement; and

   f. a monitoring strategy.

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

2. Review of PIP Completion

To fulfill its obligation to provide feedback to the Dean concerning the faculty member’s completion of the PIP, the PTR Committee shall convene at the conclusion of the academic year to review the faculty member’s progress in completing the PIP.
The PTR Committee shall (1) review the faculty member’s progress as recorded by the Dean and any information provided by the faculty member and (2) make a recommendation to the Dean concerning whether the reviewed faculty member has successfully completed the PIP (such recommendation, a “PIP Completion Recommendation”). In performing its review, the PTR Committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person meeting is necessary, and it may base its PIP Completion Recommendation solely on a review of the record (including the summaries of any meetings with the Dean). In reviewing the record and preparing a PIP Completion Recommendation, the PTR’s substantive inquiry is whether the reviewed faculty member has successfully completed the PIP. A faculty member will have “successfully completed” a PIP when the faculty member has remediated the deficiencies identified by the Committee in its PTR Committee Report, or has made substantive progress towards their remediation. The PTR Committee shall transmit its PIP Completion Recommendation to the Dean not later than two weeks following the end of the academic year, with a contemporaneous copy to be provided to the reviewed faculty member. The PIP Completion Recommendation will be included in the faculty member’s file.

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

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

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

If the Dean and the PTR Committee determine that the faculty member has not successfully completed the PIP, then the Dean shall, after consultation with the PTR Committee, recommend appropriate remedial actions corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s deficiencies. The Dean shall provide notice to the Provost, the President, the PTR Committee, and the faculty member of the recommended remedial actions no later than five (5) days following the date the Dean provided notice to the faculty member and the PTR Committee of the Dean’s determination that the faculty member has not successfully completed the PIP. If the Dean recommends remedial action, the faculty member may request due process as explained below.
The President shall make the final determination on behalf of the University regarding any appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the University’s final decision pursuant to the Board of Regents Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review 6.26.

I. Due Process Following an Unsuccessful PIP

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

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

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

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

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

5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution’s final decision pursuant to Board of Regents policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26).
**APPENDIX A – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT**

**Georgia State University College of Law**

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category &amp; Type of Points to be Carried Over</th>
<th>Academic Year in Which Points were Earned</th>
<th>Number of Unused Points to be Carried Over to Subsequent Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Request for Annual Workload Allocation for Next Review Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
APPENDIX B – FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Workload Allocation

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Name of Dean:**

**Date of Evaluation:**

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

**Comments:**

750 words max

**Overall Assessment**

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

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

**Comments:**

750 words max
Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

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

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

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

Optional Faculty Written Response

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

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

750 words max

Signatures

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

_______________________________  ________________
signature  date

Dean
I certify that I have reviewed this written evaluation

_______________________________  ________________
signature  date
A. Metrics for Tenure-Track Faculty

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

(* = student success activities)

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

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

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

2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (&gt;10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Type</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major grant application non-PI or not lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor grant application PI or lead author (&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro bono writings or reports, principal author (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online new media series (e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities (including work on funded grants) (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publication in professional or popular press (e.g. opinion piece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new CLE materials, published educational materials (e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional conference presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Service/Administration/Management

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type B Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal or non-profit research organization (e.g., Pew Trusts, Vera Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement* (serving as a reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of reference*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student counseling, non-academic*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate program supervision*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

### 1. First Year on Tenure Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 33.3%</td>
<td>7(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 33.3%</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 33.3%</td>
<td>0(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Second Year on Tenure Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 33.3%</td>
<td>7(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 33.3%</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 33.3 %</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Third Year on Tenure Track to Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 33.3%</td>
<td>11(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 33.3%</td>
<td>4(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 33.3 %</td>
<td>6(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Requirements for Tenured Faculty

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 40%</td>
<td>11 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 40%</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 20%</td>
<td>6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 33.3%</td>
<td>11 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 33.3%</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 33.3%</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 50%</td>
<td>14 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 10%</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 40%</td>
<td>8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 20%</td>
<td>7 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 50%</td>
<td>6 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 30%</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR STUDENT SUCCESS PROGRAMS & STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

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

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

(* = student success activities)

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

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

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

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

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

3. Service/Administration/Management

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

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

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

The following rules provide workload flexibility to maximize productivity.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0%</td>
<td>5(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 100 %</td>
<td>14(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. Metrics for the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development and Center Directors

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

(* = student success activities)

#### 1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major publication in law review or academic journal (&gt;10K words, including footnotes)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major grant application non-PI or not lead author</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor grant application PI or lead author</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono writings, principal author (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online new media series (e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparatory research, literature review to gain mastery in new field of expertise, and data-gathering and handling activities (must be pre-approved by Dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type B Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publication in professional or popular press (e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new CLE materials, published educational materials (e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic or professional conference presentation</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Service/Administration/Management

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high intensity committee</td>
<td>3 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium intensity committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low intensity committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty development</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center management</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for retention or promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer review for journal</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor to student organization*</td>
<td>1 point for each organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement* (serving as a reference)</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of reference*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program supervision*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 20%</td>
<td>7(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 30%</td>
<td>4(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 50%</td>
<td>10(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G – ANNUAL REVIEW METRICS FOR THE DIRECTOR OF
THE TRIAL PRACTICE/ADVOCACY PROGRAM

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

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

(*) = student success activities

1. Teaching/Instruction/Student Supervision

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

| Type B Points                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| student research supervision*                                                | 1 student research supervision = 1 point |
| (e.g. independent study, law review note)                                   |
| heavy student organization supervision*                                      | 1 student org. supervision = 2 points |
| (≥ 30 minutes per week on average)                                            |
| light student organization supervision*                                      | 1 student org. supervision = 1 point |
| (< 30 minutes per week on average)                                            |

2. Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities

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

<p>| Type A Points                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| major publication in law review or academic journal                          | 4 points  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major publication in peer reviewed journal (new research findings or theory, any length)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor publication in law review or academic journal (&lt;10K words, including footnotes, other than new research findings, e.g. symposium introduction, comment on another author’s work, law update)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of chapter in academic or professional book, including substantive forward or introduction</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or trade press book, multi-year project, substantial progress (monograph or coauthor)</td>
<td>2 points per chapter upon completion of a chapter draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or trade press book, multi-year project, publication (final editing &amp; production)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic book, edited collection, editor (editing)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (first edition)</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook or treatise or casebook or hornbook (new edition or supplement)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major grant application PI, co-PI, or lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major grant application non-PI or not lead author (&gt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor grant application PI or lead author (&lt;25K, submitted proposal, regardless of funding outcome)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro bono writings, principal author (e.g. amicus briefs, policy briefs, memos, etc.)</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online New Media Series</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. production of multi-episode podcast)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparatory Research, Literature Review, and Data-Gathering Activities</th>
<th>2 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(must be pre-approved by Dean and documented in end-of-year memo, available no more than twice in five years, points do not carry over)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type B Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication in Professional or Popular Press (e.g. op-ed, blog post, podcast guest)</th>
<th>1 point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New CLE Materials, Published Educational Materials (e.g. CALI quizzes, study aids)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic or Professional Conference Presentation</th>
<th>1 point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3. Service/Administration/Management

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

**Type A Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Intensity Committee</th>
<th>3 points + 1 point for chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Intensity Committee</td>
<td>2 points + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Intensity Committee</td>
<td>1 point + 1 point for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Administration</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type B Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Review for Retention or Promotion (teaching or scholarship, written report)</th>
<th>1 point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review for Journal</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advising*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor to Student Organization*</td>
<td>1 point for each organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student job placement* (serving as a reference)</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of reference*</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student counseling, non-academic*</td>
<td>1 point for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program supervision</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO or government advisory council or board or leadership role in a professional association</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro bono legal work (including legal representation or advisement)</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benching moot court</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Workload Allocation (T/R/S) (%)</th>
<th>Metrics: minimum A points needed (total points needed (A points + B points))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 33.3%</td>
<td>11(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 0%</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 66.6%</td>
<td>12(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H – TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

Tenure-Track Faculty Workload Guidelines

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

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

a. Teach 48 credits (or equivalent) over the course of five academic years, not including summers, unless granted a course release;

b. Engage in substantial research activity equivalent to that required to produce at least three scholarly articles every five years; and

c. Perform significant service every year in at least two committees (or equivalent) in the law school, the University, or the University System.”

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

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

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

A. Compliance with the Teaching Workload Expectations

Conformity assessment with the teaching metric in the COL workload expectations may be complicated by the fact that a 48-credit course load over five academic years, not including summers, will result in variation from year-to-year in the number of credits taught. Typically, a faculty member’s annual credit load will vary between 9 and 10 credits. Variation may be increased.
if a faculty member, with the approval of the Dean or Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, increases his or her annual credit load in one year to lighten his or her annual credit load in a subsequent year to dedicate additional time to non-teaching activities, such as significant research and scholarship, service or administrative activities. Consequently, in assessing conformity with the teaching metric, the Dean may calculate the average annual teaching load of a faculty member over a longer period of time than the previous five years, or rely on a faculty member’s running five-year average, or employ a comparable method designed to ensure substantial conformity with the metric and horizontal equity across the tenured faculty. A faculty member will not be adversely evaluated on the basis of semesters in which the faculty member was released from teaching obligations due to an authorized leave, course release, or other such legitimate grounds.

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

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

B. Compliance with Research and Scholarship Workload Expectations

Conformity assessment with the research and scholarship metric in the COL workload expectations may be complicated by the fact that faculty members engage in, the COL encourages, and the university recognizes, diverse types of scholarly work product that are published in a wide variety of formats and venues. As a general rule, work product presented for fulfillment of the research and scholarship metric in the COL workload expectations should be (but is not required
to be) published and should advance knowledge within a recognized or emerging academic field of inquiry.

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

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

C. Compliance with Service Workload Policy

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

- whether the faculty member served as chair of any committees;
- the faculty member’s responsibilities on each committee;
- whether the faculty member directed or managed any COL programs;
the faculty member’s involvement in special projects in the law school, the university, or the university system;

- the faculty member’s contributions to COL’s administrative efforts, including, but not limited to, student affairs, alumni affairs, fundraising, and faculty, student, or staff recruitment;

- the faculty member’s involvement in student success activities beyond what would be considered teaching under the teaching Guidelines above, including teaching for the COL during the summer semester;

- whether the faculty member was the advisor to any student or student organization;

- the faculty member’s service to the legal profession, the community, government, or other entities and groups consistent with the mission of the COL or that advances the interests of the institution; or

- whether the faculty member has received any COL, university, professional, or community awards for service.

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

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

- Where a faculty member teaches an overload, the Dean may reduce or eliminate the research and scholarship and/or service expected of that faculty member and/or grant additional compensation to that faculty member.

- Where a faculty member has a significant service overload, the Dean may reduce or eliminate the teaching and/or research and scholarship expected of that faculty member or grant additional compensation to that faculty member.

- Where a faculty member has significantly higher research and scholarship productivity, the Dean may reduce or eliminate the teaching and/or service expected of that faculty member or grant additional compensation to that faculty member.
• Where a faculty member has significant administrative responsibilities, the Dean may reduce or eliminate the teaching, research and scholarship, or service expected of that faculty member and/or grant additional compensation.

• Where a faculty member fails to meet the research and scholarship expectations, the Dean may reduce or eliminate the research and scholarship expected of that faculty member and add additional teaching and/or service responsibilities as a remedy for failure to meet the research and scholarship expectations.

• Where a faculty member fails to meet the teaching or service expectations, the Dean may add additional teaching and/or service responsibilities as a remedy for failure to meet teaching or service expectations.

### E. Examples of Scholarly Work

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

#### Law Review Articles


#### Online Law Review and Journal Articles


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

#### Specialty or Interdisciplinary Law Review Articles


Books


Lytton, Timothy. Kosher: Private Regulation in the Age of Industrial Food (Harvard University Press, 2013)


Edited Volumes (First Editions or Significant Updates)

Jonathan Todres & Shani M. King, editors. The Oxford Handbook of Children’s Rights Law (Oxford University Press, 2020)


Treatises (First Editions or Significant Updates)


Radford, Mary. Georgia Trusts and Trustees (2011)

Casebooks/Textbooks (First Editions or Significant Updates)


Nutshells/Hornbooks


Peer Reviewed Articles


Book Chapters


## APPENDIX I – COMMITTEE CLASSIFICATIONS

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

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