THE DEPARTMENT of SOCIOLOGY and ANTHROPOLOGY CRITERIA and PROCEDURES for ANNUAL REVIEW, RETENTION, TENURE and PROMOTION

In the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, decisions on the retention of nontenured faculty, on the award or denial of tenure, and on promotion are made primarily on the basis of excellence in teaching, evaluations of scholarship, and service within the university and beyond. Decisions on retention of nontenured faculty and on the award of tenure will also take into consideration the faculty member's potential for continuing development as a teacher and as a scholar, and for ongoing service within the university and beyond. Criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion have been developed to reflect the mission of Georgia Southern University and the Desired Attributes of Georgia Southern Faculty. (See Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec. 204 and Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997).

Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria described below, along with the Desired Attributes in Section 204, apply to all types of faculty evaluation described in Section 205.04 of the Faculty Handbook. Evaluators of faculty at all levels shall seek evidence of sustained effort, involvement, and record of achievement. Accomplishments which have enriched the student learning experience are valued most. The entire body of work submitted by candidates shall be considered, though the most recent work shall be afforded greater consideration by the deliberating bodies at each level of evaluation. At Georgia Southern, the four Board of Regents’ criteria of superior teaching, outstanding service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development are expressed as the three criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service, with professional growth and development considered among these three. The following standards, articulated by Charles E. Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff in Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997, p. 36) shall be applied where appropriate to each area of evaluation: clarity of goals, adequacy of preparation, appropriateness of methods, significance of results, effectiveness of presentation, and evidence of reflective critique. While the manifestations of faculty achievement may vary across disciplines, the qualities represented in these criteria and in the Desired Attributes shall be the predominant basis for evaluation and shall be reflected in college and departmental governance documents. -- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec. 205

Teaching

A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including the development of online courses. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on measures such as examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, critical review and dissemination of teaching
products, performance of students in subsequent venues, follow-up of graduates in graduate school or in their employment, and student ratings of instruction.

--- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec 205

**Examples of Evidence of Teaching:**

- summary of student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations;
- honors and awards related to teaching;
- practicum or internship supervision;
- undergraduate honor or MA theses directed;
- thesis/dissertation committee membership;
- new courses and/or programs developed;
- faculty development to enhance and improve pedagogical skills;
- syllabi and other relevant course materials;
- curricular materials developed;
- significant course revisions;
- successful mentoring of students’ research;
- grant applications and awards related to instruction;
- teaching-oriented professional committees;
- invited lectures; and
- directed readings and independent studies.

**Scholarship**

The significance of scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline. Candidates must provide evidence of work which has been selected for dissemination through normally accepted peer-reviewed venues such as publications, conference presentations, exhibitions, performances, or other professional accomplishments. Scholarship includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as well as aesthetic creation and is often demonstrated by publications and presentations designed for professional audiences. Scholarship is manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, postdoctoral work, and academic honors and awards. -- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec 205

*Following the Boyer (1990) model, scholarship is defined as those activities that systematically advance the teaching, research, and practice of sociology and anthropology through rigorous inquiry that 1) is significant to the profession, 2) is creative, 3) can be documented, 4) can be replicated or elaborated, and 5) can be peer-reviewed through various methods. Scholarship includes:*

- discovery, where new and unique knowledge is generated;
- teaching, where the teacher creatively builds bridges between his or her own understanding and the students' learning;
- application, where the emphasis is on the use of new knowledge in solving society's problems; and
- integration, where new relationships among disciplines are discovered.*
Scholarship of Discovery The scholarship of discovery is inquiry that produces the disciplinary and professional knowledge that is at the very heart of academic pursuits (Boyer, 1990:17-18). It takes the form of primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis. It increasingly is interdisciplinary and collaborative in nature.

Examples of the Scholarship of Discovery

- peer-reviewed publications of research or theory;
- book published with a professional press;
- research monographs;
- book chapters;
- articles written for electronic media (if subject to the same sort of scrutiny and professional editing as print medium);
- conference presentations of research or theory;
- grant applications and awards in support of research or scholarship;
- mentorship of junior colleagues in research or scholarship;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; and
- positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

Scholarship of Teaching The scholarship of teaching is inquiry that produces knowledge to support the transfer of the science and art of sociology and anthropology from the expert to the novice, building bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning (Boyer, 1990:23-25). The scholarship of teaching increases the effectiveness of the transfer of discipline-specific knowledge, and adds to deeper understanding of both the discipline and pedagogy. The scholarship of teaching is conducted through application of knowledge of the discipline or specialty area in the teaching-learning process, the development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods, program development, learning outcome evaluation, and professional role modeling.

Examples of the Scholarship of Teaching

- peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes, case studies related to teaching-learning, learning theory development, and development or testing of educational models or theories;
- accreditation or other comprehensive program reports;
- successful applications of technology to teaching and learning;
- successful mentorship of students’ research;
- positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master teacher;
- published textbooks or other learning aids;
- grant applications and awards in support of teaching and learning;
- design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
- conference presentations related to teaching and learning.

Scholarship of Application (Action-Oriented, Practice, or Clinical) The scholarship of application entails the application of disciplinary knowledge and skill to address important societal problems. Boyer (1990:21-23) also called this the scholarship of engagement as academics engage their disciplinary knowledge and skill in service to the external environment. Sociologists and anthropologists, whose work identifies significant social issues, demonstrate the
effects of public policy, or offers practical solutions to community problems are engaged in the scholarship of application.

**Examples of the Application of Scholarship**

- peer-reviewed publications of research, case studies, technical applications, field reports or other practice issues;
- conference presentations related to practice;
- consultation reports;
- Products of applied scholarship (professional work such as oral history collections, museum exhibits, local impact studies, etc.);
- reports compiling and assessing or analyzing service programs or archeological sites;
- grant applications and awards in support of practice;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner;
- professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials;
- reports of demonstration projects; and
- policy papers related to practice.

**Scholarship of Integration** The scholarship of integration refers to writings and other products that use concepts and original works from sociology or anthropology and other disciplines in creating new patterns, placing knowledge in a larger context, illuminating the data in a more meaningful way, and/or educating non-specialists. The scholarship of integration emphasizes the interconnection of ideas, and brings new insight to bear on original concepts and research. Critical analysis and interpretation are two common methodologies, but interdisciplinary work may take place through any medium for scholarship such as those described as discovery, teaching, or practice (Boyer, 1990:18-21). Original work in the scholarship of integration takes place at the margins, or interface, between two disciplines. It serves to respond to both intellectual questions and pressing human problems by creating knowledge or combining knowledge in applications that offer new paradigms and insights.

**Examples of Integrative Scholarship**

- peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, integrative reviews of the literature, and others;
- entries in encyclopedias and biographical dictionaries;
- edited books;
- positive peer evaluations of contributions to integrative scholarship;
- reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects;
- interdisciplinary grant applications and/or awards;
- conference presentations;
- policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments; and
- public lectures that present one’s own research.

Not only do we recognize scholarly activities in all four areas, we recognize knowledge-based service to the profession, where one’s disciplinary knowledge and scholarly achievements are recognized by his or her peers.

**Examples of Scholarly Service**

- book reviews in peer reviewed journals;
• serving on editorial boards;
• editing a journal;
• serving as a referee for grant proposals and/or fellowship applications; and
• serving as a reviewer for a refereed journal and/or university press.

Service
Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the department/school, college, and university levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one’s expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, or the like, as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University that do not entail systematic instruction, such as manuscript reviewing and the design and development of professional conferences. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid. -- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec. 205

Examples of Service Activities
• department, college, or university committees;
• student advisement;
• faculty senate;
• design and development of professional conferences;
• offices and committee appointments in local, state, regional, and national professional associations;
• presentation of programs and workshops on campus or within the community;
• non-remunerated professional consulting;
• organizing or acting as presiders of conference sessions;
• community outreach;
• sponsorship of student organizations;
• articles written by faculty and published in a non-scholarly (popular) medium (e.g., newspapers, magazines, books, etc.);
• honors and awards related to service; and
• grant applications and awards related to service.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Each faculty member is evaluated annually to ensure effective performance and facilitate improvement. Annual evaluations also serve as the basis for recommending merit salary increases and assist in determining continuation of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track lecturer faculty. (Annual evaluations exclude adjunct, full-time temporary and part-time faculty). In addition, a three-year moving average is used to evaluate tenured and tenure-track teaching loads.

Special evaluations are made for the following specific decisions:
• pre-tenure review
• tenure
• promotion
• post-tenure review
Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluations are conducted by the department chair with recommendations from the merit committee. The merit committee is comprised of three members appointed on a rotating basis from the tenured and tenure-track faculty at large. One member of the committee serves for two years and the other two members serve one year. The merit committee must include at least one tenured faculty member and at least one representative from each of the two degree programs—sociology and anthropology.

The merit committee evaluates the performance of all tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty in three areas—teaching, scholarly productivity, and service to the department, university, and profession. The merit committee reviews each faculty member’s annual report for the current year and the prior year (in order to better assess activities that are ongoing). Based on one’s teaching load (e.g., 3/3 or 4/4) and faculty status (e.g., tenure-track/tenured or lecturer), faculty are assigned a score for teaching, scholarship, and service. Lecturer faculty are expected to engage in appropriate professional development activities (see Lecturer Teaching Loads section in CLASS Policies and Procedures) and tenured faculty who have been approved to teach a 4/4 load have minimal scholarship expectations. See APPENDIX A for a copy of the faculty merit evaluation sheet.

Faculty should refer to Boyer’s model of scholarship (outlined above) when writing their annual reports. Faculty's annual reports must include:

- a personal narrative of accomplishment in teaching, scholarship and service;
- a copy of your Faculty Report of Activity (as submitted to the CLASS Dean’s office);
- summary of student ratings of instruction;
- copies of articles published;
- course syllabi; and
- the previous year’s copy of your Faculty Report of Activity.

Although copies of peer evaluations of teaching are required for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, they are optional for the annual review. Evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service are used to assess annual performance and to make recommendations for improvement. The department chair may elect to use input from the merit committee when preparing his/her annual evaluations of faculty.

Annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and non-tenure-track lectures will be conducted by the chair of the department (after considering individual recommendations from the department’s merit committee). The chair will provide careful, detailed evaluation of the performance of faculty, which will include a written evaluative summary and a face-to-face conference. Both the written statement and the evaluative conference will pay close attention to problem issues, if any, and offer suggestions for improvement.

Pre-Tenure Review

In addition to the annual review of faculty, the university conducts a comprehensive review of faculty achievements and performance in the third year of the probationary period as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year. In the typical case of a tenure-track faculty member hired without probationary credit, pre-tenure review occurs in the spring semester of the faculty member’s third year of service. If a faculty member is hired on a tenure-track line with probationary credit, the faculty member will be reviewed at the
midpoint of the tenure schedule. A faculty member who previously served as a temporary assistant professor at Georgia Southern University without a break in service and who has been hired on a tenure-track will be reviewed at the midpoint between the year of the change of status to probationary faculty and the year designated for tenure review.

By August 15, faculty members scheduled for pre-tenure review the following spring will be notified of the pending pre-tenure review and will be asked to submit materials the first day of spring semester. Following submission of the required materials by faculty members undergoing pre-tenure review, the department will utilize a committee comprised of at least five (and preferably all of the) tenured faculty to conduct a thorough evaluation of the pre-tenure faculty member’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. A majority of this committee must hold the rank of associate professor or professor. A sub-committee of three will prepare a written report that reflects the sentiment and vote of the larger committee to the department chair.

By February 1 of the review year, the chair will provide the faculty member with a copy of the chair’s and departmental review committee’s evaluations. The committee’s report and the chair’s evaluation will clearly indicate one of the following four results:

- The faculty member is making adequate progress toward tenure, and no specific recommendations for improvement are necessary.
- The faculty member is making progress toward tenure, but it is recommended that improvements be made. [State specific recommendations.]
- The faculty member is not making progress toward tenure, but it is felt that improvements may yet be made. [State specific recommendations.]
- The faculty member is not making progress towards tenure, and it is recommended that additional employment contracts not be issued. [No specific recommendations will be provided.]

By February 10, the faculty member may provide the chair a written response to the departmental review.

By February 15 of each year, departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences will provide the dean with the following items for each faculty member undergoing pre-tenure review:

1. A copy of the chair’s evaluation of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion.
2. A copy of the department pre-tenure review committee’s evaluation of the faculty member.
3. An up-to-date curriculum vitae in approved format. While works in progress or submitted works may be separately listed, works in press must be accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher.
4. A personal narrative of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.
5. Annual reviews and any documents or information produced in response to such reviews.
7. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction.
8. The faculty member’s written response to the departmental review, if any.
9. A list of accompanying supplemental material.
10. Other supporting materials that the applicant believes will strengthen the application.

Items 1-9 will be submitted in a single 1.5” notebook with supporting materials submitted separately.

After materials are submitted by the faculty member, only the dean may alter the packet, following consultation with the department chair, based on verified significant accomplishments.
or other information that has become available since the packet was submitted and only with written notification to the faculty member.

By March 15, the dean will evaluate the faculty member’s dossier, review the recommendations from the chair and departmental review committee, and may provide the faculty member with additional written feedback if necessary.

A positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of tenure and/or promotion.

Promotion and Tenure
The institution approves faculty for tenure in accordance with Section 8.3.7.2, Board of Regents Policy Manual, which includes a comprehensive statement of tenure policies in the University System. Tenure ensures academic freedom for faculty and protection against improper restrictions of the freedom of inquiry in teaching, scholarship, and service. It protects the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other confining orthodoxies. Academic freedom and tenure sustain and support the transmission and advancement of knowledge and understanding, which are central to the mission of the University. Tenured faculty have the responsibility to engage in continuous professional growth; to remain vital and contributing members of the faculty; to present accurate information in teaching; and to facilitate, support, defend, and preserve an environment of academic integrity.

-- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec. 209

Georgia Southern approves faculty for promotion based upon Regents policies (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, § 4.5). Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. Promotion applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost’s levels, culminating in an institutional decision at the President’s level. The Board of Regents has fixed certain minimum criteria for promotion. Promotion at Georgia Southern requires satisfactory performance in all areas of evaluation, with noteworthy accomplishment in teaching and one of the other two areas. Regents policies state that there should be appropriate involvement of faculty in making recommendations for promotion. Each unit shall have written procedures for making recommendations, and these procedures shall be available to all faculty members. Unit and college procedures must be approved by the Provost. -- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec. 208

Evaluations for promotion will be conducted in accordance with Board of Regents' policy and the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Regents' policy defines minimum time in rank for promotion to the next rank as follows:

- To Assistant Professor: 3 years
- To Associate Professor: 4 years
- To Professor: 5 years

Early promotions are rare, requiring clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation. -- Faculty Handbook, 2013-2014, sec. 208

The department promotion and tenure committee is comprised of five or more tenured faculty members. A majority of the committee must hold the rank of associate professor or professor.
Although tenured assistant professors may serve on department promotion and tenure committees, they may not vote on candidates for promotion and/or tenure at the rank of professor. In the event that a department has fewer than five faculty members eligible to serve or vote as part of the promotion and tenure committee, the dean will consult with the department chair and appoint additional eligible faculty members from within the College to bring the committee up to five voting members. The promotion and tenure committee will review a candidate’s dossier and will make recommendations to the department chair for each applicant for promotion and/or tenure. The promotion and tenure committee’s recommendation to the chair should be made in the form of a memorandum that identifies the members of the committee and reports the committee’s vote (e.g. 4 votes in favor, 2 against) and supporting rationale. When a department chair is a candidate for promotion, the committee’s memorandum and recommendation will be provided to the dean.

By October 1 of each year, departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences will provide the dean with the following items for each candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure:
1. Required cover materials, including a completed promotion and/or tenure application form.
2. A cover letter from the department chair detailing the chair’s recommendation to the dean on the faculty member’s candidacy for promotion and/or tenure
3. A copy of the department promotion and tenure committee’s memorandum to the department chair regarding the candidate.
4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae in approved format. While works in progress or submitted works may be separately listed, works in press must be accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher.
5. A personal narrative of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.
6. Pre-Tenure Review (if not yet tenured).
7. Annual reviews and any documents or information produced in response to such reviews.
8. Summary of student ratings of instruction.
9. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction.
11. A list of accompanying supplemental material.
12. Other supporting materials that the applicant believes will strengthen the application.

Items 1 through 11 will be submitted in a single 1.5” notebook with supporting materials submitted separately. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure in the same year need only submit one set of required and supporting materials to the dean.

After materials are submitted, only the dean may alter the packet, following consultation with the department chair, based on verified significant accomplishments or other information that has become available since the packet was submitted and only with written notification to the candidate.

Faculty members will be notified in writing at each level of review concerning the recommendation.

**Timing**
In ordinary circumstances (i.e., tenure-track, rank of assistant professor, no probationary credit), faculty members will be considered for tenure during their sixth year of tenure-track service. Faculty who can demonstrate clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation may choose, however, to apply for tenure in their fifth year. Tenure decisions before the fifth year are extremely rare.
Newly-appointed faculty with prior full-time service may be credited with up to three years of probationary service as per the tenure policy outlined in Section 209 in the *Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook*. Such faculty shall be notified in writing at the time of appointment as to how many years of probationary service credit is being given and therefore how long the reduced probationary period of service shall be. A faculty member who has been granted probationary credit will be considered for tenure according to the reduced period of service, unless the faculty member notifies the dean in writing by September 1 of the year in which the faculty member is first eligible for tenure that he or she has chosen not to use the probationary credit granted. If a faculty member elects not to use the probationary credit granted, then he or she will not be considered for tenure until the sixth year of service at Georgia Southern University.

Faculty members who apply and are not recommended for tenure in the minimum time of five years or who use probationary credit and are not recommended in the minimum time may apply for tenure only once more.

**Post-tenure Review**

The post-tenure review process and the process for deciding promotion and tenure share the same evaluation criteria; however, their purposes and evaluation standards are different. The purposes of post-tenure review are:

- to recognize and reward tenured faculty who have made and continue to make significant contributions to the mission of their departments, colleges, and the university;
- to provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, but also scholarship and/or service, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the university; and
- to provide a systematic faculty development plan to remedy instances where a tenured faculty member’s contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service are found to be deficient with respect to the mission of the department, college, or university.

Post-tenure review not only concentrates on the period under review, but also considers the cumulative contributions of faculty. For this reason, and because it focuses on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and the individual, judgments regarding post-tenure review should be based on contributions over one’s career and at five-year intervals and not only on the contributions which are applied to promotion. A satisfactory post-tenure review indicates that the individual continues to make contributions which benefit the university, its students, and its other constituents.

Each faculty member’s post-tenure review will occur on a rotating five-year schedule. The five-year period will begin with the faculty member’s last major personnel decision (i.e., tenure or promotion). This schedule of reviews will be maintained by the associate dean for faculty services and research and verified by the Office of the Provost.

Post-tenure reviews will continue every five years until the faculty member submits to the dean a written statement of his or her intention to retire within the next five years.

A faculty member’s five-year evaluation period may be interrupted by a change of status (for instance, a full-time administrative assignment) or promotion. In these cases, a new five-year interval will be set.
By February 1 of a faculty member’s review year, the department will forward to the college the following items for each faculty member undergoing review:
1. A department chair’s evaluation specifically written for the purpose of the post-tenure review
2. A current curriculum vitae in standard format, highlighting the review period
3. Copies of annual performance reviews for the review period
4. The results of the faculty member’s most recent major personnel evaluation (tenure, promotion, or previous post-tenure) by the department
5. Summary of student ratings of instruction for the review period
6. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction
7. Self-evaluation narrative with projected goals
Items 1-7 will be submitted in a single 1.5” notebook with supporting materials, if any, submitted separately.

After materials are submitted by the faculty member, only the dean may alter the packet, following consultation with the department chair, based on verified significant accomplishments or other information that has become available since the packet was submitted and only with written notification to the candidate.

Prior to submission of a faculty member’s post-tenure review dossier to the dean, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of the department chair’s post-tenure review evaluation. The faculty member’s post-tenure review dossier will be reviewed by the college personnel review committee.
APPENDIX A
EVALUATION SHEET FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

Faculty Merit Evaluation Sheet
Evaluator’s Name________________________

Faculty Member’s Name________________________

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

| 0------------------------ | 1.0................................1.9 | 2.0............................3.0 | 
| Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |

TEACHING

Numerical Rating: ______
Comments:

RESEARCH/CREATIVITY

Numerical Rating: ______
Comments:

SERVICE

Numerical Rating: ______
Comments:

APPENDIX B
VOTING PROCEDURES FOR PRE-TENURE REVIEW, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The chair of the department will make each candidate's dossier available to the tenured faculty for review. The tenured faculty will function as a committee of the whole in evaluating candidates for pre-tenure review, tenure and promotion. The promotion and tenure committee's recommendation to the chair should be made in the form of a memorandum that identifies the members of the committee and reports the committee's vote and supporting rationale.
The chair of the department will conduct the meeting but shall not vote. Following discussion of the teaching, scholarship, and service of each candidate, all tenured faculty who are eligible to vote will do so by secret ballot. A faculty member who cannot participate in the discussions because of illness or other pressing reasons may submit a ballot to the chair prior to the meeting. The chair will collect the ballots and select a faculty member to count the ballots while the chair tallies them. This vote constitutes the tenured faculty’s recommendation to the chair.

This procedure will be followed for each candidate under consideration. If more than one candidate is being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion, the committee of the whole will discuss and vote on each candidate separately, but ballots will not be counted until the committee has completed its deliberations on all candidates in the same category.

Candidates for promotion will not participate in any deliberation or vote on any recommendation concerning their own file. Candidates will not participate in any deliberations or vote on any recommendations concerning colleagues who are candidates for the same rank.

APPENDIX C
PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW

General Policy:
As part of consideration for a faculty member’s promotion to the rank of associate or full professor, the department will obtain external reviews of the candidate’s research, publications, and professional contributions. The department chair will add these reviews to the dossier of materials prepared and submitted by the applicant. Appropriate reviewing bodies at department, college and university levels will have access to external reviews.

Procedures:
1. The process of external review will be initiated by the faculty member, who will provide the chair of his or her department with a list of at least five individuals outside of the university who the candidate believes to be qualified to judge his/her scholarly accomplishments (i.e., are specialists in one or more of the candidate’s fields of research). The candidate’s list shall include the names, mailing addresses, phone numbers, email addresses, and areas of expertise. The candidate’s list should be presented to the chair no later than April 1st of the academic year prior to the promotion review. The chair normally will select at least three external referees from the list provided by the candidate but may independently solicit external reviews if necessary.

2. Reviewers will be contacted either by phone or email to secure consent before the candidate’s materials are mailed to them. If a reviewer declines to evaluate the faculty member’s scholarship, the chair will contact other people on the candidate’s list, if necessary scheduling another meeting with the candidate to add additional names. The chair will keep the faculty member informed about progress in procuring at least three reviewers.

3. The chair will maintain a record of the names of external referees from whom letters of evaluation have been solicited, along with their titles and qualifications to review the candidate. If an external referee declines to submit a letter of evaluation, the reason shall be recorded. These data may be included in the candidate's supplementary materials. In addition, a copy of the letter(s) sent by the chair to the external referee may also be included as part of the candidate's supplementary materials, in order to clarify the charge given to referees.
4. The materials sent out to the reviewers will consist of the following: (a) a cover letter from the chair briefly describing the nature of the review and the desired scope of the external referee’s evaluation, (b) a brief description of relevant characteristics of the candidate’s institution and departmental guidelines for evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure, (c) the candidate’s curriculum vitae, (d) the candidate’s narrative statement, (e) appropriate supporting materials, as determined by the candidate.

5. Reviewers will be asked to comment on the candidate’s research agenda, publications, and scholarly activities. They will not be asked to comment on the candidate’s teaching or to make a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. Reviewers will be asked to describe under what circumstances they know the candidate and they will be asked to provide a vitae or brief biography. Reviewers will be asked to submit their completed evaluation to the chair by August 1st. If a reviewer fails to submit the evaluation by the deadline the chair will write or email the reviewer to request an immediate submission. The chair will place a letter in the candidate’s promotion file explaining the absence of the review.

6. Reviews are confidential and will not be routinely shared with candidates.

7. After the review is completed the chair should send a letter of appreciation to each reviewer.

Etiquette of External Review

- Choose referees with appropriate professional competence and minimize biases, either personal or professional, with respect to the candidate being evaluated. You may not ask colleagues within your own institution or members from your dissertation committee to serve as external reviewers.
- The candidate should not contact possible referees. All communication with referees should be handled by the chair.
- Recognize that the process imposes a professional burden and, therefore, not to request an unnecessarily large number of letters, nor should we send an undue amount of supporting material.

Sample Email to Request an External Review

Dear _____:

I am writing you on behalf of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Georgia Southern University to request your service as an external reviewer for _____, who has requested consideration for promotion to the rank of [associate/full] professor. Georgia Southern University is making a concerted effort to promote the strongest candidates in each of its programs. Accordingly, we would very much appreciate your assistance in evaluating the merits of Professor _____’s record of research, publication, scholarly and/or professional activities. If you agree, I will immediately mail you a copy of Professor _____’s vitae, research narrative, and recent publications. In order to complete Professor _____’s dossier for University review, I would appreciate receiving your comments by August 1, ____.

Needless to say, we will appreciate your assistance as we consider Professor ( _____’s ) candidacy. We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and we assure you that your comments will be very highly valued. Your written comments will be kept confidential to the extent allowable by law. I hope you will be able to assist us in this important endeavor.
Sample Letter to request an External Evaluation

Date

Inside address

Dear______:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for (name), who is being considered for (tenure [and/or] promotion to X) in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Georgia Southern University. We believe external evaluations contribute substantially to the academic review process and greatly appreciate your willingness to serve in this capacity.

To assist you in this review, we are providing Professor (name)’s vitae and supporting materials. We solicit your comments regarding the depth, quantity, originality, importance, significance, and visibility of Professor (name)’s research and scholarship (or creative scholarship). We do not, of course, expect you to make a (tenure/promotion) recommendation as such. Your evaluative comments, however, based upon your knowledge and appreciation of the field and its standards, will be a significant contribution to our review.

Your evaluation will become part of the candidate's dossier and will be made available to those faculty in the Academic Unit and the College as well as university administrators who are involved in the promotion and tenure review process. You should be aware that The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia considers external letters of evaluation to be exempt from the Georgia Open Records Law pursuant to O.C.G.A. 50-18-72(a)(7), which exempts "[r]ecords consisting of confidential evaluations submitted to . . . a governmental agency and prepared in connection with the appointment . . . of a public . . . employee." In accordance with this understanding, Georgia Southern University will keep your submission confidential to the fullest extent permitted by law. However, this issue has yet to be adjudicated."

We also ask that you provide us with a current copy of your c.v. and a statement indicating the nature of your relationship, if any, with Professor (name).

Please be assured that we are very grateful for your participation in this review. In order to complete our process, we will need to have your review by (date). If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 912-478-(XXXX).

Sincerely,

Chair, Department of (department)
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