

**DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Policy Title:	Department of Computer Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	4
Department Approval:	02/14/2013
College Approval:	Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 02/05/2014

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

PROLOGUE

The Department of Computer Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines supplements and complements the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual and the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors. The basic, fundamental, expert peer-review of the candidate takes place within the Department. Accordingly, the purpose of this set of guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria for promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Departmental guidelines are intended to conform to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, those of Georgia State University, and those of the College of Arts and Sciences. In the event of any conflict, the System, University, and College policies will take precedence. Therefore, it is important for candidates to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this document and in that of the College of Arts and Sciences.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Computer Science at Georgia State University (GSU) assumes as a primary aspect of its mission to provide research and teaching in the fundamental concepts and applications of computer science both for the students of the university as well as other citizens of the State of Georgia.

The Department seeks to fulfill this mission in four ways: (i) offering bachelor of science, masters of science, and Ph.D. degree programs that prepare computer science majors for careers in business, industry, education, science, and government; (ii) participating in various research and funding activities; (iii) providing a wide variety of computer science courses appropriate to majors in the discipline; and (iv) engaging in advisement, academic counseling, and other related services to the University and the larger community.

To meet these responsibilities, the Department of Computer Science is committed to attracting and maintaining a faculty with exceptional research and instructional abilities, expertise in the various areas of computer science, and a facility and willingness to serve both the University and the greater community. Therefore, this document is prepared to assist in this mission and in consideration of the policies of the Board of Regents, Georgia State University, and its College of Arts and Sciences. In the event of conflict, the university and college manuals take precedence over this set of departmental guidelines.

As such, all recommendations for promotion and tenure within the Department are evaluated based on the past performance of each candidate in the areas of professional development, teaching, and service. Candidates should strive for excellence in all three components while keeping in mind the criteria described in this document. The purpose of this document, along with that of the College, is to help the appropriate committees and individuals involved in the process make these evaluations, and to help the candidates prepare their dossiers so that they display their accomplishments in a clear and convincing fashion. Clearly, the granting of tenure is a serious commitment of future resources.

The College Area Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CAACPT) independently

47 evaluates all candidates according to the College Promotion and Tenure Manual, a portion of
 48 which provides guidelines for the departmental review and the production of this departmental
 49 document. The departmental review by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee
 50 (DPTC) is made in accordance with this departmental document and the College Promotion and
 51 Tenure Manual.

52 53 **THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS** 54 **IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE**

55
 56 Policies relating to promotion and tenure (P&T) at Georgia State University, and in the
 57 College of Arts and Sciences, are described in the College Manual. The College Manual also
 58 describes the P&T process, the college area P&T committee, and the schedule for the various steps
 59 in the process. In all cases, candidates must satisfy the minimum requirements set forth by the
 60 Regents, Georgia State University, and the College of Arts and Sciences.

61 62 **EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

63 As described in the University Policy on Promotion and Tenure:

64 The candidate's record will be evaluated according to University, college, and
 65 department criteria, and professional standards for conduct in research, scholarship,
 66 and creative activities, teaching, and service. In each area-- (1) research, scholarship,
 67 and creative activities; (2) teaching; and (3) service--the candidate will be evaluated as
 68 either having met or having not met the standards for promotion or tenure. It is
 69 necessary to meet the standards in each of the three areas for promotion or tenure.
 70 Norms and expectations appropriate to the discipline are specified in the college and
 71 department manuals and must be consistent with University standards.

72 Thus, the three areas that will be evaluated by the P&T committee for all candidates for
 73 promotion and/or tenure are professional development, teaching, and service. These evaluations
 74 will be based on peer judgments from materials submitted to the committee by the candidate and
 75 the external reviewers.

76 77 **Terms of Evaluation**

78 As described in the College Manual, "Candidates will be evaluated as either having met or
 79 having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in each of the following three areas:
 80 professional development, teaching, and service. The single measure for achieving the college
 81 standard in each category is defined below in relation to a specific qualitative term (i.e., *excellent*,
 82 *very good*, or *good*)..."

83 84 **Guidelines for the Terms of Evaluation in the Department of Computer Science**

85
 86 Specific items to be considered are listed in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual.
 87 Candidates should consult that manual concerning the format and organization of the materials to
 88 be submitted to the DPTC and the CAACPT. The materials submitted by each candidate will be
 89 evaluated on an individual basis. It is the candidate's responsibility to build his/her case for

90 promotion and/or tenure.

91 The terms, descriptors, and evidence are the same regardless of the level at which the
92 promotion and/or tenure is sought. However, evidence for more extensive activity and
93 accomplishment is required at the level of professor than at associate professor, and at associate
94 professor than at assistant professor.

95 As stated in the college manual, to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank
96 of associate professor by the college, a candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional
97 development and teaching and *good* in the area of service. To be recommended for promotion to
98 and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional
99 development and teaching and *very good* in service.

100

101 **Assessment of Professional Development**

102 Assessment of professional development reflects the professional accomplishment and
103 effectiveness of the candidate. Peer review is a vital component of professional development
104 activities and can take the forms of referees, panels, committees, editorial board, or some such
105 juried review process appropriate for the work, with the key element being an external review that
106 provides an assessment of the professional value of the work. Professional accomplishment and
107 effectiveness is demonstrated by, as appropriate to the specialty or area of the candidate, a
108 combination of: publications in peer-reviewed media (including (alphabetically) books appropriate
109 to the discipline and chapters in books, electronic formats, journals, and proceedings of national
110 and international conferences and workshops); success in proposing funding or support from
111 traditional (e.g., national agencies, foundations, state agencies, and internal award programs)
112 and/or industry-related sources; peer recognition in the forms of invitations to present at
113 conferences or workshops, elections to posts in professional organizations, or invitations or
114 appointments to serve on committees or as session organizers or chairs; and professional activity
115 in the form of contributions to professional meetings.

116

117 The goal of the Department is for the faculty to be recognized within their respective
118 specialties or areas as leaders who make significant contributions to the advancement of those
119 specialties or areas. All faculty members are expected to submit proposals seeking extramural
120 funding or support for their research activities, and reviews of these proposals provide an
121 important indication of the value with which the activities are viewed by the sources of the
122 funding or support. Success in professional development activities may be affected by many
123 factors including the difficulty of the work, access to appropriate equipment or facilities or
124 processes, and the number and backgrounds of students available to assist in the work. It is the
125 responsibility of the candidate to assess the availability of appropriate equipment, facilities,
126 processes, personnel, and space so that the plans for professional development activities are
127 ambitious yet feasible.

128

129 To be tenured and/or promoted, the candidate must achieve a rating of *excellent* in
130 Professional Development, meaning they must have a nationally recognized research program.
131 Evidence of such a program could be 1) publications¹ and funding², or 2) exceptional publications

1 "Publications" indicates publications in peer-reviewed media, including (alphabetically) books appropriate to the discipline and chapters in books, electronic formats, journals, and proceedings of national and international conferences and workshops.

2 "Funding" indicates competitive peer reviewed funding or support from national agencies, foundations, industries,

132 and promising proposal reviews.

133

134 **Considerations on Evaluating Quality of Contributions to Professional Development:**

135 The candidate must submit evidence of professional development organized according to the
 136 categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.). Types of
 137 evidence of achievement in professional development include:

138

139 1. *Publications in peer-reviewed media:*

140 i. Papers: Significance and scope of results; prestige, stature, and scope of media; acceptance
 141 rate; quality and quantity of citations.

142 ii. Books appropriate to the discipline: Published reviews; citations; number of printings.

143 iii. Chapters in books: Published reviews of book in which chapter(s) appears.

144

145 2. *Funding/Support:* Degree of competition; scope of funding or support agency; appropriateness
 146 of funding or support agency to the candidate's research; scope of award; quality of proposal
 147 reviews.

148

149 3. *Invited Presentations:* Prestige of conference or workshop.

150 4. *Reviewing and refereeing:* Amount of reviewing and refereeing; prestige of media or
 151 organization for which work was done.

152

153 In judging the quality of a candidate's contributions to professional development, the DPTC
 154 and the Chair will be guided by the following:

155

156 **A. Publications.** Because explosive change is expected to continue to be the normal state in the
 157 discipline of computer science for years to come, the Department recognizes that the core
 158 indicator of scholarly attainment in computer science should be publication in competitive
 159 peer-reviewed, or juried, media (e.g., books, chapters in books, electronic journals, electronic
 160 postings, journals, proceedings, workshops – listed here in alphabetical order). The particular
 161 media and its physical characteristics are not issues. The competition for contributing to a
 162 particular instance of a media is important. The candidate should clearly indicate for each
 163 publication if it was juried and the degree of competition for a particular instance of a media
 164 that contains the publication. Evidence of competition would include the acceptance rate for
 165 the proceedings or electronic postings of a specific instance of a conference and an historical
 166 rate of acceptance by a journal or conference. The Department recognizes and will take into
 167 account that different media have different bases for judging competition and for reviewing
 168 and that each specialty or area has different expectations in regard to the appropriateness of
 169 specific publishing media.

170

171 **B. Citations.** The quality and appropriateness of a contribution of a candidate may be clarified by
 172 the use and recognition it receives from other researchers. For this purpose of clarification,
 173 citations to and reviews of the candidate's professional development publications will also be
 174 assessed, as available and as appropriate to the specialty or area.

175

state agencies, and internal programs.

176 **C. Productivity.** The Department recognizes and will take into account that each specialty or area
 177 has different expectations in regard to the numbers of publications and of funding or support
 178 efforts undertaken.

179
 180 **D. Co-authors.** The Department accepts and values multiple authorship in publications and grant
 181 funding efforts because specialties or areas in the discipline are becoming increasingly
 182 interdependent and collaboration can focus the talents of multiple experts to produce rapid
 183 advance of the discipline. The Department anticipates no particular research model will be
 184 used in publications and funding or support efforts of the faculty that would be expected to
 185 document the roles of the co-authors. So, while the Department recognizes that multiplicity of
 186 authorship occurs differently in different areas or specialties, candidates with co-authored
 187 works and funding or support efforts should clearly indicate their contribution to the works
 188 and efforts. The evaluation committee(s) will incorporate assessment of this contribution in its
 189 letter of recommendation. Overall, the evidence must indicate that the contributions in each
 190 specialty or area, which is exhibited in a candidate's contributions to professional
 191 development, form a coherent role for the candidate in that specialty or area in order to warrant
 192 promotion and/or tenure.

193
 194 **E. Funding / Support.** The Department recognizes that funding or support may be secured from
 195 a number of sources for a variety of needs in conjunction with a candidate's professional
 196 development activities that vary with the specialty or area. Traditional sources (e.g., national
 197 agencies, foundations, state agencies, and internal award programs) may be sought to support
 198 more traditional research needs (e.g., equipment, training graduate assistants, and release time
 199 for research). The Department recognizes the emerging need in the discipline to have access to
 200 state-of-the-art environments (e.g., complex mixed-hardware networks and industrial-strength
 201 software and hardware development processes) that are generally found in industries. Industry
 202 may also be an efficient source of support in regard to in-kind contributions and matches of
 203 equipment. In any case, the candidate should clearly indicate how the source at which each
 204 funding or support effort is directed fits needs of the candidate's research activities and
 205 describe the juried process that provides the external assessment of the professional value of
 206 the work proposed for funding or support. In the case of industry funding or support, which
 207 typically involves contractual arrangements, the candidate should also indicate the competition
 208 for acquiring the funding or support, which would include the acceptance rate of responses to
 209 RFPs, levels of funding or support obtained by competing proposals, and/or the track record of
 210 proposals accepted by the source at which the funding or support effort is directed. Overall,
 211 the candidate's funding or support efforts should evidence relationships with publications, past
 212 and/or planned. A funding or support effort that evidences professional development that is
 213 not related to the majority of the past work of the candidate will be regarded as a "seed" or
 214 startup effort, which should not be confused, however, with funding or support that allows a
 215 candidate to extend, generalize, synthesize, or modernize past work of the candidate.

216

217

218 **Assessment of Teaching**

219 Assessment of teaching reflects accomplishment, performance, and effectiveness in teaching-
 220 related activities. As stated in the College Manual, "The candidate should include the teaching

221 portfolios he/she has compiled for the last four years at Georgia State (include summers, if
 222 applicable), as required in the college's Teaching Assessment Policy..."

223

224 To be tenured and/or promoted, the candidate must achieve a rating of *excellent* in Teaching,
 225 implying that the candidate is an innovative, inspirational, and creative teacher. The candidate
 226 must satisfy five of the eight criteria listed below, including (a), (b), and (c) to achieve a rating of
 227 excellent.

228

229 **Considerations on Evaluating Quality of Contributions to Teaching:**

230

231 The candidate must submit evidence of effective teaching organized according to the
 232 categories of teaching listed in the College Manual (section V.F.). Types of evidence of effective
 233 teaching include:

234

235 (a) Quality of courses developed; quality of modifications to existing courses.

236

237 (b) Quality of accomplishments of students supervised; level of students; amount of supervision.

238

239 (c) Quality of student evaluations.

240

241 (d) Significance and scope of student accomplishments such as the quality of student publications,
 242 and the stature and scope of journals or conferences in which the student publications
 243 appeared.

244

245 (e) Degree and novelty of innovations used in instructing current courses.

246

247 (f) Significance and scope of teaching-related publication results; peer-review, stature and scope
 248 of the journal or conference; acceptance rate. Significance of textbook, including adoption and
 249 stature of publisher.

250

251 (g) Significance and scope of organization issuing teaching award.

252 (f) Instructional grants, including both competitive peer-reviewed awards as well as state and
 253 internal awards;

254 (h) Significance of student placement and performance in industry, academia, and
 255 licensure/certification examinations, internships, etc.

256

257 **Assessment of Service**

258 Evaluation in the area of Service reflects contributions and effectiveness as demonstrated by
 259 departmental, College, and University service, by service to professional organizations, and by
 260 profession-related service to the community. The College Manual clarifies that "Contributions to
 261 professional associations of an administrative nature shall be counted in the category of service

262 rather than professional development. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations
 263 count in the professional development category.” Service is a critical ingredient to the successful
 264 functioning of the Department. Candidates are expected to perform service requests competently
 265 and in a timely fashion. However, only minimal service to the Department and College is
 266 expected of junior faculty during the first three years, and an average amount of service to the
 267 Department in the fourth and fifth years.

268 To be promoted to and/or tenured at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must achieve a
 269 rating of *good*, meaning they must have played an effective role for service on departmental
 270 committees.

271 To be promoted to and/or tenured at the rank of Professor, the candidate must achieve a rating of
 272 *very good*. This means they have played (1) an active role for service on College, Senate, or other
 273 University or System committees and (2) an effective role for service on departmental committees.

274
 275 **Considerations on Evaluating Quality of the Candidate’s Contributions to Service:**
 276

277 The candidate must submit evidence of effective service organized according to the categories
 278 of service listed in the college manual (section V.G.). Types of evidence of effective service:

- 279 (a) Quality of contribution to departmental committee; scope and responsibilities of committee.
 280
 281 (b) Quality of contribution to College, Senate, or other University or System committee; scope and
 282 responsibilities of committee.
 283 (c) Reputation and scope of professional organization, conference, or publication; responsibilities
 284 of position held.
 285
 286

287 **CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO RANK**
 288

289 **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

290 In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a
 291 candidate must be evaluated as at least *excellent* in professional development and teaching. The
 292 candidate must also be rated as at least *good* in service.
 293

294 The DPTC of the Whole (i.e., the professors and the associate professors who are the members
 295 of the DPTC) and the Chair of the Department independently will evaluate the credentials of all
 296 candidates with all deliberations to be completed according to the College calendar.
 297

298 For the candidate to be judged *excellent* in professional development (a nationally recognized
 299 program), there should be evidence of publications and of funding or support efforts as follows.
 300 The mix of publications must include publications in peer-reviewed media suitable for the areas or
 301 specialties to which the publications belong. Publications in this mix may involve electronic and

302 print formats but competitive peer-reviewed media is the core indicator of scholarship. At a
303 minimum, the successful candidate is expected to have published some publications, as
304 appropriate to the specialty or area of the candidate, while at Georgia State University. The mix of
305 funding or support efforts must include one of the following: efforts that resulted in acquisition of
306 extramural funding or support from foundations, industries, national agencies, or state agencies; or
307 vigorous and consistent efforts to acquire extramural funding or support from foundations,
308 industries, national agencies, or state agencies plus the acquisition of funding from internal award
309 programs that is “seed” or startup funding. Indication of effort to secure funding or support may
310 include reviewers' comments on proposals. If a candidate elects to submit these, the full set of
311 comments and scores from the funding or support source must be made available to the
312 committee.

313
314 For a rating of *excellent* in teaching, a candidate must exhibit teaching competence, teaching
315 effectiveness, the facility to engage students in constructive exchanges, imparting new insights
316 into the material, and sound standards in both undergraduate and graduate teaching. To
317 demonstrate excellence in teaching, the department recommends involvement in both
318 undergraduate and graduate teaching. Data to be reviewed by the DPTC include syllabi,
319 examinations, problem sets (including programming assignments, as appropriate), and student
320 evaluations, as well as numbers of students directed in independent work, such as independent
321 studies and theses directions. Information about graduate students who have successfully
322 completed their degrees, as well as those who show progress toward a degree, by accumulating
323 met requirements for the degree, will also be reviewed. The quality of students and publications by
324 and/or with students will be weighed more than the number of students. Co-authorship is a clear
325 indication of a significant contribution by the candidate to a student publication. Otherwise, the
326 extent of the contribution to each student publication by the candidate should be supported by
327 documentation. Evidence for an evaluation of *excellent* in teaching may be on the basis of
328 recognition of teaching-relevant publications. The Department will permit the candidate to
329 develop evidence from course materials and student evaluations as indicated above to support an
330 evaluation of *excellent*.

331
332 The Department expects all its faculty members to contribute to self-governance of the
333 Department, College, and University, commensurate with rank and experience, and to nurture the
334 professional reputation of the Department in the computer science community. For promotion to
335 and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, membership on Departmental committees,
336 membership on committees of professional organizations and of conferences, and other
337 administrative services in professional organizations are among activities reviewed in promotion
338 and/or tenure considerations by the Department. (Depending upon the committee and meeting,
339 membership and meeting activities may also indicate professional recognition that should also be
340 submitted as contributions to professional development.)

341
342 If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of her/his
343 appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary
344 credit for tenure is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and/or tenure at
345 Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not
346 be considered for promotion and/or tenure of that candidate at Georgia State University. Assistant
347 Professors may be judged to have performed service suitable for tenure and promotion to the

348 Associate Professor rank by a rating of *good*.

349

350 **Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

351 The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of
352 Associate Professor.

353

354

355 **Promotion to Professor**

356 Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have
357 distinguished records of achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia State
358 University. External reviewers will be asked to provide letters before the departmental review
359 process. Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank
360 of Professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. The
361 same evaluative terms established for promotion to Associate Professor apply to promotion to
362 Professor but the magnitude and history of accomplishments must be substantially greater. A
363 candidate for promotion to Professor must present at a minimum clear evidence of *excellence* in
364 both professional development and teaching that significantly surpasses the requirements for rank
365 of Associate Professor and must present a *very good* record in service in the Department, College,
366 and/or University.

367

368 Such accomplishments include the establishment and maintenance at Georgia State University
369 of an independent research program and the procurement of competitive extramural funding or
370 support from foundations, industries, and/or national or state agencies. The recognition of the
371 candidate's expertise as evidenced by a history of publication in high-quality media, appropriate to
372 the specialty or area, should exceed that required for a recommendation to the rank of Associate
373 Professor. Other evidence of achievement could further include membership on editorial boards
374 of significant computer science publication media or on program committees of significant
375 conferences, as well as serving as a referee for those publication media or conferences, a member
376 of review boards for funding organizations, a reviewer for promotion and tenure at other
377 universities, or a member of an accreditation board. Accomplishments in professional
378 development or teaching may be given special consideration. Accomplishments in professional
379 development as documented by national recognition, coupled with *excellent* achievements in
380 teaching and a major service role may warrant promotion to Professor. *Excellent* accomplishments
381 in professional development include a history of significant extramural support for the research
382 program coupled with high productivity evidenced by peer-reviewed, or juried, publications in
383 media that are appropriate to the specialties and areas of the publications of the candidate.
384 Similarly, accomplishments in teaching, as documented by national recognition, coupled with
385 *excellent* professional development and at least a *very good* record in service may warrant
386 promotion to Professor.

387

388 If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of her/his
389 appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary
390 credit for tenure is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and/or tenure at
391 Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not
392 be considered for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate at Georgia State University.

393

394 A candidate for promotion to Professor must submit his/her credentials to the DPTC in
 395 basically the same format in which these credentials are submitted to the CAACPT (according to
 396 the categories of professional development, teaching and service in the college manual, sections
 397 V.E. through V.G.). The Department may recommend specialized guidelines and a modified
 398 format for the documents to facilitate evaluation of the candidate's professional credentials. For
 399 instance, a facilitating format may be warranted if the candidate's publications are in
 400 nontraditional media.

401

402 **Tenure at the Rank of Professor**

403 The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of
 404 Professor.

405

406 **DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS**

407

408 The promotion and tenure review process in the Department begins during the academic year
 409 prior to the submission of materials and evaluation at the College level and beyond. The
 410 departmental review involves both the Chair of the Department and the Departmental Promotion
 411 and Tenure Committee (DPTC). The DPTC is a standing committee of the Department consisting
 412 of all tenured associate professors and professors. No candidate for promotion or tenure may serve
 413 on the DPTC during the period of her/his own consideration for promotion and/or tenure. After
 414 the departmental process, recommendations are forwarded to the College Area Advisory
 415 Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CAACPT) according to the following sequence of events.

416

417 A. The Chair of the Department shall ask all faculty members who are eligible for
 418 consideration for promotion and/or tenure in writing if they wish to be reviewed by the
 419 DPTC. (Refer to the College calendar for the deadline by which this must be done.)
 420 Eligibility is set forth by rules of the University and the College in which either time in
 421 rank or in untenured status is the major criterion. All interested candidates will be
 422 provided with copies of the current version of the departmental guidelines and of the
 423 College and University manuals.

424

425 B. Candidates desiring to be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure must respond to the Chair
 426 with a list of eight possible external reviewers. (Refer to the College calendar for the
 427 deadline by which this must be done.) Although faculty members are normally considered
 428 for both promotion and tenure during the same review process, candidates may request
 429 consideration for only promotion or tenure.

430

431 C. The Chair, together with the DPTC, will submit a list of an additional eight possible
 432 external reviewers to the Office of the Dean. (Refer to the College calendar for the deadline
 433 by which this must be done.) There should be no duplication in the names of the proposed
 434 reviewers of the previous list. Also provided to the Dean's Office will be brief profiles on
 435 the reviewers and the professional development materials to be transmitted to the reviewers
 436 for each candidate.

437

438 D. The Dean's Office provides the Chair and the DPTC with copies of the letters of
 439 assessment that have been received from the external reviewers. (Refer to the College

- 440 calendar for the deadline by which this must be done.)
 441
- 442 E. Candidates must submit complete dossiers of supporting materials to the Chair in the
 443 required format. Prior to submission of his/her dossier, a candidate should consult with the
 444 Chair or members of the DPTC for advice concerning format, procedure, and style. No
 445 materials can be added to the dossiers after the date specified in the College calendar.
 446
- 447 F. After receiving the materials from the Chair, the DPTC will review the dossiers to
 448 determine the committee recommendation. Only the professors on the DPTC are eligible
 449 to vote on candidates at the rank of professor or associate professor. The professors and
 450 associate professors on the DPTC (that is, the DPTC Committee as a Whole) are eligible to
 451 vote on candidates at the rank of assistant professor or instructor. The DPTC will forward
 452 to the Chair all materials required for departmental review, the candidate's statement of
 453 interests and goals, the curriculum vita included in the dossier, and the letter of assessment
 454 and its letter of assessment and recommendation for each candidate (refer to the College
 455 calendar for the deadline by which this must be done).
 456
- 457 G. The Chair separately evaluates each candidate. After this evaluation, the Chair will
 458 forward to the CAACPT all materials required for departmental review, the candidate's
 459 statement of interests and goals, the curriculum vita included in the dossier, the
 460 recommendation letter of the department committee, and the Chair's letter of assessment
 461 and recommendation (refer to the College calendar for the deadline by which this must be
 462 done). At this time, copies of the reports by the Chair and the DPTC will be made
 463 available to the candidate.
 464

465 REVISIONS OF THE GUIDELINES

466 Any approved version of this set of guidelines may be revised at a called departmental faculty
 467 meeting by a majority of the full-time faculty members of the Department of Computer Science.
 468
 469

**APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

Fair: The faculty member maintains a limited program in professional development with occasional publications or paper presentations.

Good: The faculty member maintains an active program in professional development with some publications or funding. The scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited.

Very Good: The faculty member maintains an emerging nationally competitive research program in professional development with publications and startup funding. While maintaining an active program of professional development, the faculty member has yet to establish a national reputation as a leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has established a nationally recognized research program in professional development, or there are clear indications that the faculty member is well on the way to establishing a nationally recognized research program, with evidence of publications and funding or exceptional publications and promising proposal reviews. The mix of publications must include publications in peer-reviewed media suitable for the areas or specialties to which the publications belong. Publications in this mix may involve electronic and print formats but competitive peer-reviewed media is the core indicator of scholarship. At a minimum, the successful candidate is expected to have published some publications, as appropriate to the specialty or area of the candidate, while at Georgia State University. The mix of funding or support efforts must include one of the following: efforts that resulted in acquisition of extramural funding or support from foundations, industries, national agencies, or state agencies; or vigorous and consistent efforts to acquire extramural funding or support from foundations, industries, national agencies, or state agencies plus the acquisition of funding from internal award programs that is "seed" or startup funding.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field by establishing an internationally recognized research program in professional development, as evidenced by substantial grant activity, publications in highly ranked journals and conference proceedings, national or international awards, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

509 **B. Teaching**

510

511 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching and needs significant
512 improvement in all areas.

513

514 **Fair:** The faculty member's instructional performance is sub-standard and has limited positive
515 effect on students.

516

517 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive.
518 S/He demonstrates limited accomplishments in (a) the supervision of students, and (b) student
519 evaluations.

520

521 **Very Good:** The faculty member's record demonstrates effectiveness in the classroom and in
522 mentoring students, with involvement in instructional development. S/He has accomplishments in
523 (a) the development of new course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of
524 students, and (c) student evaluations.

525

526 **Excellent:** The faculty member's record demonstrates evidence of a highly effective, innovative,
527 and engaged teacher. S/He has significant accomplishments in (a) the development of new
528 course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of students, (c) student
529 publications, and (d) student evaluations.

530

531 **Outstanding:** In addition to the criteria stated above for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member
532 must have significant achievements in (a) Innovative pedagogy in instruction, (b) Teaching related
533 publications including textbooks, (c) Teaching awards, (d) Instructional grants, or (e) Student
534 placement in industry/academia.

535 **C. Service**

536

537 **Poor:** The faculty member needs major improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty
 538 member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service
 539 accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a
 540 documentable, significant impact.

541

542 **Fair:** The faculty member needs improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty member
 543 may serve on departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of
 544 those committees.

545

546 **Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly and
 547 thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

548

549 **Very Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by
 550 responsibly and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities
 551 and plays an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees or in
 552 service to the professional community.

553

554 **Excellent:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly
 555 and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and plays
 556 an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees and plays an
 557 active role in service to the professional community.

558

559 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
 560 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments indicating a major
 561 effective role in service in at least one area.

562

563

**APPENDIX II:
 Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

564

565 **A. Professional Development**

566

567 **Poor:** The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

568

569 **Fair:** The faculty member maintains a limited program in professional development with
570 occasional publications or paper presentations.

571

572 **Good:** The faculty member maintains an active program in professional development with some
573 publications or funding. The scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development
574 contributions are limited.

575

576 **Very Good:** The faculty member's professional development profile may indicate steady
577 development that falls short of achievement or maintenance of a nationally recognized research
578 program. The faculty member may have high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals,
579 small external grants, and significant professional service.

580

581 **Excellent:** The faculty member continues to maintain and advance a nationally recognized
582 research program in professional development with strong evidence of publications and sustained
583 competitive extramural funding and/or support from foundations, industries, and/or national or
584 state agencies. The recognition of the faculty member's expertise as evidenced by a history of
585 publication in high-quality media, appropriate to the specialty or area, should exceed that required
586 for a recommendation to the rank of Associate Professor. Other evidence of achievement could
587 include membership on editorial boards of significant computer science publication media or on
588 program committees of significant conferences, as well as serving as a referee for those
589 publication media or conferences, a member of review boards for funding organizations, a
590 reviewer for promotion and tenure at other universities, or a member of an accreditation board.

591

592 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field by establishing an
593 internationally recognized research program in professional development, as evidenced by a
594 sustained level of substantial grant support, publications in highly ranked journals and conference
595 proceedings, national or international awards, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.596 **B. Teaching**

597

598 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching and needs significant
599 improvement in all areas.

600
601 **Fair:** The faculty member's instructional performance is sub-standard and has limited positive
602 effect on students.

603
604 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive.
605 S/He demonstrates limited accomplishments in (a) the supervision of students, and (b) student
606 evaluations.

607
608 **Very Good:** The faculty member's record demonstrates effectiveness in the classroom and in
609 mentoring students, with involvement in instructional development. S/He has accomplishments in
610 (a) the development of new course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of
611 students, and (c) student evaluations.

612
613 **Excellent:** The faculty member's record demonstrates evidence of a highly effective, innovative,
614 and engaged teacher, providing major leadership in the development of instruction in the
615 department and/or in the larger university community. S/He has significant accomplishments in (a)
616 the development of new course(s) or modification of existing course(s), (b) the supervision of
617 students, (c) student publications, and (d) student evaluations

618
619 **Outstanding:** In addition to the criteria stated above for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member
620 must have significant achievements in at least three of the following areas: (a) Innovative
621 pedagogy in instruction, (b) Teaching related publications including textbooks, (c) Teaching
622 awards, (d) Instructional grants, or (e) Student placement in industry/academia.

623 **C. Service**

624

625 **Poor:** The faculty member needs major improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty
626 member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service
627 accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a
628 documentable, significant impact.

629
630 **Fair:** The faculty member needs improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty member
631 may serve on departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of
632 those committees.

633
634 **Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly and
635 thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

636
637 **Very Good:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by
638 responsibly and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities
639 and plays an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees or in
640 service to the professional community.

641
642 **Excellent:** The faculty member plays an effective role in departmental committees by responsibly
643 and thoroughly executing assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and plays
644 an active role in either the college, senate, or other university/system committees and plays an
645 active role in service to the professional community.

646
647 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
648 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments indicating a major
649 effective role in service in at least one area.