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.
INTRODUCTION

The Department of African-American Studies at Georgia State University (GSU) is committed to both the advancement of knowledge of people of African descent and their empowerment within the local, national and international arena. To that end, the Department seeks to hire and retain the very best faculty. The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring a productive and quality faculty. The Department of African-American Studies Promotion and Tenure Guidelines specify the philosophy and procedures that will guide the evaluators of the promotion and tenure process. This set of guidelines is also intended to provide candidates a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the promotion and tenure process to which the Department of African-American Studies will adhere.

It is the responsibility of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure to ensure that their candidacy is in conformance with the requirements and procedures of the Department, College, University and Board of Regents. Candidates should pay particular attention to the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and College expectations. In all recommendations for promotion and tenure, the Department of African-American Studies evaluates candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service.

As will be described later in this document, the Department values all three areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance in each. The Department’s expectations for promotion and tenure are consistent with the criteria specified in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, which states that a
recommendation for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor requires that the candidate be judged at least **excellent** in both professional development and teaching and that she/he must be judged at least **good** in the area of service. The College Manual also specifies that the successful candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor must also be judged at least **excellent** in both professional development and teaching and at least **very good** in the area of service.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The Department of African-American Studies views professional development as encompassing various scholarly activities that advance the discipline of African-American Studies by creating and extending knowledge about people of African descent. The Department of African-American Studies recognizes that scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. Therefore, it is the Department’s position that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways and no one approach is inherently superior to another. Candidates will be judged on the quality and quantity of her/his total scholarship. For example, candidates who pursue a mixture of publication outlets e.g., articles, books (authored or edited), chapters in books, and creative works will be evaluated on the whole body of work, just as those who specialize in one form of scholarly expression will be. Consequently, books are not inherently preferred over referred journal articles. Obtaining extramural support for one’s research is a highly valued professional development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking external support, particularly from national sources, will be weighed as evidence of scholarly reputation. Grant support, however valuable, is only a means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research.
While loose hierarchies of scholarly journals, publishers and granting agencies may exist in each discipline; there is generally disagreement about such rankings. Moreover, valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence and perspectives that challenge existing knowledge may not be found in or supported by traditional mainstream publication outlets. In fact, as the history of African-American Studies shows, sometimes cutting-edge work can only be made available outside and independently of the most prestigious outlets. Rather than automatically rely on the reputation of publication outlets as evidence of research quality, the Department’s central focus will be on the scholarship’s demonstrated impact on the body of knowledge within the discipline of African-American Studies and/or the candidate’s field of specialization. To the extent that African-American Studies is interdisciplinary as well as disciplinary, cross-cutting or intersecting research is to be expected. Consequently, since such activities cut across many disciplinary fields the evaluation process within African-American Studies is often more complicated than the evaluation process within traditional disciplinary works. While the core of a candidate’s work is expected to be in or connected in some way to African-American Studies, it is important to acknowledge that not all of the candidate’s publications will appear in African-American Studies journals. Thus, given the interdisciplinary nature of African-American Studies, some of the candidate’s work may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. Such work should not be disadvantaged. Nor should co-authored scholarship be disadvantaged. The Department of African-American Studies recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative scholarship. The Department expects individual scholarship but also recognizes that the interdisciplinary nature of African-American Studies may result in co-
authored scholarship. Given that order of authorship does not necessarily convey
information about relative contribution to the work, candidates should establish their
relative contribution to co-authored work. Again, the quality of the work will be assessed
independently.

While the essential core of professional development is research and its dissemination,
the Department recognizes that professional development also includes other scholarly
activities that support or enhance research in the discipline, including organizing sessions
for professional meetings, reviewing manuscripts and proposals, and presenting
conference papers. It should be noted, however, that although these scholarly activities
are certainly to the candidate’s professional credit, no amount of this sort of activity can
substitute for the publication of original scholarship. Indeed, the pursuit of the
aforementioned scholarly activities in the absence of subsequent publications will add
very little to the case for a positive tenure decision. In short, the successful tenure
candidate must establish a significant, independent intellectual profile for herself/himself
and develop a national reputation as a scholar in the discipline of African-American
Studies and/or in her/his field of specialization. The production and exhibition of creative
works within appropriate standards of the medium in a respective unit in the College can
also be evaluated toward promotion and tenure.

The Department expects a successful candidate has moved beyond the specific projects
that were begun in graduate school under supervision of graduate faculty. The
Department also expects that a successful tenure candidate produce a significant corpus
of high quality, original scholarship and/or artistic work as well as high levels of
scholarly activities. The candidate’s body of scholarship - (in terms of both quality and
quantity) should advance the knowledge of African-American Studies. Evidence of such advancement is demonstrated by: 1) the presence of peer review, 2) the use of an anonymous review technique, 3) reference to reviews or citations, 4) awards and invited lectures, 5) the candidate’s explanation of the work’s importance, and 6) assessments by external reviewers.

**Categories of Professional Development**

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit written evidence of professional development organized according to the categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.). In addition to the lists described, the candidate must provide copies of all publications and awarded grant proposals listed. For multiple authored works and collaborative projects, the candidate should provide the names of all authors as they appear in print and explain in detail the nature and degree of her/his contribution to the work. Clear documentation from the publisher must be provided for works accepted for publication. Work in progress and work submitted but not yet accepted for publication may not be included.

Criteria for evaluating creative projects will include consideration of the length and complexity of the project, the means of dissemination the work to an audience, (including invited academic presentations), distribution, screening at academic meetings, and the evaluation of the completed work by outside peer review. If the evaluation of the creative project cannot be facilitated within the candidate’s discipline, the assessment of this work must take into account the standard in the respective discipline in the College (Communication, Music, or Art) for the medium of creative work produced.
Evaluation of Professional Development

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate’s professional development according to the college manual’s standard of excellent. The evaluation will be based on the committee’s assessment of the candidate’s potential for and progress toward achieving a national reputation as a respected scholar in the discipline as indicated primarily by the overall quality and importance of the candidate’s scholarly work.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is recognition by the department and the university that a faculty member’s scholarship is of such high quality and importance that, at a minimum, she or he is achieving or shows significant promise of achieving a national reputation as a respected scholar and researcher. Tenure and promotion requires that a faculty member be recognized by scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has contributed to the advancement and development of African-American Studies or her/his field of specialization and who seems likely to continue doing so. As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is available only to those who are judged as at least excellent in professional development.

To achieve this ranking, a candidate must typically have a record of continued growth in professional development since achieving Assistant Professor status that is significantly advanced beyond earlier achievements.

The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee’s decision is that the candidate is achieving a national reputation in a field of the discipline.
Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (e.g. 6-9) of refereed articles in respected national journals, or edited volumes of books using an anonymous review process by peers or might have published a research book in a university or respected commercial press utilizing an anonymous review process. These examples are only guidelines; they should not be taken as excluding other forms of publications or other combinations. Furthermore, the merit of each work may be determined only after its production. In addition, to qualify as excellent, a candidate should be very active in other research roles, such as conference participant, book reviewer, intramural research grant recipient, extramural research grant recipient, active research agenda and journal referee. In the final analysis, the candidate must be judged at the time of consideration as being well into the process of achieving a national reputation as a respected scholar within a field and having significant potential of achieving that goal.

**Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor**

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is recognition by the department and the university that a faculty member’s scholarship is of such high quality and importance that she or he has achieved and sustained a national reputation as a respected scholar and researcher. As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is available only to those whose professional development is evaluated as at least excellent. At a minimum, to achieve this ranking, a candidate must have a record of continued growth in professional development since achieving the Associate Professor status so that it is significantly advanced beyond the earlier achievement.
The candidate will be evaluated as *excellent* in professional development if the committee’s general impression is that the candidate is a superb scholar. Such a candidate, for example, might have, since promotion to associate professor, published a large number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality; or a book plus articles and chapters, all of excellent quality; or several books, articles, chapters, and other works, all of excellent quality. To qualify as *excellent*, a candidate also should have been highly active in other research roles, such as extramural grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

**TEACHING**

The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the department and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do.

**Categories of Teaching**

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the college manual (section V.F.).

**Evaluation of Teaching**

The department committee will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the college manual’s standard of *excellent* based on the evidence submitted. The several sets of student evaluation averages mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to reify specific numbers.

**Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

As stated in the college manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the level of Associate Professor requires that the candidate be evaluated as at least *excellent* in teaching. The
candidate will be evaluated as **excellent** in teaching if the clear impression garnered by the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s teaching and contributions to teaching are superb. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (e.g., overall average is in the mid-4 range); course material must show impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship in specialization courses; the candidate must demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students. The candidate may also have published pedagogical works or been nominated for one or more teaching awards.

**Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor**

Both the quality and quality of the achievements in Teaching are expected to surpass those required for recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A particular expectation is the consistent guidance of M.A. students to completion of thesis. Significant volume of directing student work and research will also be considered in evaluation the promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Professor.

**SERVICE**

Service to one’s colleagues, to the Department of African-American Studies, to the College, and to the University is a very important element in judging the candidate’s contributions and performance. The Department encourages and highly values faculty contributions to the field of Africana Studies. An example of service to Africana Studies is participation in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition, African-American Studies, as a field of study concerned with the plight of people of African descent, is quite conducive to useful, discipline-relevant forms of community service, so efforts at applying African-American Studies
knowledge and methods to address community concerns are highly valued in our
department.

Neither the College of Arts and Sciences nor the Department of African-American
Studies expects the same quantity and quality of service contributions from junior and
senior faculty. The information given below indicates the distinction in expectations
forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging
different levels of quality.

**Categories of Service**

The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to her/his areas of
professional competence organized according to the categories of service listed in the
college manual (section V.G).

**Evaluation of Service**

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the
candidate’s service in relation to the college’s evaluative categories of *very good* and
*good.*

**Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

To be recommended for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the
candidate must be evaluated as at least *good* in service.

Candidates will be judged as *good* in this area if they have been active in assistance to
colleagues and responsibly carried out the service tasks that were assigned to them.
Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as very good in service. Candidates will be judged as very good in this area if they have: 1) been active in assistance to colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in departmental service by serving on the Executive Committee and as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad hoc committee; and 3) provided effective service on college or university committees. Service to the profession, public organizations, and/or local, state, or national government is necessary at this level to secure promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Department of African-American Studies is governed by the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. Applications for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will be evaluated by the departmental P&T Committee, consisting of all departmental faculty with tenure and at the rank of Associate Professor or above. Applications for tenure and/or promotion to Professor will be evaluated by a committee of all professors in the department. In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members. An important part of the departmental evaluation is the assessment of the candidate’s credentials by recognized specialists outside of Georgia State University. The candidate must submit with his/her dossier a list of eight scholars in the candidate’s subfield(s) who are qualified to evaluate the
candidate’s performance in the area of professional development and his / her reputation within the discipline. The departmental chair, together with the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, will prepare a list of eight additional scholars who could perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the College Manual (section V.H.). Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, who will select from them at least four persons to perform an outside review. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A1. Professional Development (Research)

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

*Fair:* The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

*Good:* The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

*Very Good:* The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging authority in the field; however 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 produced a significant body of original research. This body of scholarship, which may include a book or comparable body of articles and book chapters, has contributed to the advancement of Africana Studies or related field. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications in sub-fields in which scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation established through the quantity and quality of citations and positive review of one’s research and/or the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies; these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and significance of the candidate’s research. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.

*Outstanding:* The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, winning prestigious fellowships or grants, and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of *excellent.*
A2. Professional Development (Creative Work)

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

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional
development and/or the faculty member’s professional development contributions are
limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional
development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field;
however, there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to
result in a more prominent creative profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has produced a body of work that shows national
recognition and strong achievement in creative production related to Africana Studies and
indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near
future. A significant body of creative work may include a full-length book, play, or film,
or a number of short pieces in the genre within which the faculty member works. This
work or collection of works will directly demonstrate her/his emerging national
reputation. Peer-reviewed digital and other new media forms of publication are also valid
venues. Securing external support, an extremely competitive undertaking, is valued
highly as acknowledgment of success and prominence. An evaluation of excellent
indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects are
likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the
faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in her or his field, as
evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication
outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and/or a volume of high-quality work
significantly greater than that required for a rating of excellent.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either competent pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores that fall regularly below the 4-out-of-5 range.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, as well as master’s theses, and student participation in academic conferences and competitions, and research symposiums. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. For example, the faculty member may have created new courses, significantly revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into course syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and exercises into course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the unit’s overall instruction and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of research or pedagogical expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment
to teaching as related to her/his research. Through these activities, the faculty member shows creative reflection and action in teaching.

Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
C. Service

**Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

**Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the work of those committees.

**Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department level as well as on the college or university levels. The faculty member engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in professional associations, serving on editorial review boards, and/or a significant amount of review work (e.g., for presses in the form of unpublished manuscripts). Civic engagement through participation with a community service, historic preservation and/or cultural enrichment organization related to the field of Africana Studies will also be considered.

**Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and/or international professional organizations.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A1. Professional Development (Research)

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

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are insufficient.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research since her or his last promotion. The book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles of the faculty member judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and/or reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues, books in reputable presses and/or reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation.
A2. Professional Development (Creative Work)

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

**Fair:** The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

**Good:** The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

**Very Good:** The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady creative development that falls short of completion of a major body of work. Included here is the circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed in the period under review.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a body of work that has led to national recognition and shows continued strong achievement in the field. Her/his record indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. Such a body of creative work will have been produced since her or his last promotion and may include a full-length book, play, or film, or a number of short pieces in the genre within which the faculty member works. Further, the faculty member’s work has received significant reviews, arts-based awards (as appropriate to the field), reprints, and/or citations. Other evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in her or his field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of excellent.
B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

Fair: The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either competent pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores that fall regularly below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.

Excellent: The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of master’s theses to completion, and students participation in academic conferences and competitions, and research symposiums. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. The faculty member evaluated as excellent also will have demonstrated a creative and reflective pedagogy that may include a substantial variety of activities related to instruction. For example, the faculty member may have created new courses, significantly revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into course syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and exercises into course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the unit’s overall instruction and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of research or pedagogical expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to her/his research.
Such a faculty member will also have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs in a timely fashion; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; presenting or publishing their work, completing their programs, and advancing into subsequent programs or into the profession. Such a faculty member advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective documented contributions to the work of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department level as well as participation on the college or university levels. The faculty member engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in professional associations, serving on editorial review boards, a significant amount of review work (either for presses in the form of unpublished manuscripts or for universities by serving as an external reviewer), or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews). Exemplary service by a faculty member to a community service and or cultural organization related to the field will also be considered.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.