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 Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language (AL/ESL) is careful to hire the best faculty and has every expectation that these faculty will meet or exceed the requirements for promotion and tenure at all ranks. To that end, the department is committed to strongly supporting the work of its faculty so that they may contribute to the work of the field of applied linguistics and to the work of the university.

This set of guidelines of the Department of AL/ESL expresses the philosophy that will guide departmental evaluators and provides candidates a clear description of departmental expectations for promotion and tenure. Each candidate, in turn, should consult both the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and also the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual for guidelines describing (1) the composition of the departmental tenure and promotion committee, (2) the responsibilities of that committee, (3) the procedures to be followed by the committee; (4) the procedures to be followed for outside review of the candidate's credentials; (5) the responsibilities of the candidate during the tenure and promotion process; and (6) the format in which documentation must be presented to outside reviewers and promotion and tenure committee members.

The Department of AL/ESL evaluates all candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. As this document indicates, the department values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its members in each one. These expectations should be understood in the context of the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, which establishes the evaluative terms that represent the standard in each of the three categories of evaluation. As the college manual states, to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, the candidate must be evaluated as excellent in the category of professional development, excellent in the category of teaching, and at least good in the category of service. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, the candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development, excellent in teaching, and very good in service.

Professional Development

The Department of AL/ESL understands professional development as encompassing various activities that advance our discipline, by creating or extending knowledge of applied linguistics and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is research and its dissemination, professional development also includes all other activities that support or enhance research in the field, including reporting at professional meetings, reviewing, editing, and refereeing. Research outcomes should be judged on whether they are appropriate to stated research goals and whether they produce valuable products. Success can be achieved in a number of ways, but the department recognizes that refereed publications, both books and articles, constitute the clearest evidence of quality. Work that has not been refereed will be given little credit. In general, textbooks and pedagogical works will be considered as contributions to teaching.
Obtaining extramural grant support for one's research is a highly valued professional
development activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources,
will weigh heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation. Grant support is a means to an end, so
that publications and other forms of reporting findings are expected to follow.

Scholarly activities such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing,
refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued activities. Although no specific type of
such activities is required to meet the minimum expectation for promotion and tenure, successful
candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

The department recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals exists in the
various fields and subfields of applied linguistics. It recognizes that valuable work that offers
innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may not be
published in the best-known journals and presses. It further recognizes that important
contributions to scholarship may appear in new forms of refereed media such as internet journals
and edited databases. The department's goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship,
and every candidate must meet that standard.

The department evaluates a candidate's publication record by a variety of criteria, including but
not limited to 1) the work's impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, awards, or
other evidence, 2) the prestige or standing of the journal in which an article appears or the
publisher of a book or book chapter, 3) the candidate's explanation of the importance of the
work, 4) the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution to the work if co-authored, 5) the
comments of outside reviewers in the promotion and tenure process, and 6) the Committee's own
evaluation of the work.

The Department of AL/ESL recognizes the value of both individual and collaborative
scholarship. The department expects some individual scholarship but also recognizes that
modern social scientific research is often a team effort and can involve interdisciplinary research.
While we acknowledge the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of determining the relative
contributions of several co-authors, we cannot assign higher intrinsic value to either single-
authored or jointly-authored works. We assume that a candidate who contributes less than 50%
to multiple-authored work should be able to publish a greater number of items than one working
alone.

Given that order of authorship does not necessarily convey information about relative
contribution to the work, candidates should state their relative contribution to co-authored work.
As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate's publications may appear in
the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. While this department's primary focus remains the
development of the discipline of applied linguistics, we do recognize that applied linguists can
and do regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we will not
disadvantage such work appearing in non-applied linguistics professional publications. The
candidate and the outside evaluators should provide guidance in assessing the importance of such
publications and research. Even so, candidates should remember that achievement of a national
reputation in applied linguistics is the goal of professional development in this department.
Perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of publications required for
promotion and tenure. Because qualitative evaluations (e.g., excellent) cannot be made solely on
the basis of numbers of publications or other scholarly activities, the department recognizes that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their work. Thus, a smaller number of works of outstanding quality might be evaluated as equal or superior to a greater number of publications of lesser quality.

Categories of Professional Development

The candidate for promotion and tenure must submit evidence of professional development organized according to the categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.). Types of evidence include: 1) presentations at professional meetings; 2) scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and reviews; 3) awards and grants; 4) significant professional services; 5) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional associations; 6) general recognition within the discipline of applied linguistics; 7) specialized professional activities appropriate to the discipline. In addition to the items enumerated below, the candidate must provide copies of all publications and grant proposals listed. Clear documentation must be provided for works accepted for publication. Work in progress and work submitted but not yet accepted for publication may not be included. In the absence of a publication record that self-evidently meets the requirements for promotion to a given rank, the candidate is expected to offer a compelling rationale for the importance, direction, and progress of his or her research conducted during the period under review.

The department further expects that a faculty member's research record should demonstrate the ability to initiate and carry out research, a coherent research agenda, and ongoing scholarly productivity that results in a body of work that contributes to a particular area or areas of research to which the faculty member's work has made a significant contribution.

1. Presentations at Professional Meetings

The candidate should provide a list of presentations at professional meetings. This list should include the title of the presentation, the type of presentation (paper, invited paper or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion, the name, location, and date of the meeting, and a one- or two-sentence description of the presentation.

2. Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews

A. Refereed Journal Articles

The candidate should provide a list of published articles and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each article the complete bibliographic citation and a brief description of the article and its contribution to applied linguistics.

B. Chapters in Books
The candidate should provide a list of chapters that have been published in edited books and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each chapter the complete bibliographic citation, a brief description of the chapter and its contribution to applied linguistics, and a description of the review process. Chapter-length encyclopedia entries may be included in this section.

C. Books and Monographs

The candidate should provide a list of authored or edited books or monographs published or accepted for publication. This list should include the complete bibliographic citation and a brief description of the book or monograph and its contribution to applied linguistics. For works only accepted for publication, clear indication should be given of whether the item is a completed book manuscript in press and scheduled for publication at a definite date, or a book project for which a contract has been awarded for a manuscript to be submitted to the publisher in the future.

D. Conference Proceedings

The candidate should provide a list of papers published in conference proceedings and those accepted for publication. The list should include for each entry the complete bibliographic citation, a brief description of the paper and its contribution to applied linguistics, and a description of the review process.

E. Book Reviews

The candidate should provide a list of book reviews published or accepted for publication, including the author and title of the book reviewed and a complete bibliographic citation.

3. Awards and Grants

The candidate should provide a list of all internal and external research grants and awards, and all scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and personal development awards that supported the candidate's scholarly research and professional development. This list should include the title of each successful application, the awarding agency, the amount and period of the award, and the precise nature of the research project. The candidate must also provide copies of official letters of award.

4. Significant Professional Service

Significant professional service in applied linguistics include serving as journal editor or associate editor, member of an editorial board, referee for scholarly journals or granting agencies, member of the program committee for a conference or of a review panel for proposals, and consultant for professional organizations and public agencies. The candidate should provide
a list that includes the activity, organization, and dates of service.

5. Recognition by National, Scholarly, and Professional Associations

Honors and awards from scholarly and professional associations that result from the candidate's research contributions will be viewed as further evidence of scholarly reputation.

6. General Recognition within the Discipline of Applied Linguistics

Invitations received for presentations or workshops at professional associations or other universities, and reviews and citations of published work will be viewed as evidence of scholarly reputation. The candidate should provide a list of titles, locations, and dates for invited presentations and, in the case of reviews and citations, a complete bibliography citation of the works in which they appear.

7. Specialized Professional Activities in the Discipline of Applied Linguistics

Included here are materials for which descriptions are not presented in any other category. These materials may not include work in progress or work submitted but not yet accepted for publication or dissemination.

Evaluation of Professional Development

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate's professional development relative to the college manual's standard of excellent and in accordance with the guidelines below.

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

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor 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 the field of applied linguistics and seems likely to continue doing so. Promotion to and/or tenure at this level is only available to those who are judged to be excellent in professional development.

The candidate promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee's general impression is that the candidate is a superb scholar with a developing national reputation in the field of applied linguistics. To qualify as excellent, a candidate normally should have published a significant number (5-7) of
full-length refereed articles of very high quality. In some cases, a rating of excellent may be
given to a candidate with fewer such articles if he or she has received external funding for a
research project; published a monograph or edited volume of very high quality; and/or served on
an editorial board or as a journal referee or grant reviewer on several occasions. Additional
evidence of professional development might include the publication of book chapters, shorter
research reports or commentaries, or book reviews. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also
should have performed several additional research roles, such as active participation in national
organizations, including giving papers and organizing colloquia or panels. Additionally, to
qualify as excellent, evidence of efforts to obtain external or internal funding for research should
normally be demonstrated.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is a recognition by the department and the
university that a faculty member's scholarship is of such high quality and importance that s/he
has achieved a national and/or international reputation as a leading scholar in his/her
field. Promotion to this level is available only to those whose professional development is
judged as excellent.

The candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor will be judged excellent in
professional development if the committee's general impression is that the candidate is a superb
scholar with a national and/or international reputation in the field of Applied Linguistics. To
qualify as excellent, a candidate, for example, might have published a large number of full-length
refereed articles and book chapters of very high quality; or a book and a significant number of
refereed articles and book chapters, or several books, full-length refereed articles, chapters, and
other works. To qualify as excellent, a candidate must also exhibit achievement in some of the
following: one or more major research grants from outside the institution; significant
professional recognition; evidence of sustained significant roles in one or more national
professional or scholarly organizations together with active participation, including presenting
papers; editing a journal, serving on an editorial board, refereeing journal manuscripts; or
reviewing grants. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also should have performed several
additional research roles, such as active participation in national organizations, including giving
papers and organizing colloquia or panels.
Teaching

Categories of Teaching

The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language (AL/ESL) and the university; indeed, it is central to what we do and who we are as a department. The AL/ESL Department believes that all faculty are responsible for quality teaching, irrespective of rank. The candidate must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the college manual (section V.F.). Types of evidence include: (1) syllabi and list of courses taught; (2) student course evaluations; (3) honors; (4) evidence of instructional service beyond the classroom; (5) published materials; and (6) other materials. In addition, the candidate should submit written evidence of any funded training grants and contracts.

1. Syllabi and List of Courses Taught

The candidate must include the most recent syllabus for each course taught during the last four years. Only one syllabus for each different course should be provided. The candidate must list the courses taught using the format specified in the College Manual. The candidate may include supplementary materials to document the quality of course content (see item 7, "Other Materials," below). In keeping with the spirit of the College Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty, the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will review syllabi for conformity with university guidelines, differentiation of graduate and undergraduate expectations, reading/assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description.

2. Student Course Evaluations

The candidate must include standardized course evaluations for every course s/he has taught during the last four years in the tabular format detailed in the College Manual. The candidate may include some brief explanation of the background and context of courses listed.

3. Honors

Honors or other special recognition of the quality of a candidate's teaching should be listed in tabular form (as detailed in the College Manual). The candidate also should submit evidence of honors her/his students have achieved which are directly connected with the candidate's teaching or mentorship. Some examples are fellowships or other rewards received by students.

4. Evidence of Instructional Service Beyond the Classroom

The candidate should provide lists of the following types of instructional service: organizing or presenting in departmental seminars on pedagogy; supervision of directed reading or independent study courses; direction of honors theses; membership on master's paper or master's thesis committees and/or direction of master's papers or master's theses; membership on dissertation committees and/or direction of dissertations; involvement in preparation and/or
grading of departmental Ph.D. qualifying papers and comprehensive examinations; supervision of internships; observation of teaching assistants' instructional efforts; advisement of students; and evidence of students' successful endeavors connected with the candidate's mentorship (e.g., student papers presented, accepted for publication, published, or co-authored). The College Manual specifies a particular tabular format for conveying much of the information in this section, to which the candidate should adhere.

5. Published Materials

The candidate should provide a list of textbooks and other published materials related to her/his teaching. The candidate should provide a brief description of the contribution of each item to the teaching of Applied Linguistics and/or English as a Second Language. The candidate may provide evidence of favorable reviews, records of adoption, etc.

6. Training Grants/Contracts

The candidate should provide the following information on all funded training grants/contracts: the candidate's responsibilities on the project, funding source, program dates, funding amount. In addition, the candidate should provide a brief statement to explain how the program connects to departmental and/or institutional goals.

7. Other Materials

The candidate may include materials that demonstrate teaching preparation, effectiveness of pedagogical methodology, and pedagogical creativity, such as a teaching or course portfolio, evidence of innovative uses of technology for teaching, course handouts and assignments, descriptions of learning exercises, assessment instruments, outstanding student papers, other written/visual evidence of course-generated student projects. The College Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty specifies that "course materials should . . . be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge of the field." The policy further states that faculty should be rewarded for "enhancing creativity and independent critical thinking," and for structuring courses in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students." The candidate should include the teaching portfolio he/she has compiled, as required in the College's Teaching Assessment Policy. Supplementary materials should demonstrate the range and variety and levels of courses the candidate has taught.
Evaluation of Teaching

The department committee will evaluate the quality of teaching relative to the college manual's standard of *excellent* and in accordance with the guidelines below:

When reviewing student evaluations, the Committee should attempt to discern a pattern in student perceptions of the overall pedagogical environment created by the candidate, attending to the scores on all questions as well as further evidence provided by the tone of students’ written comments across all course evaluations. In addition, the Committee will not take the student evaluation percentages at face value alone without also taking into consideration the candidate’s total number of students during the period of evaluation; the numbers of his/her undergraduate vs. graduate students, as well as the student evaluation numbers and ranges of each group; the numbers of required vs. elective, graduate vs. undergraduate, and core vs. special topics courses; and the numbers of large (75 students or more) vs. small-sized classes (25 or fewer students) he/she has taught during the period of evaluation.

In making the case for his/her promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may also address other variables, such as: (1) the extent to which the courses taught during the last eight semesters included any new preparations or other courses which the candidate has taught repeatedly in the past; (2) the extent to which the candidate taught courses with a lecture format or others which included collaborative/group learning, or which had a particular focus on active class participation required of students; (3) students’ perceived rigor of a candidate’s courses; (4) whether there have been any peer, institutional, or other evaluation of the candidate’s teaching abilities and methods; and (5) whether the candidate participated in any pedagogical workshops or meetings where the focus was on developing instructional excellence.

Because the AL/ESL Department evaluates teaching without regard to faculty rank, the evaluative standards mentioned in this section apply equally to candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor and to candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor. Promotion and/or tenure are only available to those candidates who are judged to be *excellent* in teaching.

The candidate will be judged *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 of very high quality. For instance, the student evaluation scores should suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; course material should show impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship in specialized courses; teaching portfolios should demonstrate substantive and sustained engagements with teaching responsibilities; the candidate’s dossier should demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students (e.g., through supervising dissertations; reading MA papers; co-authoring and co-presenting with students; directing student research projects, independent study projects/directed readings, and/or honor’s theses). Other items that may contribute toward an evaluation of *excellent* include study abroad development and instruction and participation in university-wide teaching initiatives such as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW), and online instruction. The candidate may also have published pedagogical
works, presented pedagogical works at conferences or been nominated for one or more teaching awards or received a grant related to pedagogy.

Service

Service to one's colleagues, to the department, to the College, and to the University is a very important element in judging a faculty member's contribution and performance. Faculty also owe service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers, or committee or board members. In addition, applied linguistics is a field of study that is conducive to useful, discipline-relevant forms of community service, and these efforts are recognized and valued by the Department of AL/ESL.

Neither the College nor the Department of AL/ESL ask the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. The information given below indicates what we in the department consider important forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality when evaluating a candidate's work in the area of service.

Categories of Service

The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to his/her 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 relative to the college manual’s standards of good and very good, depending on the candidate’s present rank, and in accordance with the guidelines below.

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

To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least good in service. A candidate will be judged good if s/he has been active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

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. A candidate will be judged very good if s/he has been very active in assistance to colleagues; has effectively served on departmental committees and as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad hoc committees (e.g., search committee, promotion and tenure committee); has significant service on college or university committees. In addition, a candidate should also show evidence of involvement in one or more community,
governmental, or professional organizations (e.g., service as a committee member of a regional or national professional association).
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 is minimally active in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is active in maintaining a program of professional development, but the scope and impact of the faculty member’s scholarly work are limited.

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 she or he has projects underway that are likely to result in a scholarly profile of national prominence in the near future. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member also should have applied for internal or external research funding and performed several additional research roles, such as active participation in national organizations, including giving papers; journal referee; or book reviewer.

Excellent: The faculty member produces high quality scholarship and has a developing national reputation in the field of applied linguistics. She or he has published a significant number of full-length refereed articles or she or he has published an appropriate mix of refereed articles and book chapters in combination with one or more of the following: a published monograph or edited volume of very high quality; service on an editorial board or as a journal referee or grant reviewer on several occasions. Additional evidence of professional development excellence might include the publication of conference proceedings, shorter research reports or commentaries, or book reviews. To qualify as excellent, the faculty member also should have performed additional research roles, such as active participation in national organizations, including giving papers and participating in colloquia or panels. Additionally, to qualify as excellent, evidence of efforts to obtain external and/or internal funding for research should normally be demonstrated. 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’s scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance nationally. In addition to the criteria described above for a rating of excellent, the faculty member publishes significant numbers of refereed articles in top-tier journals and serves a leading role as a principal investigator or co-investigator on one or more externally funded projects.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and little to no student mentoring.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, course materials of inconsistent effectiveness, and occasional student mentoring.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate as evidenced through student evaluations, minimally effective course materials, and generally satisfactory effort as a mentor of students.

**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 instructional 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 may occasionally fall short of departmental expectations.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching and contributions to teaching are of very high quality. For instance, the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; course material shows impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship in specialized courses; teaching portfolios demonstrate substantive and sustained engagements with teaching responsibilities; the faculty member makes significant contributions to curricular and programmatic reforms; his or her dossier demonstrates highly effective mentoring of students (e.g., through supervising dissertations; reading MA papers; co-authoring and co-presenting with students; directing student research projects, independent study projects/directed readings, and/or honor’s theses). Other items that may contribute toward an evaluation of excellent include study abroad development and instruction and participation in university-wide teaching initiatives, such as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW), and online instruction. The faculty member may also have published pedagogical works, presented pedagogical works at conferences or been nominated for one or more teaching awards or received a grant related to pedagogy.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s teaching and contributions to instruction are out of the ordinary, as evidenced by inspirational classroom performance and innovative pedagogical contributions recognized institutionally and/or nationally. She or he may have published a highly respected textbook, received a training contract, or received one or more teaching awards from a prestigious outlet.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member rarely assists colleagues and is inconsistent in willingness to accept responsibility for carrying out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

Fair: The faculty member occasionally assists colleagues and is minimally responsible in carrying out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

Good: The faculty member has been active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

Very Good: The faculty member has 1) been very active in assistance to colleagues and has responsibly and effectively performed several departmental service tasks, and 2) is active in departmental, college or university service tasks, or has had significant professionally relevant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates 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 at the college and university levels, as well as having served as an officer or board member of a state, regional or national professional association.


APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

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

Fair: The faculty member is minimally active in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is active in maintaining a program of professional development, but the scope and impact of the faculty member's scholarly work are limited.

Very Good: The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady scholarly development but falls short of a scholarly profile of national prominence.

Excellent: The faculty member has achieved and continued to advance a national reputation in the field of applied linguistics. She or he remains an active scholar, publishing a significant number of refereed articles or a combination of articles and other types of publications of excellent quality. She or he makes other contributions appropriate to the rank, such as participating in national organizations and obtaining external funding or other support that demonstrates national reputation, with documented impact on the work of others.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in the field, with ongoing scholarly work of unquestioned importance both nationally and internationally, as evidenced by continued production of influential publications, securing of extramural funding, and featured speaker invitations or awards from prestigious organizations.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and little to no student mentoring.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, course materials of inconsistent effectiveness, and occasional student mentoring.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate as evidenced through student evaluations, minimally effective course materials, and generally satisfactory effort as a mentor of students.

**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 instructional 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 may occasionally fall short of departmental expectations.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching and contributions to teaching are consistently very high quality. For instance, the student evaluation scores indicate highly effective performance in the classroom; course material shows impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship in specialized courses; teaching portfolios demonstrate substantive and sustained engagements with teaching responsibilities; the faculty member makes significant contributions to curricular and programmatic reforms; his or her dossier demonstrates highly effective mentoring of students as researchers and teachers (e.g., through supervising dissertations to completion; reading MA papers; co-authoring and co-presenting with students; directing student research projects, independent study projects/directed readings, honor’s theses, helping students secure funding, and other mentoring activities). Other items that may contribute toward an evaluation of **excellent** include study abroad development and instruction and participation in university-wide teaching initiatives such as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW), and online instruction. The faculty member may also have published pedagogical works, presented pedagogical works at conferences or been nominated for one or more teaching awards or received a grant related to pedagogy. Such a faculty member will have a strong track record of her or his students completing their programs in a timely fashion, securing scholarships or other types of funding or awards, presenting and publishing their work, and advancing into subsequent programs or into their chosen profession.
Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s
teaching and contributions to instruction have been sustained at a level that is out of the
ordinary, as evidenced by inspirational classroom performance and innovative pedagogical
contributions recognized institutionally, nationally and/or internationally. She or he may
have published a highly respected textbook, received a training contract, or received one or
more teaching awards from a prestigious outlet.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member rarely assists colleagues and is inconsistent in willingness to accept responsibility for carrying out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

Fair: The faculty member occasionally assists colleagues and is minimally responsible in carrying out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

Good: The faculty member has been active in assistance to colleagues and responsiby carries out the departmental service tasks assigned to her/him.

Very Good: The faculty member has 1) been very active in assistance to colleagues and has responsibly and effectively performed departmental service tasks, and 2) is active in departmental, college or university service tasks, or has had significant professionally relevant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates 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 track record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and at the college and university levels, as well as having served in leadership positions in state, regional, national, or international professional associations.