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

THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

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

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

As described in the University Policy on Promotion and Tenure:

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

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

Terms of Evaluation

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

Guidelines for the Terms of Evaluation in the Department of Computer Science

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

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

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

**Assessment of Professional Development**

Assessment of professional development reflects the professional accomplishment and effectiveness of the candidate. Peer review is a vital component of professional development activities and can take the forms of referees, panels, committees, editorial board, or some such juried review process appropriate for the work, with the key element being an external review that provides an assessment of the professional value of the work. Professional accomplishment and effectiveness is demonstrated by, as appropriate to the specialty or area of the candidate, a combination of: 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); success in proposing funding or support from traditional (e.g., national agencies, foundations, state agencies, and internal award programs) and/or industry-related sources; peer recognition in the forms of invitations to present at conferences or workshops, elections to posts in professional organizations, or invitations or appointments to serve on committees or as session organizers or chairs; and professional activity in the form of contributions to professional meetings.

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

To be tenured and/or promoted, the candidate must achieve a rating of excellent in Professional Development, meaning they must have a nationally recognized research program. Evidence of such a program could be 1) publications and funding, 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,
Considerations on Evaluating Quality of Contributions to Professional Development:

The candidate 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 of achievement in professional development include:

1. **Publications in peer-reviewed media:**
   i. Papers: Significance and scope of results; prestige, stature, and scope of media; acceptance rate; quality and quantity of citations.
   ii. Books appropriate to the discipline: Published reviews; citations; number of printings.
   iii. Chapters in books: Published reviews of book in which chapter(s) appears.

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

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

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

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

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

**B. Citations.** The quality and appropriateness of a contribution of a candidate may be clarified by the use and recognition it receives from other researchers. For this purpose of clarification, citations to and reviews of the candidate’s professional development publications will also be assessed, as available and as appropriate to the specialty or area.
C. **Productivity.** The Department recognizes and will take into account that each specialty or area has different expectations in regard to the numbers of publications and of funding or support efforts undertaken.

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

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

**Assessment of Teaching**

Assessment of teaching reflects accomplishment, performance, and effectiveness in teaching-related activities. As stated in the College Manual, “The candidate should include the teaching
portfolios he/she has compiled for the last four years at Georgia State (include summers, if applicable), as required in the college’s Teaching Assessment Policy...”

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

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

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

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

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

(c) Quality of student evaluations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Assessment of Service**

Evaluation in the area of Service reflects contributions and effectiveness as demonstrated by departmental, College, and University service, by service to professional organizations, and by profession-related service to the community. The College Manual clarifies that “Contributions to professional associations of an administrative nature shall be counted in the category of service
rather than professional development. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations count in the professional development category.” Service is a critical ingredient to the successful functioning of the Department. Candidates are expected to perform service requests competently and in a timely fashion. However, only minimal service to the Department and College is expected of junior faculty during the first three years, and an average amount of service to the Department in the fourth and fifth years.

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

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

Considerations on Evaluating Quality of the Candidate’s Contributions to Service:

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

(a) Quality of contribution to departmental committee; scope and responsibilities of committee.
(b) Quality of contribution to College, Senate, or other University or System committee; scope and responsibilities of committee.
(c) Reputation and scope of professional organization, conference, or publication; responsibilities of position held.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO RANK

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

For the candidate to be judged excellent in professional development (a nationally recognized program), there should be evidence of publications and of funding or support efforts as follows. 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. Indication of effort to secure funding or support may include reviewers' comments on proposals. If a candidate elects to submit these, the full set of comments and scores from the funding or support source must be made available to the committee.

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

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

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

**Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

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

**Promotion to Professor**

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

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

If a candidate has been given credit for service at other institutions at the time of her/his appointment at Georgia State University, any work done during the period for which probationary credit for tenure is given shall be included in the consideration for promotion and/or tenure at Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not be considered for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate at Georgia State University.
A candidate for promotion to Professor must submit his/her credentials to the DPTC in basically the same format in which these credentials are submitted to the CAACPT (according to the categories of professional development, teaching and service in the college manual, sections V.E. through V.G.). The Department may recommend specialized guidelines and a modified format for the documents to facilitate evaluation of the candidate’s professional credentials. For instance, a facilitating format may be warranted if the candidate’s publications are in nontraditional media.

Tenure at the Rank of Professor

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

DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS

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

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

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

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

D. The Dean’s Office provides the Chair and the DPTC with copies of the letters of assessment that have been received from the external reviewers. (Refer to the College
candidates must submit complete dossiers of supporting materials to the Chair in the required format. Prior to submission of his/her dossier, a candidate should consult with the Chair or members of the DPTC for advice concerning format, procedure, and style. No materials can be added to the dossiers after the date specified in the College calendar.

F. After receiving the materials from the Chair, the DPTC will review the dossiers to determine the committee recommendation. Only the professors on the DPTC are eligible to vote on candidates at the rank of professor or associate professor. The professors and associate professors on the DPTC (that is, the DPTC Committee as a Whole) are eligible to vote on candidates at the rank of assistant professor or instructor. The DPTC will forward to the Chair all materials required for departmental review, the candidate’s statement of interests and goals, the curriculum vita included in the dossier, and the letter of assessment and its letter of assessment and recommendation for each candidate (refer to the College calendar for the deadline by which this must be done).

G. The Chair separately evaluates each candidate. After this evaluation, the Chair will forward to the CAACPT all materials required for departmental review, the candidate’s statement of interests and goals, the curriculum vita included in the dossier, the recommendation letter of the department committee, and the Chair’s letter of assessment and recommendation (refer to the College calendar for the deadline by which this must be done). At this time, copies of the reports by the Chair and the DPTC will be made available to the candidate.

REVISIONS OF THE GUIDELINES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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 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’s professional development profile may indicate steady development that falls short of achievement or maintenance of a nationally recognized research program. The faculty member may have high quality papers in major peer reviewed journals, small external grants, and significant professional service.

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

*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 a sustained level of substantial grant support, publications in highly ranked journals and conference proceedings, national or international awards, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**C. Service**
**Poor:** The faculty member needs major improvement in the service roles s/he plays. 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 needs improvement in the service roles s/he plays. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

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

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

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

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