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I. INTRODUCTION

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the University. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Promotions are awarded in recognition of high levels of accomplishment in the academic work of the University. The decision to award tenure is particularly important because it represents a reciprocal commitment between the University and the recipient, which can last decades. The University thus shines in the reflection of the achievements of its faculty. In view of the multidisciplinary nature of the Global Studies Institute (GSI), these guidelines seek to augment and clarify, wherever advisable and appropriate, distinctive criteria for the activities of GSI faculty as they relate to the policies of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University.

Drawing from diverse academic disciplines and methodological approaches, the field of global studies examines events, activities, ideas, trends, processes and phenomena that transcend national boundaries and cultural regions. The Global Studies Institute exists at the juncture of the social sciences, humanities, arts, and sciences. The Global Studies Institute values scholarship on contemporary, historical, or comparative issues or that employs an international perspective and acknowledges that people in different places and socioeconomic positions around the world perceive global issues, activities, and trends differently. The Global Studies Institute not only values but expects multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research collaborations and the varied professional products they produce. Furthermore, the Global Studies Institute respects teaching and professional development activities that foster global citizenship in GSU students and Georgians.

The Department’s multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature necessitates that the professional development of faculty members takes diverse forms. While crediting a broad spectrum of scholarly activities, these guidelines assess the range of faculty work in terms of the positive and unique contributions made to the advancement of the individual disciplines or the interdisciplinary study of the topical areas, as well as to departmental and institutional goals.

Furthermore, given that GSI faculty engage in professional development, teaching, and service in the field of global studies and other disciplines simultaneously, candidates for promotion or tenure will be evaluated on the entire corpus of their work completed in the period under review whether it is specifically connected to the field of global studies or not.

These departmental guidelines are designed to provide information concerning expectations for performance and achievement at the departmental level for promotion and tenure as well as the manner in which departmental expectations intersect with the expectations set forth in the College manual.

The promotion & tenure processes and other faculty review processes described in these departmental guideline documents conform to the policies and procedures detailed in the Georgia State University Promotion & Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and the GSU College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual. This set of guidelines elaborates for the Institute the procedures and standards set forth in the College Manual, with the proviso that everything therein affirmed about a “department” or “school” is understood to include an “institute.” Should any conflict arise, the University or College manual will take precedence. All procedures hereinafter discussed must take place according to the deadlines specified in those manuals.
II. POLICIES ON PROMOTION & TENURE

A. Eligibility Policies

This document will apply to all GSI Core Faculty who have a primary appointment in the Global Studies Institute (as described in the GSI Bylaws). In the case of GSI Core Faculty who hold a secondary appointment in another department, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider the candidate’s specific work in the Institute (whether professional development, teaching, or service) as well as the work in the other department. Individuals from the other department may be asked to serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

To the extent allowed by college policy, GSI affiliate faculty who have a primary appointment in another department or unit (as described in the GSI Bylaws) may request for their promotion and tenure evaluation an assessment of their work by the GSI Director, who may consult with GSI core faculty of appropriate rank in evaluating them. This request must be made in a letter to the Director indicating the purpose of the evaluation and to whom it should be sent.

Candidates should refer to the College Promotion & Tenure Manual for information about “Eligibility (Time-in-Rank) Policies.”

B. General Policies

Promotion and tenure review in the Institute follows the rules, procedures, and calendar set forth in the College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual, and on the College website. University and College promotion and tenure calendars supersede any dates in these departmental guidelines, which are offered for the purpose of illustration and to provide information about the typical promotion and tenure cycle.

Every faculty member in the Global Studies Institute has a responsibility to be aware of the contents of the College of Arts & Sciences and Georgia State University promotion and tenure manuals, including all deadlines.

Candidates for tenure or promotion shall identify themselves and assemble their dossiers according to the guidelines and deadlines published in the College Manual. The candidates should submit all of their work in the areas of professional development, teaching and service for the period under review, whether it seems to be specifically connected with the field of global studies or not.

C. External Reviews

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of global studies, the College will secure, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee for a candidate will pay careful attention to external review letters assessing the candidate’s research, scholarship, and other professional development activities. Outside evaluations will be sought from lists of names submitted by the candidate and by the Director of the Institute, as specified in the GSU and College Manuals. The Director of the Institute may consult with chairs of other departments or directors of institutes or centers where the GSI faculty member has a joint appointment or affiliate status for names of potential reviewers. These individuals will be experts in the field(s) represented in the candidate’s body of work. Although they should be asked specifically to comment on the candidate’s work and professional development in the field(s) in which they share expertise, all reviewers may not be equally expert in all areas related to the candidate’s expertise. External reviewers...
may come from any discipline as long as they have the expertise necessary to evaluate a candidate’s professional oeuvre.

D. Promotion and Tenure Committees

To consider any Institute-housed faculty member’s candidacy for tenure and/or for promotion to assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, a promotion and tenure committee shall be formed consisting of all faculty with formal appointment in the Institute at or above the level to which the candidate aspires (or, in the case of a tenure-only candidate, of all those at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered for tenure). With the approval of the Dean’s Office, others may be drawn as needed from Georgia State University faculty who have relevant expertise on the candidate’s dossier and who hold the proper rank. If there are fewer than three Institute faculty and appropriate affiliated faculty at the specified rank, the Dean, in consultation with the Director, will augment the faculty review committee with members at the appropriate rank from other departments.

In advance of meeting to consider the candidate, the committee shall select a chair, who will then ensure that each member of the committee has access to all the material submitted by the candidate as well as to all external review letters. The committee shall then discuss the material submitted and vote on the candidate in each of the three areas to be evaluated: professional development, teaching, and service. Candidates will be evaluated as either having met or not met the standards for promotion or tenure in each of the three areas: professional development, teaching, and service. This determination will be made by a majority vote and will take into consideration the standards appropriate for the rank to which the candidate desires promotion or the rank at which tenure is to be awarded.

The chair or a designated member of the committee in consultation with those voting with the majority of the committee will draft a letter reflecting the committee's judgment in each of the three areas together with as much supporting argument as needed. Each member of the committee must either sign this letter or write and sign a minority report. The committee's letter together with any minority reports will be sent to the Director of the Institute and then shall be forwarded with the Director's own letter of evaluation to the appropriate area committee on promotion and tenure of the College. If there is no majority, reports reflecting the split shall be written, signed by those in agreement, and forwarded. Minority opinions may still be written.

III. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

A. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion or Tenure

Following Board of Regents, University, and College requirements, standards of evaluation differ, depending on the level for which an individual is being considered. The levels and their standards are indicated as follows:

**Associate Professor:** To be recommended for promotion to or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in professional development and teaching. In keeping with university standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline or the interdisciplinary field of global studies as determined by peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in his/her field. As part of the college and departmental reviews, the candidate will be evaluated on evidence that his/her current trajectory in both professional development and teaching will support successful progress toward the rank of professor after promotion to associate professor with
tenure. The candidate must also be evaluated as having provided at least good service to merit promotion to and/or tenure at this level.

Professor: To be recommended for promotion to or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least very good in service, with the proviso that the quality and the number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. In keeping with university standards as described in the GSU and College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manuals, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research, scholarship, and other professional development activities.

B. Areas of Evaluation

The Institute will evaluate all candidates in the three areas of professional development, teaching, and service. Each candidate for promotion or tenure in the Institute should specify what is distinct, unique and individual about her/his area of specialization within her/his field and instructional area. Distinctive aspects and features of specialization within each field and within areas of professional development, teaching, and service need to be clarified and documented for the departmental and college promotion and tenure committees. The burden for designating and elaborating such area distinctions lies with the candidate seeking tenure or promotion.

1. Professional Development

Professional development is a major consideration in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. It is essential that faculty members in the Institute maintain a high level of research and scholarship that advances the field of global studies and the candidates’ specializations within their particular areas of inquiry by creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. Specifically, these activities should demonstrate professional growth by the faculty member.

In the disciplines represented in the Global Studies Institute, professional development can involve a range of activities from experimental lab research to ethnographic field study to other forms of scholarly research and publication. It is appropriate, therefore, that criteria and methods for demonstrating and measuring professional development will come from the disciplines and fields within which the candidate works. Since the evaluation standard for professional development must be appropriate, outside reviewers will be chosen for their expertise in the area of the candidate’s scholarly work. Their reviews will supplement the understanding of that work by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Institute. The Institute committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers and shall use these letters to assist in the fullest possible appraisal of a candidate’s record.

Given the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary nature of global studies, a candidate’s work may appear in the scholarly outlets of multiple disciplines or areas of study. Some may have little recognizable global studies content. We will not disadvantage such work and will consider it as part of a candidate’s dossier.

The Institute recognizes that professional development can take many forms and employ a variety of methods. It may encompass basic and applied research, theoretical and empirical work, scholarship of discovery and integration, and qualitative and quantitative methods. Each topic, method, approach and technique shall be judged solely on whether it is appropriate to the stated Professional Development goal and whether it produces a valuable societal or disciplinary product. We believe, therefore, that success in
Professional Development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his/her work in books but whose work undergoes comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work.

Obtaining external funding for one’s research is a highly valued Professional Development activity and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in those disciplines. Grant support, however, is not a substitute for the peer-reviewed products of quality research. The Global Studies Institute recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in some departmental sub-disciplines so extramural funding will not be a requirement for tenure or promotion decisions.

Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no particular type of activity is specified for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

The Institute recognizes that there is a rough hierarchy of scholarly journals, conferences, conference proceedings, publishers, and other channels of dissemination. Interdisciplinary work as well as valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may not be published in the best known or highest ranked journals in a discipline. The Committee may consider these distinct criteria to discern the quality of the candidate’s work and the character of the venues where the work is disseminated, which collectively may be referred to as channels of dissemination: (a) geographic scope of the channel’s reputation, ranging from regional, national, and international; (b) competitiveness of the channel; (c) reputation or prestige of the channel as evidenced in the academic community; (d) size of the audience of the channel as determined by number of persons who attended, tuned in, downloaded or streamed the transmission; (e) distinguished awards given by the channel from either peer or audience review; and (f) scholarly impact, as evidenced by citations, reviews, press response, and academic research about the candidate’s work. It is incumbent upon the candidate to document objectively the quality of the dissemination outlets and recognition of his/her work within the discipline(s) and fields of expertise.

While the Global Studies Institute recognizes the value of both individual and collaborative scholarship, we acknowledge the importance and occasional difficulty of determining the relative contributions of co-authors. We strongly support interdisciplinary research, which by definition results in publications with multiple authors. We cannot therefore assign higher intrinsic value to single-author, jointly-authored, or collaboratively created works. Additionally, we know that order of authorship or credit does not necessarily convey accurate information about one’s relative contribution to the work. We will thus accord appropriate credit for the candidate’s contribution to a co-authored or collaboratively created work. It is incumbent upon the candidate to document objectively his/her specific contribution to any collaborative projects and describe how that contribution resulted in recognition within the candidate’s discipline.

As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. We recognize that work in the general academic field of Global Studies can and does regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of a broad range of disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in related professional publications, insofar as its
quality is appropriately demonstrated. Likewise, a candidate’s collaborations with scholars outside and within the discipline of Global Studies will be given consideration.

The Global Studies Institute appreciates the increasingly prominent role that online publication, new media work, and web-based resources play in the production and dissemination of knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are often difficult to apply to these new forms of scholarship. Therefore, candidates must make their own case for the quality and breadth of an intellectual project, its distinctive contribution to knowledge and the candidate’s professional development, and provide evidence of peer review (e.g., citation of the project in other venues).

**Categories of Professional Development**

The candidate must submit written evidence of professional development according to the categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.).

**Evaluation of Professional Development**

Based on the evidence submitted, the Institute committee will evaluate the candidate’s professional development.

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

Promotion to or tenure at the rank of associate professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be at least **excellent** in both professional development and teaching and at least **good** in service. Candidates already at the rank of associate professor applying for tenure must also be evaluated at least **excellent** in both professional development and teaching and at least **good** in service. Following university standards, the recommended candidate for promotion to associate professor will have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of the field as determined by peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in the field. There are obviously many ways for a candidate to provide justification for such a conclusion. It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate that they have produced a body of professional work that meets these criteria.

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

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is available only to those candidates whose professional development and teaching are both judged as at least **excellent** and whose service is judged to be at least **very good**. The recommended candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is expected to have established a national/international reputation in their field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive professional development.

The candidate will be judged **excellent** in professional development only if the committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarship activities are highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a large number of influential refereed articles or chapters of excellent quality; or a larger number of articles or chapters of very good quality and comparable to more than a book; or a book and a significant number of articles or chapters, all of very good quality. To qualify as **excellent**, a candidate could also have secured extramural funding to support his/her research and should have been highly active in additional research roles, such as reviewing grants and books, serving on editorial boards, or presenting research in professional and academic venues.
2. Teaching

Categories of Teaching

The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Institute and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. Candidates for promotion and 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 Institute committee will evaluate the quality of teaching holistically and based on the evidence submitted. For promotion to associate professor or professor, a successful candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in teaching.

A candidate for promotion to or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged to be excellent in teaching if the judgment of the committee on the basis of the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is effective. For instance, the course material presented must show diligent preparation and be current in the field; the candidate must demonstrate involvement in mentoring students; and the student evaluation scores must suggest effective performance in the classroom. In addition, candidates may have developed new courses or revised existing courses, taught courses that involve university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC, study abroad, or service learning), used technology in innovative ways, published a textbook, published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching awards.

A candidate for promotion to or tenure at the rank of professor will be judged to be excellent in teaching if the judgment of the committee on the basis of the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is effective. For instance, the course material presented must show impressive preparation and be current in the field; the candidate must demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students; and the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom. In addition, candidates will either have developed new courses (or significantly revised existing courses), taught courses that involve university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC, study abroad, or service learning), used technology in innovative ways, published a textbook, published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching awards.

3. Service

Service to one’s colleagues, to the Institute, to the College, to the University, and to the profession is a very important element in judging faculty’s contributions and performance. Faculty also owe service to their academic discipline or area(s) of study, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members, and often by serving as chairs, discussants etc. in professional society meetings. In addition, Global Studies, as a field of study concerned with pressing global issues is conducive to engaged scholarship, policy relevant activities, and other areas of professional practice, so efforts at applying specialized knowledge to address community concerns or help solve problems are highly valued in our Institute.

Neither the College nor the Global Studies Institute asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. The information given below indicates what we in the Institute consider important forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality when evaluating candidates’ work in the area of service.
Categories of Service

The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to their areas of professional expertise according to the categories of service in the college manual (section V.G.).

Evaluation of Service

Based on the evidence submitted, the institute committee will evaluate the candidate’s service.

Promotion to or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be evaluated as at least good in service.

Candidates will be judged good if they have been very effective in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed several institute service tasks. Candidates may have served as an officer or board or committee member of a regional or national professional association. They may also show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews). Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.

Promotion to or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor the candidate must be evaluated as at least very good in service.

A candidate will be judged very good if their record of service matches at least one of the following service profiles: a) the candidate has effectively taken a major role in department or institute service; or b) the candidate is active in institute service tasks and has significant, effective service on a college, university, or University System of Georgia committee; or c) the candidate is active in institute service tasks and has had significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews). Candidates may have served as an officer or board or committee member of a regional or national professional association. Candidate should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.
A. Professional Development

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 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 her/his 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 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.
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 honors and master’s theses. 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 at either level, 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).

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

A. Professional Development

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 scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects. Included here is the circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed, or positively reviewed and/or contracted by a press in the period under review.

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’s books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research since her or his last promotion, which may include a book-length project, a number of book chapters or peer-reviewed articles, co-authored or co-edited projects, or some combination of these. 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. Evidence may include national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and winning prestigious fellowships or grants.

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 extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of honors and master’s theses to completion. 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 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).

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.