

**GLOBAL STUDIES INSTITUTE
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

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

Policy Title:	Global Studies Institute Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
Version:	1
Departmental Approval:	October 19, 2016
College Approval:	November 14, 2016

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.

**Global Studies Institute
College of Arts & Sciences
Georgia State University
Promotion & Tenure Guidelines**

Contents:

I. Introduction	1
II. Policies on Promotion & Tenure	2
A. Eligibility Policies	2
B. General Policies	2
C. External Reviews.....	2
D. Promotion and Tenure Committees	3
III. Criteria for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion & Tenure.....	3
A. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion or Tenure	3
B. Areas of Evaluation.....	4
1. Professional Development	4
2. Teaching	7
3. Service	7
APPENDIX I: Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review	9
APPENDIX II: Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review.....	12

Effective Date: November 14, 2016

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2
3 The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring quality and
4 allocating rewards in the University. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Promotions are awarded in
5 recognition of high levels of accomplishment in the academic work of the University. The decision to
6 award tenure is particularly important because it represents a reciprocal commitment between the
7 University and the recipient, which can last decades. The University thus shines in the reflection of the
8 achievements of its faculty. In view of the multidisciplinary nature of the Global Studies Institute (GSI),
9 these guidelines seek to augment and clarify, wherever advisable and appropriate, distinctive criteria for
10 the activities of GSI faculty as they relate to the policies of the College of Arts and Sciences and the
11 University.

12
13 Drawing from diverse academic disciplines and methodological approaches, the field of global studies
14 examines events, activities, ideas, trends, processes and phenomena that transcend national boundaries
15 and cultural regions. The Global Studies Institute exists at the juncture of the social sciences, humanities,
16 arts, and sciences. The Global Studies Institute values scholarship on contemporary, historical, or
17 comparative issues or that employs an international perspective and acknowledges that people in different
18 places and socioeconomic positions around the world perceive global issues, activities, and trends
19 differently. The Global Studies Institute not only values but expects multidisciplinary and
20 interdisciplinary research collaborations and the varied professional products they produce. Furthermore,
21 the Global Studies Institute respects teaching and professional development activities that foster global
22 citizenship in GSU students and Georgians.

23
24 The Department’s multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature necessitates that the professional
25 development of faculty members takes diverse forms. While crediting a broad spectrum of scholarly
26 activities, these guidelines assess the range of faculty work in terms of the positive and unique
27 contributions made to the advancement of the individual disciplines or the interdisciplinary study of the
28 topical areas, as well as to departmental and institutional goals.

29
30 Furthermore, given that GSI faculty engage in professional development, teaching, and service in the field
31 of global studies and other disciplines simultaneously, candidates for promotion or tenure will be
32 evaluated on the entire corpus of their work completed in the period under review whether it is
33 specifically connected to the field of global studies or not.

34
35 These departmental guidelines are designed to provide information concerning expectations for
36 performance and achievement at the departmental level for promotion and tenure as well as the manner in
37 which departmental expectations intersect with the expectations set forth in the College manual.

38
39 The promotion & tenure processes and other faculty review processes described in these departmental
40 guideline documents conform to the policies and procedures detailed in the Georgia State University
41 Promotion & Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and the GSU College of Arts &
42 Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual. This set of guidelines elaborates for the Institute the procedures
43 and standards set forth in the College Manual, with the proviso that everything therein affirmed about a
44 “department” or “school” is understood to include an “institute.” Should any conflict arise, the University
45 or College manual will take precedence. All procedures hereinafter discussed must take place according
46 to the deadlines specified in those manuals.

47
48

49 **II. POLICIES ON PROMOTION & TENURE**

50
51 **A. Eligibility Policies**

52
53 This document will apply to all GSI Core Faculty who have a primary appointment in the Global Studies
54 Institute (as described in the GSI Bylaws). In the case of GSI Core Faculty who hold a secondary
55 appointment in another department, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider the candidate's
56 specific work in the Institute (whether professional development, teaching, or service) as well as the work
57 in the other department. Individuals from the other department may be asked to serve on the Promotion
58 and Tenure Committee.

59
60 To the extent allowed by college policy, GSI affiliate faculty who have a primary appointment in another
61 department or unit (as described in the GSI Bylaws) may request for their promotion and tenure
62 evaluation an assessment of their work by the GSI Director, who may consult with GSI core faculty of
63 appropriate rank in evaluating them. This request must be made in a letter to the Director indicating the
64 purpose of the evaluation and to whom it should be sent.

65
66 Candidates should refer to the College Promotion & Tenure Manual for information about “Eligibility
67 (Time-in-Rank) Policies.”

68
69 **B. General Policies**

70
71 Promotion and tenure review in the Institute follows the rules, procedures, and calendar set forth in the
72 College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual, and on the College website. University and
73 College promotion and tenure calendars supersede any dates in these departmental guidelines, which are
74 offered for the purpose of illustration and to provide information about the typical promotion and tenure
75 cycle.

76
77 Every faculty member in the Global Studies Institute has a responsibility to be aware of the contents of
78 the College of Arts & Sciences and Georgia State University promotion and tenure manuals, including all
79 deadlines.

80
81 Candidates for tenure or promotion shall identify themselves and assemble their dossiers according to the
82 guidelines and deadlines published in the College Manual. The candidates should submit all of their work
83 in the areas of professional development, teaching and service for the period under review, whether it
84 seems to be specifically connected with the field of global studies or not.

85
86 **C. External Reviews**

87
88 Because of the interdisciplinary nature of global studies, the College will secure, and the Promotion and
89 Tenure Committee for a candidate will pay careful attention to external review letters assessing the
90 candidate’s research, scholarship, and other professional development activities. Outside evaluations will
91 be sought from lists of names submitted by the candidate and by the Director of the Institute, as specified
92 in the GSU and College Manuals. The Director of the Institute may consult with chairs of other
93 departments or directors of institutes or centers where the GSI faculty member has a joint appointment or
94 affiliate status for names of potential reviewers. These individuals will be experts in the field(s)
95 represented in the candidate's body of work. Although they should be asked specifically to comment on
96 the candidate’s work and professional development in the field(s) in which they share expertise, all
97 reviewers may not be equally expert in all areas related to the candidate’s expertise. External reviewers

98 may come from any discipline as long as they have the expertise necessary to evaluate a candidate's
99 professional oeuvre.

100 **D. Promotion and Tenure Committees**

101 To consider any Institute-housed faculty member's candidacy for tenure and/or for promotion to assistant
102 professor, associate professor, or professor, a promotion and tenure committee shall be formed consisting
103 of all faculty with formal appointment in the Institute at or above the level to which the candidate aspires
104 (or, in the case of a tenure-only candidate, of all those at or above the level for which the candidate is
105 being considered for tenure). With the approval of the Dean's Office, others may be drawn as needed
106 from Georgia State University faculty who have relevant expertise on the candidate's dossier and who
107 hold the proper rank. If there are fewer than three Institute faculty and appropriate affiliated faculty at the
108 specified rank, the Dean, in consultation with the Director, will augment the faculty review committee
109 with members at the appropriate rank from other departments.
110

111 In advance of meeting to consider the candidate, the committee shall select a chair, who will then ensure
112 that each member of the committee has access to all the material submitted by the candidate as well as to
113 all external review letters. The committee shall then discuss the material submitted and vote on the
114 candidate in each of the three areas to be evaluated: professional development, teaching, and service.
115 Candidates will be evaluated as either having met or not met the standards for promotion or tenure in each
116 of the three areas: professional development, teaching, and service. This determination will be made by a
117 majority vote and will take into consideration the standards appropriate for the rank to which the
118 candidate desires promotion or the rank at which tenure is to be awarded.
119

120 The chair or a designated member of the committee in consultation with those voting with the majority of
121 the committee will draft a letter reflecting the committee's judgment in each of the three areas together
122 with as much supporting argument as needed. Each member of the committee must either sign this letter
123 or write and sign a minority report. The committee's letter together with any minority reports will be sent
124 to the Director of the Institute and then shall be forwarded with the Director's own letter of evaluation to
125 the appropriate area committee on promotion and tenure of the College. If there is no majority, reports
126 reflecting the split shall be written, signed by those in agreement, and forwarded. Minority opinions may
127 still be written.
128

129 **III. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE**

130 **A. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion or Tenure**

131 Following Board of Regents, University, and College requirements, standards of evaluation differ,
132 depending on the level for which an individual is being considered. The levels and their standards are
133 indicated as follows:
134

135 **Associate Professor:** To be recommended for promotion to or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a
136 candidate must be evaluated as at least *excellent* in professional development and teaching. In keeping
137 with university standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial
138 body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline or the interdisciplinary
139 field of global studies as determined by peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a
140 national reputation in his/her field. As part of the college and departmental reviews, the candidate will be
141 evaluated on evidence that his/her current trajectory in both professional development and teaching will
142 support successful progress toward the rank of professor after promotion to associate professor with
143
144
145
146

147 tenure. The candidate must also be evaluated as having provided at least *good* service to merit promotion
148 to and/or tenure at this level.

149
150 **Professor:** To be recommended for promotion to or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be
151 evaluated as at least *excellent* in both professional development and teaching and at least *very good* in
152 service, with the proviso that the quality and the number of achievements required for a recommendation
153 to the rank of Professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor.
154 In keeping with university standards as described in the GSU and College of Arts and Sciences Promotion
155 and Tenure Manuals, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have established a
156 national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high quality and
157 productive research, scholarship, and other professional development activities.

158 159 **B. Areas of Evaluation**

160
161 The Institute will evaluate all candidates in the three areas of professional development, teaching, and
162 service. Each candidate for promotion or tenure in the Institute should specify what is distinct, unique and
163 individual about her/his area of specialization within her/his field and instructional area. Distinctive
164 aspects and features of specialization within each field and within areas of professional development,
165 teaching, and service need to be clarified and documented for the departmental and college promotion and
166 tenure committees. The burden for designating and elaborating such area distinctions lies with the
167 candidate seeking tenure or promotion.

168 169 **1. Professional Development**

170
171 Professional development is a major consideration in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. It
172 is essential that faculty members in the Institute maintain a high level of research and scholarship that
173 advances the field of global studies and the candidates' specializations within their particular areas of
174 inquiry by creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. Specifically, these activities should
175 demonstrate professional growth by the faculty member.

176
177 In the disciplines represented in the Global Studies Institute, professional development can involve a
178 range of activities from experimental lab research to ethnographic field study to other forms of scholarly
179 research and publication. It is appropriate, therefore, that criteria and methods for demonstrating and
180 measuring professional development will come from the disciplines and fields within which the candidate
181 works. Since the evaluation standard for professional development must be appropriate, outside reviewers
182 will be chosen for their expertise in the area of the candidate's scholarly work. Their reviews will
183 supplement the understanding of that work by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Institute. The
184 Institute committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers and shall
185 use these letters to assist in the fullest possible appraisal of a candidate's record.

186
187 Given the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary nature of global studies, a candidate's work may appear
188 in the scholarly outlets of multiple disciplines or areas of study. Some may have little recognizable global
189 studies content. We will not disadvantage such work and will consider it as part of a candidate's dossier.

190
191 The Institute recognizes that professional development can take many forms and employ a variety of
192 methods. It may encompass basic and applied research, theoretical and empirical work, scholarship of
193 discovery and integration, and qualitative and quantitative methods. Each topic, method, approach and
194 technique shall be judged solely on whether it is appropriate to the stated Professional Development goal
195 and whether it produces a valuable societal or disciplinary product. We believe, therefore, that success in

196 Professional Development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique is
197 inherently superior to another.
198

199 For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen
200 as equally successful with another who published his/her work in books but whose work undergoes
201 comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles,
202 authored or edited books, and chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work.
203

204 Obtaining external funding for one's research is a highly valued Professional Development activity and
205 success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh as evidence of scholarly
206 reputation in those disciplines. Grant support, however, is not a substitute for the peer-reviewed products
207 of quality research. The Global Studies Institute recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support
208 in some departmental sub-disciplines so extramural funding will not be a requirement for tenure or
209 promotion decisions.
210

211 Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing,
212 refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar.
213 Although no particular type of activity is specified for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for
214 tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.
215

216 The Institute recognizes that there is a rough hierarchy of scholarly journals, conferences, conference
217 proceedings, publishers, and other channels of dissemination. Interdisciplinary work as well as valuable
218 work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may
219 not be published in the best known or highest ranked journals in a discipline. The Committee may
220 consider these distinct criteria to discern the quality of the candidate's work and the character of the
221 venues where the work is disseminated, which collectively may be referred to as channels of
222 dissemination: (a) geographic scope of the channel's reputation, ranging from regional, national, and
223 international; (b) competitiveness of the channel; (c) reputation or prestige of the channel as evidenced in
224 the academic community; (d) size of the audience of the channel as determined by number of persons
225 who attended, tuned in, downloaded or streamed the transmission; (e) distinguished awards given by the
226 channel from either peer or audience review; and (f) scholarly impact, as evidenced by citations, reviews,
227 press response, and academic research about the candidate's work. It is incumbent upon the candidate to
228 document objectively the quality of the dissemination outlets and recognition of his/her work within the
229 discipline(s) and fields of expertise.
230

231 While the Global Studies Institute recognizes the value of both individual and collaborative scholarship,
232 we acknowledge the importance and occasional difficulty of determining the relative contributions of co-
233 authors. We strongly support interdisciplinary research, which by definition results in publications with
234 multiple authors. We cannot therefore assign higher intrinsic value to single-author, jointly-authored, or
235 collaboratively created works. Additionally, we know that order of authorship or credit does not
236 necessarily convey accurate information about one's relative contribution to the work. We will thus
237 accord appropriate credit for the candidate's contribution to a co-authored or collaboratively created
238 work. It is incumbent upon the candidate to document objectively his/her specific contribution to any
239 collaborative projects and describe how that contribution resulted in recognition within the candidate's
240 discipline.
241

242 As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate's publications may appear in the
243 scholarly outlets of other disciplines. We recognize that work in the general academic field of Global
244 Studies can and does regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of a broad range of disciplines,
245 and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in related professional publications, insofar as its

246 quality is appropriately demonstrated. Likewise, a candidate's collaborations with scholars outside and
247 within the discipline of Global Studies will be given consideration.

248
249 The Global Studies Institute appreciates the increasingly prominent role that online publication, new
250 media work, and web-based resources play in the production and dissemination of knowledge. It also
251 recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are often difficult to apply to these new forms of
252 scholarship. Therefore, candidates must make their own case for the quality and breadth of an intellectual
253 project, its distinctive contribution to knowledge and the candidate's professional development, and
254 provide evidence of peer review (e.g., citation of the project in other venues).

255 **Categories of Professional Development**

256
257
258 The candidate must submit written evidence of professional development according to the categories of
259 professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.).

260 **Evaluation of Professional Development**

261
262
263 Based on the evidence submitted, the Institute committee will evaluate the candidate's professional
264 development.

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

266
267
268 Promotion to or tenure at the rank of associate professor is available only to those candidates who are
269 judged to be at least *excellent* in both professional development and teaching and at least *good* in service.
270 Candidates already at the rank of associate professor applying for tenure must also be evaluated at least
271 excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least *good* in service. Following university
272 standards, the recommended candidate for promotion to associate professor will have developed a
273 substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of the field as determined by
274 peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in the field. There are
275 obviously many ways for a candidate to provide justification for such a conclusion. It is incumbent on the
276 candidate to demonstrate that they have produced a body of professional work that meets these criteria.

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

278
279
280 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is available only to those candidates whose
281 professional development and teaching are both judged as at least *excellent* and whose service is judged
282 to be at least *very good*. The recommended candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of
283 professor is expected to have established a national/international reputation in their field and have a high
284 probability of continued high quality and productive professional development.

285
286 The candidate will be judged *excellent* in professional development only if the committee's assessment is
287 that the candidate's scholarship activities are highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might
288 have published a large number of influential refereed articles or chapters of excellent quality; or a larger
289 number of articles or chapters of very good quality and comparable to more than a book; or a book and a
290 significant number of articles or chapters, all of very good quality. To qualify as *excellent*, a candidate
291 could also have secured extramural funding to support his/her research and should have been highly
292 active in additional research roles, such as reviewing grants and books, serving on editorial boards, or
293 presenting research in professional and academic venues.

294
295

296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346

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.

347 **Categories of Service**

348
349 The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to their areas of
350 professional expertise according to the categories of service in the college manual (section V.G.).
351

352 **Evaluation of Service**

353
354 Based on the evidence submitted, the institute committee will evaluate the candidate's service.
355

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

357
358 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be evaluated as at
359 least *good* in service.
360

361 Candidates will be judged *good* if they have been very effective in assistance to colleagues and have
362 willingly and responsibly performed several institute service tasks. Candidates may have served as an
363 officer or board or committee member of a regional or national professional association. They may also
364 show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations or significant public
365 contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews). Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their
366 service wherever possible.
367

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

369
370 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor the candidate must be evaluated as at least *very*
371 *good* in service.
372

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

381 **APPENDIX I: RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR PRE-TENURE REVIEW**

382

383

384 **A. Professional Development**

385

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

387

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

389

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

392

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

397

398 **Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research. This body of
399 scholarship, which may include a book or comparable body of articles and book chapters, has contributed
400 to the advancement of her/his field. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital
401 media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Peer-
402 reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and
403 computer software) is valued equally to print publications in sub-fields in which scholarship adopting
404 emerging technologies is essential. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes documentation
405 directly demonstrating one's emerging national reputation and/or the securing of fellowships, grants,
406 contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies;
407 these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and
408 significance of the candidate's research. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty member's
409 current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he
410 comes up for tenure, should the faculty member's upward trajectory continue.

411

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

416

417

418 **B. Teaching**

419

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

423

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

427

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

434

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

443

444 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent
445 involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student
446 research papers, as well as honors and master's theses. The faculty member's student evaluation scores
447 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
448 level. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned
449 courses. For example, the faculty member may have created new courses, significantly revised existing
450 courses, incorporated digital literacies into course syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-
451 through-writing core tenets and exercises into course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other
452 activities that strengthen the unit's overall instruction and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive
453 invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in
454 leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of
455 research or pedagogical expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to her/his
456 research. Through these activities, the faculty member shows creative reflection and action in teaching.

457

458 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent* at either level, the faculty member's student
459 evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has won a significant teaching
460 award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

461

462 C. Service

463

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

467

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

471

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

474

475 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and
476 leadership at the department level as well as on the college or university levels. The faculty member
477 engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in professional associations,
478 serving on editorial review boards, and/or a significant amount of review work (e.g., for presses in the
479 form of unpublished manuscripts).

480

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

484

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

489

490

491

492

493

494 **APPENDIX II: RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW**

495

496 **A. Professional Development**

497

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

499

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

501

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

504

505 **Very Good:** The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady scholarly
506 development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects. Included here is the
507 circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed, or
508 positively reviewed and/or contracted by a press in the period under review.

509

510 **Excellent:** The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or
511 international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member
512 continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The faculty
513 member's books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles are published by presses and in
514 journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the
515 faculty member's work attest to this reputation. The faculty member has produced a significant body of
516 original research since her or his last promotion, which may include a book-length project, a number of
517 book chapters or peer-reviewed articles, co-authored or co-edited projects, or some combination of these.
518 Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from
519 internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

520

521 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field. Evidence may include
522 national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in
523 prestigious venues and winning prestigious fellowships or grants.

524

525 **B. Teaching**

526

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

530

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

534

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

541

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

550

551 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive
552 involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of
553 honors and master's theses to completion. The faculty member's student evaluation scores will often be in
554 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
555 member evaluated as *excellent* also will have demonstrated a creative and reflective pedagogy that may
556 include a substantial variety of activities related to instruction. For example, the faculty member may
557 have created new courses, significantly revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into course
558 syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and exercises into
559 course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the unit's overall instruction
560 and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her
561 reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing
562 pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of research or pedagogical expertise, thereby
563 demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to her/his research. Such a faculty member will also
564 have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs in a timely fashion; securing
565 fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; presenting or publishing their work, completing their
566 programs, and advancing into subsequent programs or into the profession. Such a faculty member advises
567 and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

568

569 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's student evaluations
570 will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a significant teaching award

571 from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, or will have been otherwise
572 recognized for superior instruction.

573

574 **C. Service**

575

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

579

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

583

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

586

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

593

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

597

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