

GERONTOLOGY INSTITUTE
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Policy Title:	Gerontology Institute Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	4
Department Approval:	09/23/2013
College Approval:	Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 02/05/2014

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

INTRODUCTION

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism of ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the university. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Great care is taken to ensure accurate assessments and proper outcomes. It is not our intention in this set of guidelines to enumerate every step necessary for promotion and tenure. Rather, this document is an expression of the philosophy that will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the process that will be followed in the Institute. Candidates are directed to both the *Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors (University Manual)* and the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (College Manual)* for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and College expectations.

The Gerontology Institute will evaluate all candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. As will be described later in these guidelines, the Institute values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its members in each one.

Candidates will be reviewed and evaluated by both an Institute committee and by the Institute Director. The College Manual describes the review process and the evaluation standards. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as **excellent** in professional development and teaching according to departmental guidelines and evaluated as having provided **good**

23 service. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a
24 candidate must be judged **excellent** in professional development and teaching and
25 **very good** in the area of service.

26

27

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

28 The Gerontology Institute views professional development as encompassing any
29 activity that advances our discipline by creating or extending gerontological knowledge
30 and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is research,
31 professional development also includes all other activities that support or enhance
32 research in the field of aging, including reviewing, editing, and refereeing. The
33 Gerontology Institute recognizes that gerontological scholarship comes in many forms
34 and employs a variety of methods, including basic or applied research, theoretical or
35 empirical work, scholarship of discovery or scholarship of integration, qualitative or
36 quantitative methods, and primary or secondary analyses. Each research topic, method,
37 approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate to the
38 stated research goal and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore,
39 that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways and that no
40 one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

41 Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely
42 heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give little credit to published work that
43 was not refereed. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to
44 instruction unless the text can be shown to make significant or seminal contributions to

45 the scholarship of the field.

46 Obtaining extramural grant support for one's research is a highly valued
47 professional development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking
48 external grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh heavily as evidence
49 of scholarly reputation. Assistant professors seeking promotion to the next higher rank
50 are expected to begin a focused line of research, which usually involves seeking
51 internal grant support and extramural grants. Grant support, however valuable, is only a
52 means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research.

53 Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings
54 and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected
55 activities for any scholar. Although no specific type of such activities is required for
56 promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in
57 such roles.

58 The Institute recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals does
59 exist within the field of gerontology. The difficulty of ranking journals is most apparent
60 with "specialty" journals, where specialists in one sub-field are technically unable to
61 draw comparisons between their own journals and those of another sub-field. The
62 Institute's goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship, and we will expect
63 every candidate to meet that standard. Quality of publications will be assessed on
64 several factors: 1) the work's impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, or
65 other evidence; 2) the prestige or standing of the journal in which an article appears or
66 the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate's explanation of the

67 importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the committee's
68 independent assessment of the work.

69 The Gerontology Institute recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative
70 scholarship. While we acknowledge the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of
71 determining the relative contributions of several co-authors, modern gerontological
72 research is increasingly a team enterprise, and interdisciplinary research—which we
73 strongly support—by definition, results in publications with multiple authors. We do
74 assume that a candidate who chooses to collaborate should be able to publish a greater
75 number of items than one working alone. We also know that order of authorship does
76 not necessarily convey information about relative contribution to the work. Credit will be
77 assigned based on the candidate's relative contribution to a multiple-authored work.
78 Again, the quality of the work will be assessed independently.

79 As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate's publications
80 may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. While the Institute's primary
81 focus remains the development of the field of gerontology, we do recognize that
82 gerontologists can and do regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of other
83 disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in non-gerontology
84 professional publications.

85 Finally, perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of
86 publications required for promotion and tenure. The Gerontology Institute strongly
87 resists the idea that the evaluation of one's work can be defined solely by numbers of
88 publications or other scholarly activities, the number or size of grants, or the number of

89 other scholarly activities. In other words, there is no magic number. As discussed below,
90 we expect candidates to demonstrate both the quality and quantity of their scholarly
91 productivity.

92 Candidates for promotion must submit all work done since their initial
93 appointment or the completion of the dossier used in the review that led to promotion to
94 his/her current rank at Georgia State University, whichever is relevant. Candidates for
95 tenure at the level of associate professor may submit any relevant prior work done at
96 other institutions, and candidates for tenure at the level of professor must submit any
97 work done since their initial appointments as associate professors at other institutions.
98 Candidates who receive probationary credit must submit work done during the period
99 for which such credit is given as stipulated in the *College Manual*.

100

101 **Categories of Professional Development**

102 The candidate for promotion and tenure should submit written evidence of
103 professional development organized in the following categories (as outlined in the
104 *College Manual* and relevant to the discipline): 1) presentations at professional
105 meetings; 2) scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and reviews; 3)
106 achievements in the visual and performing arts; 4) awards and grants; 5) significant
107 professional services; 6) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional
108 associations; 7) general recognition within the discipline of gerontology; and 8)
109 specialized professional activities in the discipline of gerontology.

110

111 **Evaluation of Professional Development**

112

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

114 Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires that a faculty member be
115 recognized by scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has
116 contributed to the advancement and development of gerontology and demonstrates a
117 strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory in terms of high quality and productive
118 research and scholarship. As stated in the *College Manual*, promotion to this level is
119 available only to those who are judged to be **excellent** in professional development.

120 Following college and university standards, a candidate for promotion to the rank
121 of associate professor must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work
122 that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by
123 peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in
124 his/her field. Finally, the candidate's body of work should indicate a trajectory of
125 continued scholarship to support future promotion to professor.

126 An assistant professor seeking promotion is expected to have developed a
127 focused research agenda demonstrating the candidate's expertise in their specialty
128 area. Examples of such a research agenda may include: a significant number (6-8) of
129 high quality refereed articles published in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-
130 tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary
131 journals; and/or a book of comparable quality published by major university or
132 commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be

133 considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they
134 are of comparable quality.

135 The products of a candidate's research agenda should also include grant-
136 seeking activities that establish the foundation for future extramural support of their
137 research. Such activities may include one or more of the following: serving as a
138 principal investigator or co-investigator on an externally funded grant; serving as
139 principal investigator or co-investigator on contracts, subcontracts, or foundation
140 awards; serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving
141 internal funding for pilot studies that may lead to future external grant support; or
142 serving as a consultant on external awards.

143 To qualify as **excellent**, a candidate also should have been very active in other
144 research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or
145 participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

146

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

148 As stated in the *College Manual*, promotion to the rank of professor is recognition
149 by the Institute and the university that a faculty member's scholarship is of such high
150 quality and importance that s/he has achieved and sustained a national and/or
151 international reputation as a leading scholar in his/her field and have a high probability
152 of continued high quality and productive research and scholarship.

153 To qualify as excellent, the candidate should have published: a significant
154 number of high- quality refereed articles in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-

155 tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary
156 journals; and/or a book (or books) of comparable quality published by a major university
157 or commercial academic press. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be
158 considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they
159 have been subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, candidates
160 should normally have served as a principal investigator on external grants of a caliber
161 that demonstrates the national and/or international prominence of their scholarship. This
162 includes grants from federal agencies, prestigious foundations, or significant levels of
163 state funding. A co-investigator may be considered the equivalent of a principal
164 investigator if the candidate demonstrates a significant leadership role in the project.
165 Candidates who have not served as principal investigators on grants should present
166 comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their
167 research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial
168 intellectual contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more
169 nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles
170 reprinted in high quality edited research volumes. In addition, candidates should
171 demonstrate activity in additional research roles, such as editorial board member,
172 conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book
173 reviewer.

174

175

176

177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198

TEACHING

Categories of Teaching

The quality of instruction of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Institute and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. The candidate for promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the following categories (as mandated in the *College Manual*): 1) courses taught during the last four academic years; 2) perception of students; 3) honors or special recognition for teaching or mentorship; 4) independent studies, practica, honors, theses, and dissertations; 5) published materials relevant to teaching; 6) teaching portfolio; and 7) additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. The candidate may not solicit letters to include in any of these categories.

Evaluation of Teaching

The Institute will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the *College Manual's* evaluative standard based on the evidence submitted. The committee will be mindful of the vagaries inherent in student evaluations; the student evaluation averages mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to reify the numbers.

Teaching includes both activities that relate to classroom instruction and the mentoring of individual students. Both are important to effective teaching and student learning. Therefore, the committee recognizes that the balance between the two varies. Thus, effective classroom teaching may be given more weight and significance for a candidate with extensive classroom teaching experience and evidence of high quality

199 classroom teaching but less mentoring activities; and comparably mentoring may be
200 given more weight and significance for a candidate who has been very actively involved
201 in directed theses and dissertation, or co-authoring publications and presentations with
202 students, or in other activities related to individual student learning.

203

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

205 The candidate will usually be judged to be *excellent* in teaching when the
206 student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the
207 overall average is normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and; the course material
208 presented must show thorough preparation. In addition, the candidate should
209 demonstrate effective mentoring of students. For candidates for promotion to associate
210 professor this entails directing at least two theses, as well serving on thesis and
211 dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring activities. The
212 candidate may also have accomplished one or more of the following: published a
213 textbook; published a teaching-related article; won one or more teaching award;
214 presented papers at professional meetings with one or more students; co-authored with
215 one or more students. Once again, while candidates must demonstrate excellence in
216 both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students the relative emphasis on
217 classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

218

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

220 The candidate will usually be judged to be *excellent* in teaching when the

221 student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the
222 overall average is normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and course material
223 presented show thorough preparation. For promotion to the rank of professor
224 candidates must also demonstrate a trajectory of active and effective mentoring of
225 individual students. This entails having directed completed and ongoing theses as well
226 serving on thesis and dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring
227 activities. The candidate may also have accomplished one or more of the following:
228 published a textbook; published a teaching-related article; won one or more teaching
229 award; presented papers at professional meetings with one or more students; co-
230 authored with one or more students. As noted above, while candidates must
231 demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of
232 students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may
233 vary by candidate.

234

235

SERVICE

236 Service to one's colleagues, to our Institute, to the College, and to the University is very
237 important elements in judging faculty contributions and performance. Faculty members
238 also owe service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of
239 professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition,
240 gerontology, as a field of study is concerned with aging and age-related issues at the
241 individual, institutional, and societal levels gerontological endeavors are very conducive
242 to a variety of forms of community service. Efforts at applying gerontological knowledge

243 and methods to address community concerns are highly valued by the Institute. As
244 mandated by the *College Manual*, the candidate must submit written evidence of service
245 activity related to his/her areas of professional competence.

246

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

248 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be
249 evaluated as at least **good** in service. A candidate will be judged **good** if s/he has been
250 active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service
251 tasks that are assigned to him or her.

252

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

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

256 A candidate will be judged **very good** if s/he has: 1) been active in assistance to
257 colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in Institute service by serving on the
258 executive committee, as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad
259 hoc committee (e.g., curriculum, graduate admissions, awards); 3) served effectively in
260 one or more of the following roles: graduate director, undergraduate director, research
261 director, chair of a recruitment committee, or other major ad hoc committees; and 4)
262 given significant service on college or university committees or serving as officers in
263 regional, national, or international professional societies.

EVALUATION PROCESS

264
265 The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the
266 Gerontology Institute is governed by the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and*
267 *Tenure Manual*. Until which time the Gerontology Institute has sufficient numbers of
268 faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members, the
269 dean, in consultation with the director, will augment faculty committees with members at
270 the appropriate rank from other departments. Each committee will elect its own chair,
271 meet and deliberate, and report its evaluation and recommendation by letter to the
272 department chair. All deliberations in the promotion and tenure process are confidential
273 An important part of the promotion and tenure evaluation is the assessment of the
274 candidate's credentials by gerontologists outside Georgia State University. The
275 candidate must submit with his/her dossier a list of eight scholars in the candidate's
276 specialty area who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's performance in the area of
277 professional development and his/her reputation within the discipline. The Institute
278 director, together with the Institute's committee on Promotion and Tenure, will, without
279 input from the candidate, prepare a list of eight additional scholars who could perform
280 the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the *College*
281 *Manual* Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, who will select from them
282 at least five persons to perform an outside review. The letters supplied by these outside
283 reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University. The Institute's
284 director will review and check the candidate's dossier before it is sent to the outside
285 reviewers.

286 All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review
287 process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the
288 candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

289 **APPENDIX I:**

290 **Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

291

292 **A. Professional Development**

293

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

295

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

297

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

301

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

306

307 **Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a focused research agenda
308 demonstrating expertise in her/his specialty area(s). Examples of such a research
309 agenda may include: a significant number of high quality refereed articles published in
310 top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier
311 specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary journals; and/or a book of comparable quality
312 published by major university or commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-
313 reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the
314 faculty member demonstrates that they are of comparable quality. The research agenda
315 ideally will include grant-seeking activities that establish the foundation for current
316 and/or future extramural support of research. Such activities may include: serving as a
317 principal investigator or co-investigator on an externally funded grant; serving as
318 principal investigator or co-investigator on contracts, subcontracts, or foundation
319 awards; serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving
320 internal funding for pilot studies that may lead to future external grant; or serving as a
321 consultant on external awards. The faculty member should also be active in other
322 research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or
323 participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

324 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has met the criteria for *excellent* and has achieved
325 eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory
326 reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

327

328

329 **B. Teaching**

330

331 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced
332 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in
333 departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical
334 techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient
335 transmission of the course content to students.

336

337 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as
338 evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little
339 involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
340 pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the
341 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

342

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

350

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

360 **Excellent:** The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly
361 involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective
362 faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or
363 execution with evaluation scores in the mid-4.0 out of 5 range or higher. In addition, the
364 candidate should demonstrate effective mentoring of students. The faculty member's
365 teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with
366 individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student
367 research papers, honors and master's theses and capstone projects. The faculty
368 member may also demonstrate effective mentoring of students by serving on and
369 chairing thesis committees. The candidate may also have published a textbook, or
370 published a teaching-related article, won a teaching award, presented papers at
371 professional meetings with students, and/or co-authored with one or more students.
372 While candidates can demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual
373 mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual
374 mentoring may vary by candidate.

375
376 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's
377 student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has
378 won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published award winning
379 textbook, or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

380
381
382 **C. Service**

383
384 **Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no
385 other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other
386 departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

387
388 **Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few
389 other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other
390 departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those
391 committees.

392
393 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental
394 duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

395 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and
396 effective service and leadership at the department as well as participating in
397 professional associations.
398

399 **Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective
400 leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university
401 administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described
402 as above as *very good*.
403

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

408 **APPENDIX II:**

409 **Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

410

411 **A. Professional Development**

412

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

414

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

416

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

420

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

423

424 **Excellent:** The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished
425 national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization.
426 The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the
427 work of others in the field. The articles, book chapters, and/or books of the faculty
428 member judged as *excellent* are published in journals and by presses that are held in
429 esteem within gerontology. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be
430 considered the equivalent of journal articles if the faculty member demonstrates that
431 they have been subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, the
432 faculty member ideally serves or will have served as a principal investigator on external
433 grants of a caliber that demonstrates the national and/or international prominence of
434 their scholarship. This includes grants from federal agencies or prestigious foundations.
435 The faculty member who has not served as principal investigator on a grant may
436 present comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of
437 their research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial
438 intellectual contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more
439 nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles
440 reprinted in high quality edited research volumes. The faculty member also is active in
441 additional research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session
442 organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

443 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has met the criteria for *excellent* and achieved
444 eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong
445 reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues, and so on.

446
447

448 **B. Teaching**

449

450 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced
451 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in
452 departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical
453 techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient
454 transmission of the course content to students.

455

456 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as
457 evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little
458 involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
459 pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the
460 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

461

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

469

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

479 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and
480 prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of
481 undergraduate and graduate student research papers, honors and master's theses, and
482 capstone projects. The faculty member demonstrates effective mentoring of students by
483 serving on and chairing thesis committees and engaging in other student mentoring
484 activities such as serving on or chairing dissertation committees. The faculty member's
485 student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty
486 member may have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related article, won a
487 teaching award, presented papers at professional meetings with students, and/or co-
488 authored with one or more students. While candidates can demonstrate excellence in
489 both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on
490 classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

491

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

497

498

499 **C. Service**

500

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

504

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

509

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

512

513 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and
514 effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the
515 university levels as well as participating in professional associations.

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

520
521 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the
522 faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service
523 accomplishments, often leadership roles, beyond the department and throughout the
524 college and university, as well as in national and international professional
525 organizations.