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

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

As an essential academic department in a major research university, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics has responsibilities in scholarship, teaching, and service. In meeting these responsibilities, the department’s overall goals are excellence in creating and disseminating knowledge, in teaching at all levels, and in service to the profession, the University, and the community. The general responsibility of scholarship at a research university and the specific responsibility of effective teaching require that faculty be engaged in research which is at national and international levels. Thus, the department believes that the “teacher-scholar” is the most appropriate model for faculty in a university setting. While it is responsible for essentially all mathematics/statistics classes at Georgia State University, the department has strong undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as cutting-edge research in mathematics and its applications. Its faculty members are expected to be part of these activities.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has formulated these promotion and tenure guidelines in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Promotion and tenure recommendations from the Department will be based upon a candidate's past performance in three broad areas: professional development, teaching, and service. Judgment of activities in these areas should be made by those closest to the situation and most knowledgeable in the candidate's discipline. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee of Tenured Associate Professors and Professors (TAPP), the Chairperson of the Department, and the College Area Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the candidates according to the criteria specified in this document and the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. Any faculty member who might be considered for promotion and/or tenure should study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures that are outlined in both documents.
DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA

Three areas to be considered for each candidate for promotion and/or tenure are professional development, teaching and service. Specific items to be considered are listed in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual, and summarized in the sections below. Candidates should consult the college manual concerning the format and organization of the materials to be submitted to the Department and College Promotion and Tenure Committees. Candidates shall be aware that the Department’s TAPP Committee will do a critical and thorough evaluation of their dossier. In all cases, candidates must satisfy the minimum requirements set forth by the Board of Regents, Georgia State University, and the College of Arts and Sciences. Each case for promotion will be considered on its own merits based on the materials submitted by a candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to build his or her case for promotion and/or tenure.

The criteria set out below are intended to elaborate those provided in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professional Development

To be rated excellent in professional development, the candidate should have a nationally/internationally recognized research program, which consists of significant publications, nationally competitive grants and/or grant activity record, and presentations at national/international research conferences, or research and education institutions.

1. Professional accomplishment is indicated most clearly by publications in peer-reviewed journals. While it is difficult to rank the quality of journals accurately, candidate’s productivity will be mainly evaluated on publications in major and topline research journals in the candidate’s research areas. Other publications can include peer-reviewed conference proceedings and invited chapters and/or books appropriate to the discipline.

2. Grants are defined as from external sources, including federal grants, travel grants, exchange grants, and industrial grants. The size and duration of grants are a consideration in assessing the level of professional activity. Grant activities include submitting grant proposals to external sources. GSU internal grants are considered and should be sought where appropriate but are largely viewed as seed grants that support the preparation of external grant proposals. It is recognized that research sub-areas may differ in the availability of certain types of grant programs, and that this is a consideration in evaluation of grants and grant activities.

3. Presentations include contributed and/or invited talks at professional conferences and symposia and colloquia/seminars at other universities and research institutes.
Note: Election to offices, committee activities, and important service to professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer reviewing as related to research and other creative activities, may also indicate the scholarly efforts of the candidate. It should be noted though that many activities related to professional associations should be listed under service if scholarship is not involved.

Teaching

Items of consideration include:

(a) evidence of teaching effectiveness.

All candidates must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness, which includes evidence of student learning outcomes, summaries of student evaluation, representative syllabi, selected examinations, and samples of other materials developed by the teacher.

(b) development of courses and curriculum.

(c) significant participation in and successful direction of Master's theses and/or Ph.D. dissertations.

(d) significant participation in the direction of student research projects, membership on MS/Ph.D. thesis/dissertation committees, direction of independent studies, and participation on graduate examinations.

Significant and successful direction of graduate students is expected of faculty, as defined in the College workload policy. Significance is indicated by the quality and quantity of graduate students directed. The number of graduate students directed by faculty may depend on the sub-area of research specialization and the availability of students given that nature of our graduate training programs, and this should be considered in evaluation.

Successful direction of graduate students is indicated by completion of degree in a timely fashion and the publication of their research activities in peer-reviewed journals as appropriate. Providing financial support for graduate students from the faculty member’s research grants is considered here.

Significant participation refers to the number of efforts, the time expended, the role played by the candidate, and the quality of activities.
(e) instructional grants and/or publications in instructional journals.

To be rated *excellent* in teaching, the candidate must be an innovative and effective teacher and must provide instructional leadership in the university community. Evidence for an evaluation of *excellent* in teaching should contain at least 4 of the 5 items above and must include item (a).

Note: Candidates are encouraged to submit evidence of any other activity related to teaching they deem appropriate.

**Service**

To be rated *very good* in service, the candidate should be a leader and team member. The evidence for an evaluation of *very good* in service is a substantial contribution to item a) below and at least one of the other two categories.

To be rated *good* in service, the candidate should demonstrate a consistent record of effective service in carrying out assigned tasks. The evidence for an evaluation of *good* in service is a positive contribution to item a) below and at least one of the other two categories.

Items of consideration include:

(a) Departmental service

(b) College, University, Senate, or System committees

(c) Professional service

Additional considerations and notes:
1. Community service will be considered if it is discipline related.
2. Other items of consideration in this area may include activities that directly support the University, College or Department, such as student recruitment, teaching test preparation courses, and involvement with local high schools.
Application and Elaboration of the Criteria

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chairperson of the Department independently evaluate the credentials of all candidates with all deliberations to be completed according to the College calendar. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee in judging professional development determines the extent of the candidate's progress in developing a research program. This determination is based on judgments concerning professional activities such as publications, seeking and/or securing extramural funding, presentations, involvement in professional organizations, and related activities. The peer recognition associated with these activities and received by the candidate is referred to as the candidate's professional reputation. The activities and associated professional reputation of candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to be of national/international scope rather than local or regional. Research programs are expected to result in publications in major peer-reviewed journals. The successful candidate is expected to have published (or have manuscripts in press) several such papers based on research conducted during the candidate’s current rank and/or after the last promotion. Other evidence of achievement may include serving as a referee for scholarly publications, service as a grant reviewer, honors, awards, fellowships, and significant citations. As a professional scholar continues to develop, there are several dimensions to measure the growth of his/her research program. A few of these concerning research publication include rate of publication, cumulative publication record, significance of problems, reputation of the publishing journal or serial, applicability of results, longevity of problems, and breadth of problems. During this continued development, there is normally a widening variety of professional activities including invited presentations, refereeing papers for journals, and refereeing proposals for granting agencies. A nationally competitive program of extramural funding is indicated by a record of successful funding, or when funding has not been secured, evidence of extensive and consistent efforts to secure extramural funds from national agencies and/or foundations. To establish such a rating for an unfunded proposal, the candidate should submit the full set of comments and scores received from the agency. When the continued growth and development of the candidate's publications are significant enough to establish the candidate as a national or international scholar, then the candidate is judged as excellent in professional development.

In the area of teaching, a candidate should exhibit competence, enthusiasm, effectiveness, and sound standards in both the undergraduate and the graduate instructional programs. Involvement in teaching at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels is recommended. Criteria for evaluation of teaching competence include: (a) evidence of teaching effectiveness, (b) development of courses and curriculum, (c) significant participation in and successful direction of Master's theses and/or Ph.D. dissertations, (d) significant participation in the direction of student research projects, membership on MS/Ph.D. thesis/dissertation committees, direction of independent studies, and participation on graduate examinations, and (e)
instructional grants and/or publications in instructional journals. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes the quality of materials in the teaching portfolio, including course syllabi, class notes, web-based materials, examinations, and student evaluations. Evidence of significant participation in and successful direction of graduate students includes numbers of M.S. and Ph.D. students directed, successful completion of their degrees in a timely fashion, evidence of successful progress toward a degree by passing comprehensive exams or writing a research paper or thesis, and publication of their research activities in peer-reviewed journals as appropriate. The candidate is judged as excellent in teaching if there is strong record in four out of (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) that establishes him or her as an effective and innovative teacher, providing instructional leadership in the university.

The candidate should strive for a sound service record. Membership, effectiveness, and leadership on departmental and university committees and on committees and offices in professional organizations are activities reviewed in promotion and/or tenure. Assistant Professors or untenured Associate Professors may be judged to have performed service suitable for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor with a rating of good. Associate Professors applying for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor must be evaluated as very good in service to be recommended for promotion and/or tenure at these levels. If the candidate has been given credit towards tenure for professional activities at other institutions, any work done during the period for which credit toward tenure is given will be included in the consideration for promotion and tenure at Georgia State University. Any work done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not be considered for promotion of that candidate at Georgia State University.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Candidates are referred to the College Manual for eligibility and credits to be nominated to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. All candidates that are recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor must be evaluated as excellent in professional development and teaching, and as good in service.
Candidates are referred to the College Manual for eligibility and credits to be nominated to the rank of Professor. The same evaluation measures established for promotion to Associate Professor apply to promotion to full professor, but the magnitude and history of accomplishments must be substantially greater. A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor must present at a minimum clear evidence of an excellent record in research and teaching that surpasses the requirements for rank of Associate Professor and must present a service record of at least very good. Such accomplishments include the establishment and maintenance at Georgia State University of an original nationally recognized research program that has resulted in substantial publications, and either grant support or an extensive and consistent effort to secure extramural funding from national agencies and/or foundations.

The recognition of the candidate’s expertise as evidenced by a history of publication in quality journals should exceed that requirement for a recommendation to the rank of Associate Professor. Other evidence of achievement could include membership on editorial boards of significant journals, serving on grant review panels, membership on program committees or holding offices in national scientific organizations, and serving as an outside reviewer for promotion and tenure at other universities. Accomplishments in research or teaching may be given special consideration.

Accomplishments in research as documented by national recognition, coupled with required achievements in teaching and a major service role, may warrant promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor. Similarly, accomplishments in teaching as documented by national recognition, coupled with appropriate research and at least a very good record in service may warrant promotion to Professor.

**DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS AND SCHEDULE OF IMPORTANT DATES**

The departmental process will follow the College of Arts and Sciences Manual including the Calendar for the Promotion and Tenure Process. A candidate for promotion must submit his/her credentials to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee in the same format in which these credentials are to be submitted to the College Area Committee on Promotion and Tenure.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member has a moderate research program with a few publications, meeting presentations, and may have one or more internal grants. The scope and impact of the faculty member’s overall professional development contributions are limited.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has publications, presentations and grant activities that are likely to lead to a nationally/internationally recognized research program in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has established a nationally/internationally recognized research program, or there are clear indications that the faculty member is well on the way to establishing a nationally/internationally recognized research program. S/he has produced original research published in peer-reviewed highly regarded journals. Collaborative work should complement the development of an independent research program. Grant support is a significant indication of research productivity. The faculty member should have a demonstrated ability to attract external funding via grant support or positive reviews to grant applications. Further evidence for a rating of excellent includes invited talks at professional conferences and symposia and colloquia/seminars at other universities and research institutes. 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 with marked impact on the work of others, as evidenced by publication in topline research journals, external funding as a P.I. for his/her independent research program, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.
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 that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students. The faculty member has no record of supervision of individual student work.

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 that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students. Such a faculty member displays insufficient involvement in supervision of individual student work.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. The supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional 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. Such a faculty member displays limited involvement in supervision of individual student work, mainly as a committee member rather than a research advisor.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent and effective teacher. The teaching record shows evidence of teaching effectiveness. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from two of the following four areas of teaching, as listed in the current P&T departmental manual: (i) curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate students, membership on thesis/dissertation committees and related activities; (iv) instructional grants and/or publications. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about students who have successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality of their
publications are important in the review. The faculty member’s 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.

**Excellent:** The faculty member is a highly effective and innovative teacher, showing instructional leadership. Her/his teaching record shows evidence of teaching effectiveness. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from three of the following four areas of teaching, as listed in the P&T departmental manual: (i) curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate students and membership on the thesis/dissertation committees and related activities; (iv) instructional grants and/or publications. Such a faculty member has started to show a prominent involvement with individual student work. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about students who have successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality of their publications are important in the review.

**Outstanding:** The level of effectiveness and accomplishments demonstrated in the faculty member’s record of instruction and student mentoring exceed the criteria for excellent described above. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest exceptional performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional preparation; the faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, as indicated, for example, by student publications or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may receive a significant teaching award or significant instructional grants/publications or invitations to leading workshops and consultation, based upon his or her creativity in teaching.
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 departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of assistance to colleagues. Additionally, some positive contribution to college/university/system administrative functions or professional associations should be shown.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates diligent, collegial service and leadership at the department level. Additionally, a substantial contribution to college/university/system administrative functions or professional associations should be shown.

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

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of effective leadership in a major role in the department and/or throughout the college and university and/or in national and 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 has a moderate research program with a few publications, meeting presentations, and may have one or more internal grants. The scope and impact of the faculty member’s overall professional development contributions are limited.

*Very Good:* The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects. A continued record of publications in peer-reviewed journals, invited presentations and submitted applications for external funding of his/her research program is expected.

*Excellent:* The faculty member continues to maintain a nationally/internationally recognized research program and is an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. S/he has produced original research published in peer-reviewed highly esteemed journals by the profession with impact on the work of others in the field. Grant support is a significant indication of research productivity. The faculty member’s professional development record should demonstrate a sustained level of grant activity. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes invited talks at professional conferences and symposia and colloquia/seminars at other universities and research institutes.

*Outstanding:* The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field with marked impact on the work of others, as evidenced by publication in topline research journals in the profession, sustained external funding as a P.I. for his/her independent research program, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.
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 that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students. The faculty member has no record of supervision of individual student work.

**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 that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students. Such a faculty member displays insufficient involvement in supervision of individual student work.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. The supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional 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. Such a faculty member displays limited involvement in supervision of individual student work, mainly as a committee member rather than a research advisor.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent and effective teacher. The teaching record shows evidence of teaching effectiveness. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from two of the following four areas of teaching, as listed in the current P&T departmental manual: (i) curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate students, membership on thesis/dissertation committees and related activities; (iv) instructional grants and/or publications. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about students who have successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality of their
publications are important in the review. The faculty member’s 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.

**Excellent:** The faculty member is a highly effective and innovative teacher, providing instructional leadership. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from three of the following four areas of teaching, as listed in the current P&T departmental manual: (i) curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate students, membership on thesis/dissertation committees; (iv) instructional grants and/or publications. Such a faculty member shows a prominent and successful involvement in the direction of individual student work. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about students who have successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality of their publications are important in the review.

**Outstanding:** The level of effectiveness and accomplishments demonstrated in the faculty member’s record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent described above. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest exceptional performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional preparation; the faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, as indicated, for example, by student publications or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may receive a significant teaching award or significant instructional grants/publications or invitations to leading workshops and consultation, based upon his or her creativity in teaching.
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 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 departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of assistance to colleagues. Additionally, some positive contribution to college/university/system administrative functions or professional associations should be shown.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates diligent, collegial service and leadership at the department level. Additionally, a substantial contribution to college/university/system administrative functions or professional associations should be shown.

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

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of effective leadership in a major role in the department and/or throughout the college and university and/or in national and international professional organizations.