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 purpose of this document is to set forth the guidelines of the Department of Political Science regarding promotion and tenure recommendations. The criteria and procedures here are intended to fulfill the requirements and procedures of the College, University, and Regents. Although the material in this document reflects the policies of the College, it is the responsibility of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure to insure that their candidacy is in conformance with the requirements and procedures of the Department, College, University and Regents.

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the University. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. 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 Department. Candidates should pay particular attention to the College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Promotion and Tenure for guidance.
about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for
tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and
College expectations.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Promotion and
Tenure defines the criteria for promotion and tenure.
Candidates will be evaluated in professional development,
teaching, and service. The evaluations should take into account
expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the
standards of the candidate’s discipline, and the mission and
resources of the Department. Specific guidelines for evaluating
candidates are detailed in each Department’s promotion and
tenure guidelines.

CRITERIA BY RANK IN COLLEGE MANUAL

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

In order 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,
and as good in service.
Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia State University. Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor substantially must surpass those required for promotion and tenure at the rank of Associate Professor. In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, a candidate must be judged excellent in both professional development and teaching, and very good in service.

DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA

This document defines the terms representing the college standards in each of the three areas (professional development, teaching, and service) in which candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated. Although the Department has sought to distinguish the three areas, it recognizes that the categories are not entirely exclusive and that some activities may reflect achievement in more than one area.
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The candidate should strive to receive national recognition from peers in her or his field of study. Evidence of such recognition is provided by the faculty member’s record of publication in peer-reviewed outlets, by publication in sources recognized for quality in the field or discipline, by citations of the work of the faculty member in the products of other scholars, by receipt of peer-reviewed grants for research purposes, by the faculty member’s service on editorial boards and as a reviewer of grants and of manuscripts for scholarly publications, by invitations to contribute to various scholarly endeavors including edited books, conferences, etc., and by the reports of external reviewers utilized in the review process. This list is not intended to be exclusive of other possible evidence. The importance of each piece of evidence depends on the quality of the accomplishment as perceived by the scholarly community.

The Department of Political Science recognizes that scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic vs. applied research, theoretical vs. empirical work, scholarship of discovery vs. scholarship of integration, qualitative vs. quantitative methods, and primary vs. secondary analysis as less
important than whether the scholarship advances the knowledge of
the discipline beyond previous work. We believe that success in
professional development can be achieved in many ways and no one
approach is inherently superior to another.

Candidates will be judged on their total scholarship. For
example, a person who chooses mainly to write articles for
national journals using an anonymous review process conducted by
peers could be seen as equally successful with another who
publishes books whose publication process has comparable peer
review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication
outlets (e.g., articles, books (authored or edited), and
chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work,
just as those who specialize in one form of scholarly
expression.

A candidate’s body of scholarship should be assessed in
terms of how it advances the knowledge of political science
beyond previous work and, if appropriate, its impact on the
practice of politics at the international, national, state or
local level. Evidence of such advancement should be shown by
1) the presence of peer review, 2) the use of an anonymous review
technique, 3) reviews or citations, 4) the prestige of the
publisher or journal, 5) the candidate’s explanation of the
work’s importance, and 6) assessments by external reviewers.
Since peer review using an anonymous technique is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, and will give less credit to published work that was not refereed in this manner. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to teaching unless the text can be shown to advance the knowledge of the discipline beyond its status prior to publication.

The Department recognizes the lack of a consensus concerning a precise hierarchy of prestigious scholarly journals and presses. With regards to journals, distinctions can be reasonably made and each candidate's record will be reviewed for his or her contributions in three types of scholarly outlets: 1) highly respected journals in the discipline and fields of political science, 2) less prestigious but respected disciplinary and field journals, and 3) journals targeted to the candidate's sub-field specialty or specialties. The Department particularly encourages and values publication in the first category of journals, but publication in the other two categories will be valued as well.

The Department of Political Science recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative scholarship. The Department typically expects some individual scholarship but also recognizes that modern social scientific research is often a
team enterprise and can involve interdisciplinary research. Thus, we also value such collaborative efforts. Given that order of authorship does not necessarily convey information about relative contribution to the work, candidates should establish their relative contribution to coauthored work. Again, the quality of the work will be assessed independently.

As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. While this Department’s primary focus remains on the development of the discipline of political science, we recognize that political scientists regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we shall not disadvantage such work appearing in non-political science professional publications. The candidate and the outside evaluators should provide guidance in assessing the importance of non-mainstream publications and research. Even so, candidates should remember that achievement of a national reputation in political science is the goal of professional development in this Department.

Perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of publications required for promotion and tenure. The Department of Political Science strongly resists the idea that qualitative evaluations (e.g., achievement of national
reputation) can be defined solely by numbers of publications or other scholarly activities. In other words, there is no necessary number. We expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their publications and other research activities. For example, it is possible that a smaller number of works of outstanding quality will be evaluated as equal or superior to a much greater number of publications of lesser quality.

Obtaining extramural grants in support of one’s research is a valued professional development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources using peer review and an anonymous review system, will weigh heavily as evidence of professional development. Grant support, however, is only a means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research.

Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no specific type of such activities is required for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles. In these roles as well as the others outlined above, the candidate should
demonstrate a pattern of consistent professional development that reflects intellectual growth, increasing sophistication, and an active, ongoing research agenda.

**Evaluation of Professional Development**

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure should submit written evidence of professional development organized in the categories set forth in the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual*. Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate’s professional development according to the College Manual’s evaluative categories.

**Promotion and Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

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. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of the discipline of political science. The candidate should also have demonstrated a continued upward trajectory of high quality scholarship and should be in the process of establishing a national reputation in a field. As part of the departmental review, the candidate
will be evaluated on evidence that his/her current trajectory in professional development will support successful progress towards the rank of professor after promotion to associate professor with tenure.

The candidate will be judged **excellent** in professional development if he/she is achieving a national reputation in a field of the discipline and shows a continued upward trajectory of high quality research and scholarship. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6) of articles in respected journals with a national reputation that use an anonymous peer review process, or he/she might have published one research book in a respected academic press that uses an anonymous review process and a small number (1-2) of additional articles in respected peer-reviewed journals with a national reputation. Editing a published book will be considered in the candidate’s favor but will not substitute for authorship or co-authorship of a complete research book. Peer reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they are of comparable quality. These examples are only guidelines; they should not be taken as excluding other forms of publications or other combinations. Furthermore, the merit of each work may be determined only after its production.
In evaluating a candidate’s dossier, the committee will take due consideration of the guidelines outlined in the above section on professional development. In particular, the committee will consider the prestige and quality of the journals or presses in which a candidate’s work appears, the candidate’s specific contributions to co-authored works, and the impact of the candidate’s work on his/her field or subfield. Both scholarly citations and the comments of the external reviewers will factor heavily into the committee’s evaluation of impact. The committee will also remain cognizant that different scholarly practices and citation norms may exist in different subfields of political science.

In addition, to qualify as excellent, a candidate should be very active in other research roles that provide evidence of progress towards a national reputation. These could include conference participant, book reviewer, intramural research grant recipient, extramural research grant recipient, extramural research grant seeker, invited presenter, leader in APSA sections and other professional organizations, and book manuscript and/or journal referee. A candidate should also be able to point to an active, ongoing research agenda as evidence of his/her positive trajectory.
To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development. In keeping with University standards, both the quality and the level of achievements in the area of professional development must substantially surpass those required for promotion and tenure at the rank of associate professor. For example, since promotion to associate professor, the candidate may have published one research book with a respected academic press and a small number (1-2) of refereed articles in nationally or internationally respected journals, or the candidate might have published a significant number (6) refereed articles in nationally or internationally respected journals. Editing a published book will be considered in the candidate’s favor but will not substitute for authorship or co-authorship of a complete research book. Peer reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they are of comparable quality.

A professor is expected to have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research and scholarship. Thus, promotion to the rank of
professor is a recognition by the Department and the University
that is awarded to candidates who have distinguished records of
achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia
State University.

The candidate for promotion to the rank of professor will
be judged *excellent* in professional development if the
candidate’s accomplishments are of such significance and quality
that he/she has achieved and is highly likely to maintain a
national/international reputation as a respected scholar and
researcher in a field of the discipline. The candidate should
be able to document evidence of recognition from respected
scholars. This evidence should include most of the following:
considerable citations of her/his work by scholars in the field,
editorial board membership(s), a steady record of reviewer
experience, frequent participation in conferences, receipt of
extramural grants, receipt of professional awards, leadership
positions in professional organizations, and recognition as an
expert for the purpose of providing knowledge. The committee
will also remain cognizant that different scholarly practices
and citation norms may exist in different subfields of political
science.
Evaluation of Teaching

The teaching quality of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Department and the University. The candidate for promotion and/or tenure should submit written evidence of successful teaching organized in the categories set forth in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. Candidates should present evidence of effectiveness in and commitment to teaching and its improvement. The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the College Manual’s evaluative categories based on the evidence submitted. In making its rankings the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure should consider the evidence to determine the success of the candidate in teaching and his or her commitment to teaching and its improvement. Teaching should be considered both within the classroom and outside the classroom, and the committee may need to give more or less weight to each component depending on the circumstances of individual candidates.

Within the classroom, a faculty member should be prepared for class, should teach courses reflecting the current state of the discipline, should have syllabi prepared according to the standards of the College, should be available to students
outside the classroom, should give assignments that are well prepared and used effectively to encourage learning and analytical thinking, should have his/her students do work that teaches analytical thinking and improves writing skills, and should provide a positive learning environment. The committee should also consider the candidate’s efforts and commitment to teaching success and innovation by evaluating evidence of teaching preparation and pedagogical creativity, such as the creative use of technology, assignments, learning exercises, or other in-class techniques to enhance student learning. In considering student perceptions of the candidate’s teaching through student course evaluations, the committee will take into account such factors as the type of course.

Outside the classroom, a faculty member should strive to support student learning through such activities as writing and evaluating graduate comprehensive examinations, chairing or serving on honors thesis, masters thesis, and doctoral dissertation committees, sponsoring student organizations or teams, preparing graduate students for the job market, advising graduate and undergraduate students, developing and revising curricula and courses, aiding in instructional leadership and coordination, leading departmental seminars on pedagogy and advising, developing and supervising internships, developing and
supervising directed readings and independent studies,
publishing textbooks or pedagogical research, receiving grants for instructional purposes, participating in pedagogical continuing education, and helping graduate students in presenting papers, publishing, and/or job placement. Faculty members can also show evidence of outside the classroom teaching success by highlighting successful student endeavors connected with their supervision.

In rating the candidates, the committee needs to consider their academic rank and the availability of graduate students with compatible research interests. Other things equal, candidates for professor should have considerably more involvement with graduate students than candidates for associate professor.

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

To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in teaching. To achieve an evaluation of excellent, a candidate for promotion and tenure at the rank of associate professor must demonstrate success in teaching, effort at improvement in teaching, and a strong commitment to student learning.
Promotion to the Rank of Professor

To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in teaching. To achieve an evaluation of excellent, a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate considerable success in teaching, effort at improvement in teaching, and a strong commitment to student learning.

SERVICE

Service to colleagues, to our Department, to the College, to the University, and to the discipline of Political Science is a very important element in judging a faculty member’s contributions and performance. As members of a discipline concerned with policy issues and conflict resolution and as a faculty at a public university, we value opportunities to serve the community outside the University at the local, national or global level.

Neither the College nor the Department of Political Science asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior ranks as is asked from those in senior ranks. The information given below indicates what we in the Department...
of Political Science consider to be important forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality when evaluating a candidate’s work in the area of service.

**Evaluation of Service**

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure should submit written evidence of successful service organized in the categories set forth in the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual*. Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate’s service according to the College Manual’s evaluative categories.

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

For promotion and tenure at the rank of associate professor, the candidate must be evaluated as **good** in service. A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged **good** if she or he is active in assistance to colleagues, responsibly carries out the departmental service tasks that are assigned to him or her, and demonstrates a commitment to the betterment of the Department.
Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must be evaluated as very good in service. A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor will be judged very good if she or he is active in assistance to colleagues and has taken an effective leading role in departmental service. This should include one of more of the following: service as undergraduate director, graduate director, or department chair; chairing a recruitment committee or an important departmental standing or ad hoc committee; and/or serving on the departmental executive committee. In addition, to be judged very good, a candidate should perform significant service roles at the College, University, or System levels. Finally, he or she should show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations, or have significant contact with media representatives. Under certain circumstances, significant leadership roles in one area (College, University, System, professional, community, or governmental) can substitute for a lesser service role in another area.
The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Department of Political Science is governed by the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. Applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged by a committee composed of all tenured faculty in the Department holding the rank of associate professor or professor. Applications for promotion to the rank of professor and for tenure at that rank will be judged by a committee composed of all tenured professors. Each committee will elect its own chair and, after deliberation, report its evaluation in each area and its recommendation by letter to the department chair.

An important part of the departmental evaluation is the assessment of the candidate’s credentials by political scientists outside Georgia State University. The candidate must submit a list of the names of at least eight scholars in the candidate’s specialty area outside of Georgia State University who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s performance in the area of professional development and her/his reputation within the discipline. The department chair, together with the relevant departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, will, without input from the candidate, prepare a list of at least eight names
of colleagues outside of Georgia State University who could perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the College Manual. Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, which will select the reviewers according to the procedures laid out in the College Manual. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University. The calendar for this review process is in the College Manual.

PROCESS FOR REVISING THESE GUIDELINES

Any revisions to the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines will be governed by the following process:

1. Upon the request of the department chair, the faculty will elect a Promotion and Tenure Manual Revision Committee from among its members. This committee should include faculty at the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The committee will then select a chair holding the rank of professor or associate professor with tenure.

2. The Promotion and Tenure Manual Revision Committee will discuss changes to the Promotion and Tenure Manual, consulting the department chair and representatives of the College and University when appropriate. When the committee has reached agreement, it will present the faculty with its
proposed revisions. All meetings of the committee will be announced and open to all members of the faculty.

3. The full faculty will be given adequate time to consider these changes, and the committee will give any feedback careful consideration.

4. Once this process is complete, the committee will present a final proposal to the Department. This proposal will be adopted upon two-thirds vote of all current members of the Department holding the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

5. Should the proposal fail to be adopted, the committee will solicit another round of comments from the faculty and produce a further revision.

6. Once the revisions have been approved by the faculty, they will be forwarded to the College for its approval. Any substantive changes made in response to College input will need to be approved by the faculty by a two-thirds vote as outlined above.
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 is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s 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 projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by respected university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member may also have applied for internal or external research fellowships or grants. S/he would have performed several additional research roles, including active
participation in national professional organizations, such as presenting papers or serving as a journal or grants referee. **Excellent:** 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. The faculty member has published a number of journal articles in respected, peer-reviewed journals, a mixture of such journal articles and peer-reviewed book chapters of comparable quality, or has a published book or a book in press at a university or commercial academic press. In addition, the faculty member presents evidence that testifies to her/his scholarly reputation and the significance of her/his research. Such evidence might include the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies; citations of the work of the faculty member in the products of other scholars; service on editorial boards and as a reviewer of grants and manuscripts for scholarly publication; and by invitations to contribute to collaborative scholarly endeavors. This list is not intended to be exclusive of other possible evidence. **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards,
laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues 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.

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.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either 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.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, s/he may have little involvement with the type of individual student work that contributes to a rating of excellent, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores that tend to fall somewhat lower than the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or that are considerably lower than departmental norms for large introductory core courses.

**Excellent:** Beyond being a highly competent teacher in the classroom, the faculty member’s teaching record shows active preparation and involvement with individual student work, including directing undergraduate and graduate student research papers, serving on graduate qualifying examination committees,
or directing or serving on honors theses, non-thesis projects, master’s theses, and dissertation committees. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent at either level, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member also demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and that show innovation and creativity in teaching.

The faculty member may have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

**C. Service**

**Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments.
Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and actively assists colleagues.

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

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

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, 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 is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited. The faculty member may attend conferences and annual meetings and may write reviews and be active in media contacts, but may have very few scholarly publications in the period under review.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of maintaining a scholarly profile of national prominence.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The books,
book chapters, and/or articles of the faculty member judged as
excellent are published by presses and in journals that are held
in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the
faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. Other important
evidence might include the securing of fellowships, grants,
contracts, and/or awards from external agencies, invitations to
participate in collaborative endeavors with other scholars, a
steady record of reviewer experience, frequent participation in
congresses, recognition as an expert for the purpose of
providing knowledge, and leadership positions in professional
organizations.

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or
her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, a
very strong record of publication, receipt of prestigious
extramural support, strong reviews in major publication outlets,
invited lectures at 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.

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.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely
exceeds adequate. This faculty member's supporting materials
provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent,
valid content, but fail to demonstrate either 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.

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

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows extensive preparation and extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of honors theses, non-thesis projects, master’s theses and/or dissertations to completion; or high level of involvement on such committees. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. Faculty members can also show evidence of outside the classroom teaching success by highlighting successful student endeavors connected with their supervision.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member also demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or
her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and that show innovation and creativity in teaching. The faculty member may also have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, or been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

C. Service

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

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

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.
Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels as well as participating in professional associations and beginning to take service roles in professional organizations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. In addition, s/he should show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations, or have significant contact with media representatives. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good. Under certain circumstances, significant leadership roles in one area (College, University, System, professional, community, or governmental) can substitute for a lesser service role in another area.

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