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 decision to promote and/or tenure a faculty member is viewed by the Department of Psychology as one of the most important decisions that it has to make. The careers of individual faculty are markedly affected. In addition, the future health and development of the department, as well as the morale of the faculty, are directly related to the appropriateness of the decisions. As such, the department’s recommendations are only made after careful deliberations, employing the best available evidence, and with the most reasonable and concrete criteria available. The process and criteria applied have been carefully considered and endorsed by the members of the tenured faculty in the Department of Psychology with the review and endorsement of the College of Arts and Sciences.

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 with a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the process that will be followed in the department. Candidates are directed to both the Georgia State University Policy for Promotion, Tenure, and Development for Tenure Track Faculty and the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure 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 Department of Psychology will evaluate all candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. As will be described later in this document, the department 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 both by a departmental committee and by the departmental chair. The college manual describes the entire review process and the evaluation standards and takes precedence over the department guidelines. 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 service. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, a candidate must be judged excellent in professional development and teaching and very good in the area of service.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Psychology views professional development as encompassing those activities that advance our discipline by creating or extending psychological knowledge and modes of inquiry. The department recognizes that scholarship in psychology comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical versus empirical work, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses as misguided struggles over false choices. Each research topic, method, approach, and technique shall be judged on whether it is appropriate to the stated research goal and whether it advances the candidate’s program of research. No one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.
The department’s goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship and we will expect every candidate to meet that standard. Quality of scholarship will be assessed on several factors: 1) the work’s recognition in the field, shown through reviews, citations, and/or other evidence; 2) the prestige, standing, and/or impact scores of the journal in which an article appears or of the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate’s explanation of the importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the committee’s independent assessment of the work. Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give less emphasis to work that was not refereed.

The department recognizes that a loose hierarchy of scholarly journals does exist within the discipline of psychology. Indeed, journal rankings are inherently difficult to establish, and this is most apparent with specialty journals, where specialists may come from a variety of different disciplines. In recognition of these limitations, the department uses such rankings cautiously. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to instruction unless the text can be shown to make significant contributions to advancing the scholarship of the discipline.

Obtaining extramural grant support for one’s research is a highly valued professional development activity and success in seeking grant support – particularly from national and other prestigious peer-reviewed sources – will weigh heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation. We believe, however, that grant support is a means to an end and is not the only way to accomplish significant work. While the department recognizes the clear value inherent in candidates' demonstrated ability to obtain financial support for their research, we emphasize that candidates must also produce empirical publications of high quality.

The Department of Psychology recognizes the value of both individual and collaborative scholarship. Research in psychology is increasingly a team enterprise, and the department recognizes that psychologists can and do regularly conduct interdisciplinary research that makes scholarly contributions to other disciplines. As a result of our faculty’s broad expertise, interdisciplinary collaborations, and the nature of the discipline of psychology, candidate’s publications may appear in a range of scholarly outlets. We assign value to publications that appear in psychology and other professional refereed publications. In addition, collaborative and/or interdisciplinary research, by definition, results in publications and grants with multiple contributors. We cannot, therefore, assign higher intrinsic value to either single-authored or jointly-authored works. We also know that the ordering of authors or investigators does not always convey clear information about participants’ relative contribution to the work and, in fact, can convey different information about the relative contribution to the work in different sub-fields. The candidate’s contribution to all published works should be made clear in the dossier, as per the college manual, section V.

Candidates are expected to engage in other professional activities that advance their research program and have an impact on the field. Although no specific type of such activities shall be required for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion should demonstrate meaningful activity in such roles. Finally, the Department of Psychology strongly resists the idea that the evaluation of one’s work can be defined solely by the number of publications, the number or size of grants, or the
number of other scholarly activities performed. Thus, we expect candidates to
demonstrate their scholarly impact not only through quantity, but also through quality of
refereed publications, external grants, and other research activities.

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

The candidate should submit written evidence of professional development
organized as instructed in the college manual. Evidence of professional development
includes: 1) invited and peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings; 2)
scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and reviews; 3) awards and grants; 4)
significant professional services; 5) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional
associations; 6) general recognition within the discipline of psychology; and 7)
specialized professional activities in the discipline of psychology.

**Evaluation of Professional Development**

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

As stated in the college manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is
available only to those who are judged to be **excellent** in professional development.
Following college and university standards, a candidate for promotion to the rank of
associate professor must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has
already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline or field as determined by
peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in
his/her field. Finally, the candidate’s body of work and professional development
statement should indicate a trajectory of continued scholarship to support future promotion
to professor.

An assistant professor seeking promotion is expected to have developed a focused
research agenda demonstrating the candidate’s own expertise in his or her specialty area.
Primary evidence of such a research agenda includes a significant number of high quality
refereed articles. Book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university
or commercial academic presses are also considered. Although less common at this stage
of professional development, monographs and authored books published by prestigious
university or commercial academic presses would also be considered as evidence for such
a research agenda.

A candidate’s research agenda should also demonstrate the capacity to obtain
external support for their scholarly work. Typically, this capacity is evidenced by the
candidate’s involvement in externally funded research as an investigator with a clearly
delineated role. The department is attentive to availability of resources when considering
a candidate’s research funding.

To qualify as **excellent**, a candidate also should have been active in other research
roles. Typically, candidates have served as ad hoc journal referees. Other roles may include book or special issue editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, a consultant on external awards, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

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

As noted in the college manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is a recognition awarded to candidates who have a distinguished record of achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia State University. The *University Manual* states that both the quality and the level of achievements required for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of professor must substantially surpass those required for a recommendation of promotion to associate professor. A professor is expected to have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and sustained a productive program of research with a high probability of continued quality scholarship.

As stated in the college manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is available only to those whose professional development is judged as excellent. To qualify as excellent, the candidate should have published a significant number of high quality refereed articles. Book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses are also considered. Monographs and authored books published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses would also be considered as evidence for such a research agenda.

In addition, candidates should typically have served as a principal investigator on external grants of a caliber that demonstrate the national prominence of their scholarship. This includes grants from federal agencies, prestigious foundations, or significant levels of state funding. A co-principal investigator may be considered the equivalent of a principal investigator if the candidate demonstrates a significant leadership role in the project. Candidates who have not served as principal investigators on grants should present comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants or receiving one or more nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments. In addition, candidates should demonstrate significant activity in additional research roles, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, a consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

**TEACHING**

Teaching is of great importance in the evaluation of candidates for promotion and/or tenure. Candidates are expected to be engaged in activities related to classroom instruction and individual mentoring. The ways in which faculty participate in these types of activities vary by program area as well as by individual areas of expertise. The candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching, with the dossier organized according to the categories in the college manual. In assessing the quality of teaching, the department will evaluate candidates based on the whole body
of evidence presented in the dossier, taking into account the diverse ways in which faculty in the Psychology department participate in classroom-related instructional and mentoring activities.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

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

As stated in the college manual, promotion and/or tenure is available only to those who are judged to be *excellent* in teaching. A candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at classroom-related teaching and is developing effectiveness in mentoring students outside of the classroom.

Highly effective candidates will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. One 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. Additionally, other materials provided in candidates’ teaching portfolios, including pedagogical publications and teaching awards, will also be used to gauge effectiveness.

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the candidate is expected to be developing and demonstrating a commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom. Involvement in mentoring typically includes (a) chairing one or more completed or ongoing dissertation and/or thesis committee(s), (b) being a member of additional dissertation and/or thesis committees, (c) preparation or evaluation of departmental Ph.D. exams, and (d) mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, for example through supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica. Other mentoring activities described in candidates’ dossiers (e.g., postdoctoral or post-baccalaureate supervision) will also be evaluated.

Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ successful endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship. Examples of such endeavors for graduate students include authorship on publications and professional presentations at local, regional, national, or international conferences; submission and award of doctoral fellowships and grants; student awards; and other accomplishments relevant to students’ specific program of study and career trajectory. Examples for undergraduate students include student awards, publications, or presentations at university, regional, national, or international professional conferences.

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

As stated in the college manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is available only to those who are judged to be *excellent* in teaching. A candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at classroom-related teaching and has an established record of effectiveness in mentoring students outside of the classroom.

Highly effective candidates will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. One 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 factors such as the type of
course. Additionally, other materials provided in candidates’ teaching portfolios,
including pedagogical publications and teaching awards, will also be used to gauge
effectiveness.

For promotion to professor, the expectation is that the candidate will have a
record of highly involved and effective mentoring outside the classroom. Involvement in
mentoring typically includes (a) chairing multiple completed dissertation committee(s),
(b) being a member on additional dissertation and/or thesis committees, (c) preparation or
evaluation of departmental Ph.D. exams, and (d) mentoring undergraduate and/or
graduate students, for example through supervising honors theses, directed readings, and
research or applied practica. Involvement in other mentoring activities described in
candidates’ dossiers (e.g., postdoctoral or post-baccalaureate supervision) will also be
evaluated.

Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ successful
endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship. Examples of such endeavors for
graduate students include authorship on publications and professional presentations at
local, regional, national, or international conferences; submission and award of doctoral
fellowships and grants; and other accomplishments relevant to students’ specific program
of study and career trajectory. Examples for undergraduate students include publications
or presentations at university, regional, or national professional conferences.

SERVICE

Service to one’s colleagues, to the department, to the college, and to the
University is a very important element in judging faculty’s contributions and
performance. Faculty also provide service to their academic discipline, usually by
participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or
board members. In addition, psychology, as a field of study concerned with
psychological issues and problems, is conducive to useful, discipline-relevant forms of
community service, so efforts at applying psychological knowledge and methods to
address community concerns are highly valued in our department.

Neither the college nor the Department of Psychology asks the same quantity and
quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. The information
given below indicates what we in the Department of Psychology consider important
forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging
different levels of quality when evaluating candidates’ work in the area of service.
Candidates must submit written evidence of service activity related to their areas of
professional competence according to the Categories for Service in the College of Arts
and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual.

Evaluation of Service

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

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor the candidate
must be evaluated as good in service. Candidates will be judged good if they been active
in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks that were assigned to them.


Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor the candidate must be evaluated as very good in service. Candidates will be judged very good if they have (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) carried out the service tasks assigned to them and, (c) effectively assumed major service roles that serve the mission of the university. In addition, candidates may have made significant contributions to professional associations or to other organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that benefit from the candidate’s expertise as a psychologist.
APPENDIX I:
RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR PRE-TENURE REVIEW

A. Professional Development

Outstanding: The faculty member’s scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance. In such instances, faculty may publish significant numbers of refereed articles in top tier journals and serve a leading role (e.g., PI, PD, Co-PI) on multiple or particularly prestigious externally funded projects, in addition to meeting the criteria for excellent outlined below.

Excellent: The evidence indicates that the faculty member produces high quality scholarship. The faculty member demonstrates a research program with a trajectory towards a national/international reputation. The faculty member has published a significant number of high quality refereed articles. Book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses are also considered. The faculty member demonstrates efforts to obtain external support for their scholarly work. The faculty member also demonstrates significant activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Very Good: The evidence indicates the faculty member has not yet consistently produced high quality scholarship. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member demonstrates some activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Good: The evidence indicates that the faculty member has not published a sufficient number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality. Although the faculty member may have demonstrated activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer, this activity does not constitute a substitute for generating a sufficient number of publications.

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

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

Faculty are expected to be engaged in activities related to classroom instruction and individual mentoring. However, the ways in which faculty participate in these types of activities vary by program area as well as by individual areas of expertise. In assessing the quality of teaching, the department will evaluate faculty based on the whole body of evidence presented in their teaching portfolios, taking into account the diverse ways in which faculty in the department participate in classroom-related instructional and mentoring activities. The department also takes into consideration that factors such as research obligations and other responsibilities affect the quantity of classroom-related teaching year to year.

**Outstanding:** The record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent described below. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational 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 training grants or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may have published a textbook or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.

**Excellent:** The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly 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. Highly involved mentoring typically includes (a) chairing one or more completed or ongoing dissertation and/or thesis committee(s); (b) being a member of additional dissertation and/or thesis committees; (c) preparation or evaluation of departmental Ph.D. exams; and (d) mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, for example through supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica. Other mentoring activities described in candidates’ dossiers (e.g., postdoctoral or post-baccalaureate supervision) will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship. Examples of such endeavors for graduate students include authorship on publications and professional conference presentations, submission and award of doctoral fellowships and grants, and other activities relevant to students’ specific program of study and career trajectory. Effective mentoring is a process that may unfold over several years.
Very Good: The evidence indicates effective classroom teaching and moderate involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent course development, preparation, and/or execution. Markers of classroom teaching effectiveness are described above. Moderately involved mentoring typically includes being a member of dissertation and/or thesis committees, plus some evidence of individual supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate students, for example through chairing a dissertation or thesis committee, supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica.

Good: The faculty member does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described above.

Fair: The evidence indicates a minimally acceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Poor: The evidence indicates an unacceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal and ineffective or no involvement in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

C. Service

Outstanding: A faculty member will be judged outstanding in service if criteria for excellent are met and s/he has been substantially active and engaged in a professional organization or won a prestigious service award.

Excellent: A faculty member will be judged excellent in service if the criteria for very good are met and s/he has been active and effective in significant service. Typically this includes significant service outside of the department or holding a major leadership role within the department.

Very Good: The faculty member has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) carried out the service tasks assigned and, (c) effectively assumed service roles that serve the mission of the department (e.g., membership on a standing departmental committee, chairing a faculty search committee).

Good: The faculty member has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks that were assigned.

Fair: The faculty member manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.
Poor: The faculty member manifests no significant service accomplishments and does not carry out service roles assigned. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable impact.
APPENDIX II:
RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Professional Development

**Outstanding:** The faculty member’s scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance. In such instances, faculty may publish significant numbers of refereed articles in top tier journals and serve a leading role (e.g., PI, PD, Co-PI) on multiple or particularly prestigious externally funded projects, in addition to meeting the criteria for excellent outlined below.

**Excellent:** The evidence indicates that the faculty member produces high quality scholarship. The faculty member demonstrates a research program with an established national/international reputation. The faculty member has published a significant number of high quality refereed articles. Book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses are also considered. The faculty member has a track record of external grant funding that demonstrates the national/international prominence of their scholarship. The faculty member also demonstrates significant activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

**Very Good:** The evidence indicates that the faculty member produces quality scholarship but has not continued to demonstrate a trajectory consistent with significant national/international impact. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by prestigious university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member demonstrates some activity in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

**Good:** The evidence indicates that the faculty member is not consistently publishing a sufficient number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality. Although the faculty member may currently be insufficiently active in additional roles related to professional development, such as book or journal editor, editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, consultant on external awards, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer, this activity does not constitute a substitute for generating a sufficient number of publications.

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

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

Faculty are expected to be engaged in activities related to classroom instruction and individual mentoring. However, the ways in which faculty participate in these types of activities vary by program area as well as by individual areas of expertise. In assessing the quality of teaching, the department will evaluate faculty based on the whole body of evidence presented in their teaching portfolios, taking into account the diverse ways in which faculty in the department participate in classroom-related instructional and mentoring activities. The department also takes into consideration that factors such as research obligations and other responsibilities affect the quantity of classroom-related teaching year to year.

Outstanding: The record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent described below. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational 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 training grants or student awards; and there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member may have published a textbook or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.

Excellent: The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly 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. Highly involved mentoring typically includes (a) chairing multiple completed or ongoing dissertation committees; (b) being a member of additional dissertation and/or thesis committees; (c) preparation or evaluation of departmental Ph.D. exams; and (d) mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students through, for example, supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica. Other mentoring activities described in candidates’ dossiers (e.g., postdoctoral or post-baccalaureate supervision) will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship. Examples of such endeavors for graduate students include authorship on publications and professional conference presentations, submission and award of doctoral fellowships and grants, and other activities relevant to students’ specific program of study and career trajectory.

Effective mentoring is a process that may unfold over several years.
**Very Good:** The evidence indicates effective classroom teaching and moderate involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent course development, preparation, and/or execution. Markers of classroom teaching effectiveness are described above. Moderately involved mentoring typically includes being a member of dissertation and/or thesis committees, plus some evidence of individual supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate students, for example through chairing a dissertation or thesis committee, supervising honors theses, directed readings, and research or applied practica.

**Good:** The faculty member does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described above.

**Fair:** The evidence indicates a minimally acceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Poor:** The evidence indicates an unacceptable record of teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described above, minimal and ineffective or no involvement in mentoring students, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**C. Service**

**Outstanding:** A faculty member will be judged outstanding in service if criteria for excellent are met and s/he has been substantially active and engaged in a professional organization or won a prestigious service award.

**Excellent:** A faculty member will be judged excellent in service if the criteria for very good are met and s/he has been active and effective in significant service. Typically this includes significant service outside of the department or holding a major leadership role within the department.

**Very Good:** The faculty member has (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) carried out the service tasks assigned and, (c) effectively assumed service roles that serve the mission of the department (e.g., membership on a standing departmental committee, chairing a faculty search committee).

**Good:** The faculty member has been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks that were assigned.

**Fair:** The faculty member manifests the bare minimum of significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but makes few effective contributions to the business of those committees.
Poor: The faculty member manifests no significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on departmental committees, but without a documentable impact.