

**DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

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

Policy Title:	Department of Religious Studies Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	3
Department Approval:	11/08/2013
College Approval:	Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 02/05/2014

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
a. General Comments	
b. Tenure	
c. Promotion	
2. The Promotion and Tenure Process in the Department	3
a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process	
b. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure Within the Department	
c. Committee Membership	
3. The Evaluation of Candidates	5
a. Terms Used in Evaluation	
b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	
c. Departmental Evaluation Process	
4. Evaluation of Professional Development	5
a. General Comments on Professional Development	
b. Procedures in the Evaluation of Professional Development	
c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development	
d. Assignment of Final Evaluation Term to an Item in Category A Professional Development	
e. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development	
f. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Professional Development	
5. Evaluation of Teaching	10
a. General Comments on Teaching	
b. Evaluation Process for Teaching	
c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Teaching	
6. Evaluation of Service	12
a. General Comments on Service	
b. Evaluation Process for Service	
c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Service	
7. The Overall Promotion and Tenure Recommendation	14
8. Post-Evaluation Procedures	14
9. The Assessment of Journals and Presses	16
10. Third-Year Promotion and Tenure Review	18

1 **1. Introduction**

2
3 The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring the quality
4 of scholarship, teaching, and service in the university. The process is intended to be both
5 thorough and fair. The promotion and tenure policies of the Department of Religious Studies
6 have been formulated in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board of
7 Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Georgia State University Promotion & Tenure
8 Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors, and the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the
9 College of Arts and Sciences. The policies, procedures, and standards of the Regents, University
10 and College take precedence over and govern the material in this manual.

11
12 As a result, individuals using these guidelines are urged to consult these other documents from
13 beginning to end. To avoid repetition and potential inconsistencies, many details essential to the
14 promotion and tenure process and delineated in these other manuals have not been included here.
15 It is particularly important that the following guidelines be read in tandem with the Promotion
16 and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

17
18 The departmental guidelines contained in this document are designed to provide information
19 concerning specific expectations for performance and achievement for promotion and tenure to
20 candidates from the Department of Religious Studies and to guide the deliberations of members
21 of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and the department chair. It is important
22 that all of these parties become thoroughly familiar with these guidelines, as well as with those
23 contained in the College and University manuals. Candidates are specifically directed to the
24 College manual for guidance about preparing, formatting and submitting a dossier in application
25 for tenure and/or promotion.

26
27 The content, guidelines, and standards in this document will be reviewed at any time if so
28 requested by the Chair of the Department or by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track
29 departmental faculty. Any changes in policies or procedures will require a two-thirds vote of the
30 tenured and tenure-track members of the Department, and any changes in substantive standards
31 will require a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured members of the Department. As specified
32 in the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, any changes proposed by the
33 Department only become effective upon approval of the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion
34 and Tenure Review Board.

35
36 **2. The Promotion and Tenure Process in the Department**

37
38 **a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process**

39
40 Recommendations with regard to promotion and tenure begin at the departmental level. Both the
41 Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair provide independent
42 evaluations and make independent recommendations about a candidate to the College's relevant
43 area committee. The College Committee subsequently makes a recommendation to the Dean.
44 The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost, who makes a recommendation to the
45 President, and the President makes the final decision.

47 b. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure Within the Department

48
49 No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the Department Chair will remind all
50 faculty in the Department who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure that they may so apply.
51 All eligible faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must state
52 their intention in writing no later than the date specified in the College Manual. Those who wish
53 to apply must provide the Department Chair with a list of eight possible outside reviewers for
54 professional development. The chair will also provide a list of eight possible reviewers. For
55 details on this process, see the College Manual (section V.H.). The reviewers should not be from
56 institutions in Georgia, should not have taught at the institution from which the candidate
57 received his or her Ph.D. during the time the candidate was at that institution, and should be from
58 national research universities and national liberal arts colleges that qualify as aspirant peers to
59 Georgia State University. In cases involving promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers may
60 be either associate or full professors, though the candidate should give first preference to full
61 professors; in cases of promotion to Professor, reviewers must be full professors. The Office of
62 the Dean will be responsible for selecting and contacting the external reviewers.

63
64 No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must provide the Chair of
65 the Department with copies of his or her professional development materials to be sent to the
66 outside evaluators. For details on this process and the nature of the materials to be included, see
67 the College Manual (section V.I.).

68
69 No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must submit his or her
70 dossier to the Department Chair. The material must be in the format required by the College
71 Manual (sections V.A. – V.G.). At this time, candidates must also submit their Teaching
72 Portfolio as a component of the promotion and tenure process. By departmental policy, this
73 portfolio must include: (a) the latest version of syllabi for all courses taught during the past four
74 years, (b) a representative sample of materials given to the students in all of these courses (e.g.,
75 tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments), and (c) the numerical and written
76 student evaluations for all of these courses.

77
78 The Department Chair will add the letters from the outside reviewers to the dossier before the
79 dossier is given to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Portions of the outside
80 reviewers' letters may be quoted in the evaluation letters written by the Department Committee
81 and the Department Chair as part of the evaluation process, but the identities of the outside
82 evaluators must not be explicitly or implicitly revealed.

83
84 c. Membership of the Department Committee

85
86 For details on the membership of the Department Committee, see the College Manual (section
87 III.A.).

88
89 d. Department Evaluation Procedures

90

91 The Chair of the Department Committee will call the meeting to evaluate the candidate. Prior to
92 meeting, the members of the Committee will familiarize themselves with the College manual,
93 departmental guidelines and the candidate's materials.

94
95 The Department Committee will meet to discuss and deliberate about each candidate being
96 considered for promotion and/or tenure.

97
98 Both the Department Committee and the Department Chair will provide recommendations
99 regarding promotion and/or tenure. For details on these processes, see the College Manual
100 (section III.A.).

101
102 Unless otherwise noted in this document, the College Manual, or the University Manual,
103 *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* will be followed throughout the deliberations.

104
105 Confidentiality: The deliberations of the Committee are strictly confidential. The only
106 information the candidate should receive about the deliberations is the letters sent forward to the
107 Department Chair. No discussion of substantive aspects of the deliberations should be held with
108 any individual who is not part of the formal decision-making process.

109
110 e. Conveying the Recommendations of the Department Committee and Chair

111
112 Both the Department Committee and the Department Chair will provide letters outlining their
113 recommendations with regard to promotion and/or tenure. For details on this process, see the
114 College Manual (section III.A.).

115
116 **3. The Evaluation of Candidates**

117
118 a. Standard Used in Evaluation

119
120 Candidates for promotion are evaluated in three areas: professional development, teaching, and
121 service (to the department, university, community, and profession). In each of these three areas,
122 candidates are evaluated based on whether or not the candidate meets the standard for promotion
123 and/or tenure.

124
125 Evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration,
126 the standards of the candidate's subfield, and the mission and resources of the Department of
127 Religious Studies, the College, and of the University.

128 b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

129 *Associate Professor*

130 In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor,
131 the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional development. The successful
132 candidate must present evidence that he or she is recognized as having an emerging national
133 reputation according to professionals in his or her field outside of the University and is making

134 significant contributions to the advancement and development of his or her field. In the category
135 of teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* to be recommended for tenure and
136 promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. An evaluation of *excellent* in teaching presumes a
137 demonstrated ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and
138 graduate students and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The
139 candidate must also be judged as contributing significantly and positively to the service activities
140 of the department and thereby evaluated as at least *good* in the category of service.

141 Further details governing the evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of
142 Associate Professor are outlined in sections 4, 5, and 6 below.

143 *Professor*

144 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates
145 who have distinguished records of achievement and standing at Georgia State University and in
146 their professions nationally and internationally. The quality and number of achievements
147 required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor surpass those required for a
148 recommendation to Associate Professor. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at
149 the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional development,
150 *excellent* in teaching, and *very good* in service.

151 The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor are the same as those described above and
152 outlined in sections 4, 5, and 6 below for promotion to Professor.

153 **4. Evaluation of Professional Development**

154 155 **a. General Comments on Professional Development**

156 The evaluation of a candidate's Professional Development is based primarily on the candidate's
157 consistent publication of important original scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, books)
158 along with additional scholarly work significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations,
159 book reviews, editing and refereeing work). The Department sees the peer-review process as a
160 principal determiner of the type of scholarship a candidate has produced. Scholarship and
161 scholarly activities that have not undergone a peer-review process may be considered
162 "significant to the profession," but they will not weigh as heavily as peer-reviewed projects and
163 publications. The candidate must submit evidence of professional development organized
164 according to the categories of professional development listed in the College manual (section
165 V.E.).

166 The Department of Religious Studies recognizes that professional development can take many
167 forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as
168 scholars in the profession. For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles
169 for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his or her
170 work in books that undergo comparable peer-review scrutiny. Other candidates will pursue a
171 mixture of publications (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books). While
172 there is no one path, the Department recognizes that some external reviewers from our field have

173 increasingly expected candidates for promotion and tenure to publish books. The Department
174 recognizes that the nature of publishing is changing and will consider those realities in the
175 context of candidates' subfields.

176 While the Department of Religious Studies recognizes the central importance of refereed journal
177 articles to the profession, it also acknowledges the significant accomplishment represented by
178 having leading scholars in one's field invite one to contribute substantive articles and chapters to
179 anthologies, encyclopedias, and other scholarly works. The particular significance of an
180 individual instance of such scholarship can be weighed, in part, by the presence/absence of a
181 peer-review process, the reputation of the editor(s) of the volume, and the quality of the journal
182 or press in which it is published.

183 The Department of Religious Studies appreciates the increasingly prominent role that on-line
184 publication and other electronic resources play in the production and dissemination of
185 knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are sometimes difficult
186 to apply to emerging forms of scholarship relying on electronic media. Therefore, if including
187 such materials in their dossiers, candidates should make a case for the quality of the project by
188 briefly outlining its distinctive contribution to disciplinary knowledge and to the candidate's
189 professional development, providing evidence of peer review, when applicable, and/or by noting
190 citations of the project in other venues when applicable.

191 Obtaining external funding for one's research or creative works is a valued professional
192 development activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources,
193 will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in one's disciplines. At the same time, the
194 Department of Religious Studies recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in
195 some departmental sub-fields and, furthermore, that grant support is a means to the end of
196 producing scholarship, not an end in itself. The candidate should explain how grants she or he
197 has received have contributed or will contribute to the publication of peer-reviewed materials or
198 other significant scholarly accomplishments.

199 Other scholarly activities, such as making presentations at professional meetings and reviewing,
200 refereeing, and editing the scholarly work of others also are valued and expected activities for
201 any scholar. Although no one type of activity is mandated for promotion and tenure, successful
202 candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in some roles.

203 The Department of Religious Studies resists the idea that meeting the professional development
204 standard is solely a matter of the quantity of a candidate's publications or other scholarly
205 activities. We expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both
206 the quality and quantity of their professional record. Evaluation of an individual faculty
207 member's professional development will focus on the entire profile of that individual's
208 contribution.

209 b. Procedures for the Evaluation of Professional Development

210
211 The Committee will first divide the candidate's professional development materials into two
212 categories, Category A and Category B. Category A items include important original

213 publications of scholarly research that have been subjected to the peer-review process (e.g.,
214 articles, chapters, and books). At the discretion of the candidate and/or Department Committee,
215 Category A may also include grants received in support of these publications. Category B items
216 are other scholarly works significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, reviews,
217 editing and refereeing others' work). While the departmental committee typically will have
218 comments from the outside reviewers on the nature and quality of most of the items found in
219 Category A, this will be less typical of the items placed in Category B.

220

221 Examples of Category A Items

- 222 Articles
- 223 Books
- 224 Book Chapters
- 225 Book Review Essays
- 226 Critical Encyclopedia Articles
- 227 Critical Introductions to Anthologies
- 228 Critical Translations of Books and Articles
- 229 Edited volumes
- 230 Essays in Anthologies
- 231 Fellowships and Grants Received
- 232 Scholarly Monographs

233

234 Examples of Category B Items

- 235 Bibliographical Monographs
- 236 Book Notes
- 237 Book Reviews
- 238 Commentaries on Papers Read at Professional Meetings
- 239 Editorial Service to Journal and Book Publishers
- 240 Expository Encyclopedia Articles
- 241 Honors and Awards
- 242 Professional papers presented
- 243 Review of Programs and Candidates at Other Institutions

244

245 Note 1: Book review essays are article-length works that contain sustained critical
246 discussion. Book reviews are standard-length reviews of the work of others. Book notes
247 are short reviews of the work of others.

248

249 Note 2: In cases of collaborative efforts (e.g., coauthored articles), the candidate must
250 submit a statement indicating the specific share he/she contributed to the item.

251

252

253 c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development

254

255 In the manner described below, the Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate each item
256 placed in Category A individually.

257

258 The Committee will consider what the letters of the outside reviewers say, if anything, about the
259 item in question. The departmental evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and
260 contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly. After a discussion of the outside
261 reviewers' comments, each member of the Departmental Committee will determine whether, in
262 his or her view, the reviewers, taken as a group, judge the item under consideration as meeting
263 the standard for professional development.

264
265 The Committee will consult the Departmental List of Presses and Journals—compiled over
266 several years based on input from leading scholars from outside Georgia State University (see
267 Appendix) – to help determine the press/journal's generally perceived quality in the field, and
268 this will contribute to the Committee's consideration of whether the publication meets the
269 professional development standard. The fact that a scholarly work appears in a press/journal not
270 on the Departmental List should not be taken to imply anything about its quality.

271 The Committee will read the published materials included in the Candidate's dossier and
272 evaluate the relative quality of each item according to the evidence it provides of sound research
273 methods, creative engagement with the requisite fields or sub-fields, clarity and rigor of
274 expression and, where relevant, its impact on contemporary scholarly discussion. This aspect of
275 the assessment relies on the Committee's professional judgment of the Candidate's scholarship.

276
277 Finally, the Committee will establish the Final Assessment of the item. The Final Assessment
278 will take into account the external reviewer's recommendations, the quality of the presses and
279 journals in which the candidate has published (as determined by a departmental process laid out
280 in the Appendix), the variety of the candidate's distinct contributions to his/her field, and the
281 professional judgment of the Committee members.

282 283 d. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development

284
285 The Committee next shall consider all Category B Professional Development accomplishments
286 in the candidate's dossier. The Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate the items in
287 Category B. While supporting evidence will be sparser here (outside evaluation letters may
288 contain no mention of these items and copies of presented papers are not included in the dossier),
289 the Committee Chair will solicit comments from the Committee about the scholarly significance
290 of the various Category B accomplishments. Final assessments may not be assigned to every
291 item in Category B, but the candidate's accomplishments in this area will become part of his or
292 her Professional Development Profile (see section 4.f, below).

293 294 e. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Professional Development

295
296 To arrive at an assessment in Professional Development, the Professional Development Profile
297 will be examined and applied in light of the criteria set forth below.

298
299 The Department Committee will develop an overall assessment of the Candidate's dossier as it
300 relates to Professional Development. In all cases, the number of publications required to earn a
301 particular assessment decreases as the quality of the candidate's publications and the number and
302 quality of the candidate's Category B professional development activities increase.

303

304 The final assessment of the Departmental Committee for Professional Development shall be the
305 highest assessment to which the majority of the Committee can agree. As noted in the College
306 Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final evaluation will write a Minority
307 Report. Such a Minority Report must include substantive justification for the Minority's
308 disagreement with the final assessment of the majority of the Committee.
309

310 *Rankings for Associate Professor (Professional Development)*

311 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is
312 available only to those candidates who are judged as *excellent* in professional development,
313 *excellent* in teaching, and at least *good* in service.

314 A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor will be judged as
315 *excellent* in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's
316 scholarly work is highly accomplished. There are obviously many ways for a candidate to
317 provide justification for such a conclusion. For example, a candidate may have published a book
318 and one or two articles in top tier journals or presses. Alternatively, a candidate's portfolio may
319 include a combination of articles or book chapters in top tier or highly regarded journals or
320 presses, production of an edited volume, published book review essays, critical translations, and
321 had his or her work recognized with a fellowship or grant. While the exact number and type of
322 materials in this combination may vary, the candidate will be assessed based on the candidate's
323 distinct contributions to his/her field. To receive an overall ranking of *excellent*, a candidate may
324 also have been active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher, conference session
325 organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, external grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

326 *Rankings for Professor (Professional Development)*

327 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available
328 only to those candidates whose professional development is judged as *excellent*.

329 The candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Professional Development if the Committee's
330 judgment is that the candidate's scholarship is widely recognized as highly accomplished. Such a
331 candidate will typically have published a second book. In addition, the candidate may have also
332 published two or three articles in top tier journals or presses or alternatively published a
333 combination of articles or book chapters in top tier or highly regarded journals or presses,
334 produced an edited volume, published book review essays, critical translations, and had his or
335 her work recognized with a fellowship or grant. While the exact number and type of materials in
336 this combination may vary, the candidate will be assessed based on the candidate's distinct
337 contributions to his/her field. To be recommended for such promotion, a candidate also should
338 have been very active in other research roles, such as invited lecturer and panelist in national and
339 international venues, intramural researcher, conference session organizer or presenter, journal
340 editor or referee, book series editor, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

341 **5. Evaluation of Teaching**

342 a. General Comments on Teaching

343 The Department of Religious Studies regards high quality teaching and student learning to be of
344 foremost importance to its mission. Teaching is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such,
345 the Department recognizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement as central in the
346 evaluation of its faculty members. The Department expects its faculty members to be engaged in
347 instructional efforts, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, not only in the classroom
348 setting but also in directing individual student work.

349 The evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate's submission of documentation
350 organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the College manual (section V.F.).
351 Types of evidence include:

352 1. Courses Taught During the Last Four Academic Years

353 2. Perceptions of Students

354 3. Honors or Special Recognitions for Teaching

355 4. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, and Dissertations

356 5. Published Materials (as related to teaching)

357 6. Teaching Portfolio

358 By Departmental policy, this portfolio must include: (a) the latest version of
359 syllabi for all courses taught; (b) all materials given to the students in all such
360 courses (e.g., tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments); and (c)
361 the numerical and written student evaluations for all courses. College Policy bases
362 the evaluation of teaching only on the last four academic years in which the
363 candidate has taught. These, in turn, are the courses that should be documented in
364 the Teaching Portfolio.

365 7. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, such as:

366 (a) the development of effective evaluation and assessment methods
367 relative to student performance and the acquisition of knowledge and
368 skills (to be reflected in examinations, teaching methods and pedagogical
369 philosophy);

370 (b) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the
371 appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of
372 established courses (to be reflected in course syllabi and other curricular
373 materials);

374 (c) the maintenance of high standards for the material taught and
375 expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions,
376 syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other
377 examples);

378 (d) the advisement of students on various levels and in various degree
379 programs;

380 (e) guest lectures in classes; and

381 (f) a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching methodology.

382 b. Evaluation Process for Teaching

383 Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate's
384 teaching according to the College Manual's standard of *excellent*. The materials will be used to
385 evaluate the candidate's instructional contribution in four general areas (described further
386 below): 1) Course Content, 2) Course development, 3) Student Evaluations, and 4) Instructional
387 and Mentoring Activity Beyond the Classroom.

- 388 1) Course Content. Effective course content is evidenced by demonstrating coherence
389 between reading assignments, lecture materials, and graded assignments. Clear
390 organization of the syllabus and effective communication to students regarding their
391 responsibilities and expectations are also indications of thoughtful course content
392 development. In addition to these elements, the category of course content also takes into
393 consideration the level of rigor incorporated into the course through such things as the
394 nature and amount of reading required of students, types of assignment and tests.
395 Pedagogical innovation also belongs to the category of course content.
- 396 2) Course Development: Effective course development is evidenced by the candidate's
397 instructional contribution to the range and scope of courses offered by the department and
398 the way in which those courses fulfill the mission of the Department and serve to address
399 its curricular needs. Effective course development should enhance the Department's
400 offerings and, when possible, align with University Teaching Initiatives such as CTW or
401 WAC courses and/or provide signature experience activities such as field work or study
402 abroad programming. Evidence of course development that aligns with the University's
403 Strategic Plan will also be considered in high regard.
- 404 3) Perception of Students. The Department understands the category of student evaluations
405 to be inclusive of the totality of student perceptions of the instructor's contribution to the
406 learning environment. Therefore, standardized student evaluations are considered only as
407 one element among many that can be used to evaluate a candidate's performance within
408 this category. In addition to considering the written comments on the standardized
409 student evaluation, candidates may also submit feedback gained from students through
410 other channels, where applicable. Thereafter, the Department Committee will calculate an
411 average score for Question # 17 and a separate average for Questions ## 1-16 of the
412 standardized online student evaluations for each course. These averages should typically
413 be within the mid-4 range in order to demonstrate teaching excellence. The Department

414 Committee will qualitatively assess these numerical scores by taking into account the
415 level and type of course taught, the number of years in which it was taught, and the
416 nature of the fluctuations in the evaluation scores. Thus, the Department Committee will
417 not focus on Question #17 exclusively in its assessments, but rather will evaluate the
418 students' perceptions in line with criteria such as: student response rate, whether the
419 course was required or elective, the class size, and so on. The Department Committee
420 will attempt to discern a pattern in student perceptions of the overall pedagogical
421 environment created by the candidate, attending to the scores on all questions as well as
422 further evidence provided by students' written remarks.

423 4) Instructional and Mentoring Activity Beyond the Classroom. The Department considers
424 instructional and mentoring activity outside the traditional classroom setting as an
425 important supplement central to its educational mission. Thus, the Department
426 Committee will also consider the candidate's effective supervision of independent
427 studies, practica, undergraduate and graduate thesis development and writing, research
428 mentoring, supervision of internships, and the development of service-learning
429 opportunities. In making its assessment, the Department Committee will also take into
430 account the traditional enrollment numbers within the Department, the multiple non-
431 thesis tracks available at the undergraduate and graduate level, and the overall ratio of
432 faculty to students in the Department. Advising students on their post-graduate activities
433 and writing letters of recommendation on their behalf will also be considered in this
434 category.

435 c. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Teaching

436 After the completion of discussion, the Departmental Committee shall vote on one cumulative
437 final ranking for the candidate in the area of teaching based on the four categories outlined above
438 and come to a final decision on the candidate's standing in the area of teaching. In line with the
439 College manual, the final ranking of the Departmental Committee for teaching shall be rendered
440 relative to the standard of *excellent*. As specified in the College Manual, members of the
441 Committee who disagree with the final ranking of the committee will write a Minority Report.
442 Any such Report must include the justification for disagreeing with the final ranking. The
443 following comments are intended to offer guidelines rather than absolute criteria.

444 *Rankings for Associate Professor (Teaching)*

445 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is
446 available only to those candidates whose Teaching is judged as *excellent*. The candidate will
447 have demonstrated *excellence* if his or her dossier indicates that that he or she has been effective
448 across all four instructional categories, namely course content, course development, student
449 evaluations, and mentoring activity beyond the classroom. For instance, the course material
450 presented must show diligent preparation and be current in the field; the student evaluation
451 scores must suggest effective performance in the classroom; and the candidate must demonstrate
452 involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates may have developed new courses or
453 revised existing courses, taught courses that involve university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC,
454 study abroad, or service learning), used technology in innovative ways, published a textbook,
455 published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching awards.

456 *Rankings for Professor (Teaching)*

457 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available
458 only to those candidates whose Teaching is judged as *excellent*. The candidate will have
459 demonstrated *excellence* if his or her dossier indicates that that he or she has been highly
460 effective across all four instructional categories, namely course content, course development,
461 student evaluations, and mentoring activity beyond the classroom. For instance, the course
462 material presented must show diligent preparation and be current in the field; the student
463 evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; and the candidate
464 must demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates will
465 have developed new courses or significantly revised existing courses, taught courses that involve
466 university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC, study abroad, or service learning), used technology in
467 innovative ways, published a textbook, published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching
468 awards.

469 **6. Evaluation of Service**

470 a. General Comments on Service

471 The Department of Religious Studies is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the
472 university, local, and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and international
473 professional organizations. Only those service activities that are related to the candidate's areas
474 of professional expertise will be included in an evaluation of his or her service. While the
475 expectations for the amount and quality of service work will be higher for those seeking
476 promotion to Professor than for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor, collegiality, in
477 the broadest sense, is a necessary and highly valued quality sought in all candidates seeking
478 promotion and tenure in the Department of Religious Studies.

479 The candidate must submit documentation of service organized according to the categories of
480 service listed in the College manual (section V.G.). Complete descriptions for any service
481 category must be provided by the candidate along with explanatory documentation, when
482 appropriate. Possible examples of each category of service are provided below.

483 1. Contributions to the Department: Chairing departmental committees, memberships on
484 committees, development of programs and activities, participation in major department
485 sponsored activities, holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload
486 assessment.

487 2. Contributions to the College, University, or University System: Committees served on or
488 chaired at the College or University level, serving on the University Senate, holding positions of
489 significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment.

490 3. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: Consultations, memberships
491 on advisory boards, offices held.

492 4. Assistance to colleagues: Consultations concerning student issues, collaborations with other
493 University departments and programs.

494 5. Significant Discipline-Related Community Service: Community lectures, speeches,
495 presentations, short courses, hosting conferences.

496 6. Meritorious Public Service: Assistance to governmental agencies; major service awards that
497 are discipline related. The service category “Support of Local, State, National, or International
498 Organizations” refers to services to professional organizations (e.g., treasurer of a learned
499 society, coordinating logistics of conferences) that do not rely predominantly on the scholarly
500 expertise of the candidate. Professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing the
501 promotion materials of faculty at other institutions, etc.), on the other hand, would be counted in
502 Category B of Professional Development. A research based, largely expository, introductory
503 lecture to a non-academic audience would be counted under Service. A lecture on substantive
504 and novel scholarly ideas presented in an academic setting would be counted in Category B of
505 Professional Development. Should there be disagreement about the classification of an item, the
506 view of the Committee will be decided by majority vote. No item may count in more than one
507 category.

508 b. Evaluation Process for Service

509 Within the Department, the evaluation of service is based on two factors: *quality* of service work
510 performed and *quantity* of the service work performed.

511 After a thorough discussion of the items listed in the candidate’s dossier under service and using
512 the guidelines set forth below, every member of the Committee will rank the candidate as to
513 whether he or she has provided *good* service. The Committee’s assessment of a candidate in each
514 of the individual areas outlined below will be the highest ranking at which a majority of the
515 Committee ranks the candidate.

516 *1. Quality of Service Work Performed:* Can the candidate be relied upon to perform assigned
517 tasks in a timely and competent fashion? Does he or she attend scheduled meetings? Does he or
518 she provide good leadership and results when chairing a committee? Has he or she made
519 substantive service contributions? Does the candidate work well with colleagues? Does he or she
520 avoid unnecessary conflict?

521 A candidate judged to have provided *good* quality service will receive a majority of positive
522 answers to each of these questions. A candidate judged to have provided *very good* quality
523 service will receive positive answers to almost all of these six questions.

524 *2. Quantity of Service Work Performed:* Does the candidate accept an amount of service
525 responsibility commensurate with rank? Does the candidate accept an amount of service
526 responsibility commensurate with the fair distribution of responsibilities in the Department?
527 Does he or she consistently accept reasonable service requirements when asked? If being
528 considered for promotion to Professor, has the candidate assumed major service roles at the
529 College and/or University levels? Does the candidate recognize a range of service

530 responsibilities—not merely to the Department but to colleagues and the profession? Does the
531 candidate show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

532 A candidate judged to have provided *good* quality service will receive a majority of positive
533 answers to each of these questions. A candidate judged to have provided *very good* quality
534 service will receive positive answers to almost all of these six questions.

535 c. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Service

536 Based on the evidence submitted and the evaluations with regard to the quality and quantity of
537 the candidate’s service work (see section 6.b, above), the departmental committee will judge the
538 candidate as at least good or very good in service relative to the rank for which the candidate is
539 being considered and whether or not the candidate is being considered for tenure at his or her
540 present rank. The evaluative terms to be used in the evaluation letters that represent the standards
541 in the category of service are described in the subsections below on rankings. As noted in the
542 College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final assessment will write a
543 separate letter indicating their recommendations with their justification for disagreeing with the
544 final assessment. Any dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for
545 disagreeing with the Final Ranking. The following comments are intended to offer guidelines
546 rather than absolute criteria.

547 *Ranking for Associate Professor (Service)*

548 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be
549 evaluated as at least *good* in service. Candidates will be judged *good* if they have been effective
550 in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed several department
551 service tasks. In addition, candidates may be active in department, college, or university service
552 tasks or have provided service to community, governmental, or professional organizations.
553 Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible. The
554 department considers both quality and quantity of service.

555 In cases in which the evaluation of quality and quantity of Service do not coincide, the overall
556 final assessment shall come from the committee selecting the higher of the two ratings.

557 *Ranking for Professor (Service)*

558 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available only to those candidates who
559 have been evaluated as at least *very good* in service. Candidates will be judged *very good* if they
560 have been consistently effective in providing assistance to colleagues, sometimes in a leadership
561 capacity, and if they have consistently, willingly and responsibly performed several department
562 service tasks. Candidates are expected to have contributed service at the college or university
563 levels in addition to supporting department programs. They should have provided significant
564 service to community, governmental, or professional organizations, including some leadership
565 service. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.
566 The department considers both quality and quantity of service.

567 In cases in which the evaluation of quality and quantity of Service do not coincide, the overall
568 final assessment shall come from the committee selecting the higher of the two ratings.
569

570 **8. Post-Evaluation Procedures**

571
572 By the date given in the College manual, the Chair of the Departmental Committee will write a
573 letter to the Department Chair expressing the Committee's recommendation and providing a
574 detailed justification of the recommendation. Every member of the Committee will sign this
575 letter or write and sign a dissenting letter. These letters must be in the format specified in the
576 College Manual (see section III.A.) and must protect the anonymity of the outside evaluators.
577

578 The Department Chair will review the Committee's letter and conduct an independent review of
579 the candidate's qualifications in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service. In
580 conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria specified in this document.
581 The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee
582 expressing his or her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the
583 recommendation. The Committee's letter(s), the Department Chair's letter, and the candidate's
584 external letters and dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date
585 specified by the College. Candidates for promotion and tenure will receive from the
586 Departmental Chair, in a timely fashion, copies of the recommendations of the Departmental
587 Committee and Department Chair. The candidate can respond in writing to any of these
588 recommendations by writing to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than the
589 date specified in the College Manual.
590

591 The remainder of the promotion and tenure process is described in the College and University
592 manuals.
593

594 **Process**

595
596 For details on the timing of the third-year review, the preparation of the dossier, and the
597 submission of materials, please see the College manual (section VII.).
598

599 The departmental Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor will review the dossier. After
600 due deliberation, Committee members will jointly prepare a summary report on the dossier that
601 includes an evaluation of how well the candidate is progressing towards promotion and tenure.
602

603 The Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor will
604 hold a conference to inform the faculty member of how well he or she is progressing towards
605 promotion and tenure. The Department Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of the
606 Committee's written evaluation and a copy of the Department Chair's own independent report.
607

608 The Chair will forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and a member of the
609 Dean's Office will meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.
610
611

612 **APPENDIX I. The Assessment of Journals and Presses**

613

614 While loose hierarchies of scholarly journals, publishers, granting agencies, and more
615 experimental venues may exist in each field or subfield, there is generally disagreement about
616 such rankings, both as to the merit of such ranking as well as to the specific assessment of
617 specific scholarly venues. Moreover, valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new
618 ideas, or evidence and perspectives that challenge existing knowledge may not be found in or
619 supported by the allegedly best of these. In fact, as the history of a great deal of scholarship in
620 the Humanities and Social Sciences attests, sometimes cutting-edge work can only be made
621 available outside of and independently of the most prestigious venues. In addition, given the
622 interdisciplinary nature of academic work in the comparative study of religion, some of a
623 candidate's work may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines and areas of study and
624 have little recognizable Religious Studies content. Given the shifting disciplinary landscape in
625 the Humanities and Social Sciences, we also recognize that some candidates may work in
626 cognate fields or sub-fields, and we do not wish to disadvantage such work. Likewise, a
627 candidate's more creative collaborations may require moving outside the field as traditionally
628 construed and should be assessed with all due consideration.

629

630 With that recognition, a candidate's work should nonetheless demonstrate overall advancement
631 of scholarly inquiry within the field of Religious Studies as it is broadly defined. To that end, and
632 in order to assist candidates who are preparing to come up for promotion and/or tenure (and who
633 are deciding where they might seek to publish their work), the Department will create, maintain,
634 and regularly update a list of journals and presses in which faculty might publish, along with
635 assessments of the quality of these journals/presses provided by outside scholars with
636 distinguished scholarly records in relevant subfields.

637

638 The Department Chair will circulate this list each year at the last official Department faculty
639 meeting of the academic year (usually in April). At this time, faculty may request that a new
640 journal/press be assessed or that a journal/press already on the list be assessed again. Potential
641 candidates for promotion and/or tenure are particularly encouraged to request ranking for all
642 journals and presses in which they might reasonably anticipate publishing their work.

643

644 The Department Chair will then solicit judgments about the quality of the journals and presses
645 from leading scholars suggested by the faculty member(s) requesting the review. Faculty
646 members will be asked to submit three to five names of scholars in the appropriate field or
647 subfield. These scholars must not be affiliated with Georgia State University. All tenured and
648 tenure-track members of the Department may nominate scholars to rank the journals and presses.
649 Scholars will be asked to rank listed journals and presses on the following scale:

650

651 *Top Tier:* the journal or press published is considered one of the top 1-3 in a given
652 (sub) field

653 *Highly Regarded:* the journal or press publishes highly regarded work in a given
654 (sub) field

655 *Not Highly Regarded:* the journal or press publishes work that is below the
656 professional standard normal to the (sub) field.

657 *Unable to Rank:* the scholar may decline to rank a journal/press

658 The Department will assemble the solicited assessments by external reviewers at the next
659 Department faculty meeting (normally in August). In cases of disagreement among external
660 reviewers, the Department will vote on how to translate the external assessment into
661 departmental criteria. The judgment of the majority will determine the provisional final
662 assessment. "Unable to Rank" is not a departmental criterion, but is reserved for the use of
663 external reviewers who feel unqualified to assess the quality of a press or journal.

APPENDIX II. Third-Year Pre-Tenure Review

The Department of Religious Studies reviews all tenure-track faculty members during their third year of employment. Faculty members who come to Georgia State University with one year of credit from a previous institution go through a third-year review in their second year at Georgia State University. Faculty members who come to Georgia State University with two years of credit go through a third-year review in their first year at Georgia State. Faculty members who come to Georgia State University with three years of credit do not go through a third-year review.

The purpose of this review, which considers the faculty member's effectiveness in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service, is to ensure that faculty members have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and tenure decision.

While the faculty member under third-year review should be familiar with the Department guidelines and use the document as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion and tenure process. While extremely important, the third-year review is more informal; it is meant to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, the faculty member's achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Department Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion and tenure decision, the Department Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, he or she will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion and tenure.

APPENDIX III. Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

The Department of Religious Studies recognizes that professional development can take many forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in the profession. The following ratings provide an assessment of the candidate's progress toward meeting the professional development standards for tenure and promotion in a timely fashion. The standards for tenure and promotion in professional development are articulated more fully in the body of this manual.

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

Fair: The faculty member maintains a minimal program of professional development, but has no evidence that he or she is producing scholarly work that is recognized as accomplished. For example, he or she has presented work at scholarly conferences, written book reviews, and/or has published one article in an unranked or non-peer-reviewed journal. Overall, the quantity and quality of the faculty member's work does not indicate he or she is an active scholar, and there is no substantial plan for increasing his or her activity.

Good: The faculty member maintains a program of professional development, but the reviewers are not confident that he or she is producing scholarly work that is accomplished or is establishing a reputation within his or her field. For example, the faculty member may have presented work at scholarly conferences and published one or two articles, but they appear in unranked or poorly ranked journals. Alternatively, the faculty member is working on a book, but has not completed a manuscript and there is no evidence of interest from a publisher. Overall, the quantity and quality of the faculty member's work suggest that he or she will not have established a body of scholarly work that will be viewed as highly accomplished by the time of tenure review, and/or that the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, does not yet demonstrate that he or she is producing scholarly work that is highly accomplished. The faculty member has published in journals or in edited volumes, but has not yet published work in sufficient quantity or with enough highly ranked journals to indicate that he or she is on track to developing a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field. Similarly, the faculty member may have begun a book project, but has not yet made sufficient progress in writing and/or eliciting publisher interest to indicate that he or she is on track to having the book published in a timely fashion. Overall, it is not clear whether the projects that he or she has underway are likely to result in a sufficiently prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member is moving toward establishing the reputation of a highly accomplished scholar, as indicated by a contract with an academic press; two or more articles in highly ranked journals or presses; several articles, book chapters, and critical essays in

recognized journals or presses; production of an edited volume (in some stage of production or under contract), and/or recognition of the faculty member's work by a national or international fellowship or grant. 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, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, winning prestigious fellowships or grants, and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of excellent.

B. Teaching

The Department expects its faculty members to be engaged in instructional efforts, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, not only in the classroom setting but also in directing individual student work. The following ratings provide an assessment of the candidate's progress toward meeting the teaching standards for tenure and promotion, standards which are articulated more fully in the body of this manual.

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 efforts, ineffective course development or pedagogical techniques, and so forth.

Fair: The faculty member displays a marginal record of teaching, as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic efforts, ineffective course development or pedagogical techniques, and so forth.

Good: The faculty member's instructional performance displays some evidence of conscientious preparation and appropriate class content, but fails to demonstrate either effective 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 capable teacher who displays evidence of diligent classroom preparation and instruction, effective pedagogy, student mentoring, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the department, but requires some improvement on course content and development, instructional activity beyond the classroom, and/or student course evaluations.

Excellent: The faculty member's teaching record shows consistently strong classroom preparation and instruction and demonstrates instructional effectiveness and student achievement. The faculty member is engaged in instructional and mentoring activities beyond the classroom that include direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, as

well as honors and/or master's theses. The faculty member's student evaluation scores are often in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher.

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 has demonstrated unusually effective student teaching and mentoring; for example, he or she has won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet; he or she has co-authored published scholarly work with a student; he or she has developed new instructional or extra-curricular programming; and/or he or she has had significant demonstrable positive impact on a student's post-graduation opportunities or achievements..

C. Service

The Department of Religious Studies is committed to providing professionally-oriented service to the university, local, and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and international professional organizations. The following ratings provide an assessment of the candidate's progress toward meeting the service standards for tenure and promotion, standards which are articulated more fully in the body of this manual

Poor: The faculty member does not make any significant contribution to departmental meetings or committees.

Fair: The faculty member attends general faculty meetings and serves on departmental committees, but makes few significant contributions to the business of those meetings or committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department level, and has contributed to other college or university functions and/or 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 above as *very good*.

Outstanding: The faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained significant service accomplishments at all levels of the college and university, as well as in national and/or international professional organizations.