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.
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1. Introduction

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

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

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

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

2. The Promotion and Tenure Process in the Department

a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process

Recommendations with regard to promotion and tenure begin at the departmental level. Both the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair provide independent evaluations and make independent recommendations about a candidate to the College’s relevant area committee. The College Committee subsequently makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President, and the President makes the final decision.
b. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure Within the Department

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

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

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

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

c. Membership of the Department Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

e. Conveying the Recommendations of the Department Committee and Chair

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

3. The Evaluation of Candidates

a. Standard Used in Evaluation

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

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

b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Associate Professor

In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development. The successful candidate must present evidence that he or she is recognized as having an emerging national reputation according to professionals in his or her field outside of the University and is making...
significant contributions to the advancement and development of his or her field. In the category of teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* to be recommended for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. An evaluation of *excellent* in teaching presumes a demonstrated ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and graduate students and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The candidate must also be judged as contributing significantly and positively to the service activities of the department and thereby evaluated as at least *good* in the category of service.

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

*Professor*

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

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

4. Evaluation of Professional Development

a. General Comments on Professional Development

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

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. For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his or her work in books that undergo comparable peer-review scrutiny. Other candidates will pursue a mixture of publications (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books). While there is no one path, the Department recognizes that some external reviewers from our field have
increasingly expected candidates for promotion and tenure to publish books. The Department recognizes that the nature of publishing is changing and will consider those realities in the context of candidates’ subfields.

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

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

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

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

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

b. Procedures for the Evaluation of Professional Development

The Committee will first divide the candidate’s professional development materials into two categories, Category A and Category B. Category A items include important original
publications of scholarly research that have been subjected to the peer-review process (e.g.,
articles, chapters, and books). At the discretion of the candidate and/or Department Committee,
Category A may also include grants received in support of these publications. Category B items
are other scholarly works significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, reviews,
etting and refereeing others’ work). While the departmental committee typically will have
comments from the outside reviewers on the nature and quality of most of the items found in
Category A, this will be less typical of the items placed in Category B.

Examples of Category A Items

- Articles
- Books
- Book Chapters
- Book Review Essays
- Critical Encyclopedia Articles
- Critical Introductions to Anthologies
- Critical Translations of Books and Articles
- Edited volumes
- Essays in Anthologies
- Fellowships and Grants Received
- Scholarly Monographs

Examples of Category B Items

- Bibliographical Monographs
- Book Notes
- Book Reviews
- Commentaries on Papers Read at Professional Meetings
- Editorial Service to Journal and Book Publishers
- Expository Encyclopedia Articles
- Honors and Awards
- Professional papers presented
- Review of Programs and Candidates at Other Institutions

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

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

c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development

In the manner described below, the Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate each item
placed in Category A individually.
The Committee will consider what the letters of the outside reviewers say, if anything, about the item in question. The departmental evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly. After a discussion of the outside reviewers’ comments, each member of the Departmental Committee will determine whether, in his or her view, the reviewers, taken as a group, judge the item under consideration as meeting the standard for professional development.

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

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

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

d. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development

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

e. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Professional Development

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

The Department Committee will develop an overall assessment of the Candidate’s dossier as it relates to Professional Development. In all cases, the number of publications required to earn a particular assessment decreases as the quality of the candidate’s publications and the number and quality of the candidate’s Category B professional development activities increase.
The final assessment of the Departmental Committee for Professional Development shall be the highest assessment to which the majority of the Committee can agree. As noted in the College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final evaluation will write a Minority Report. Such a Minority Report must include substantive justification for the Minority’s disagreement with the final assessment of the majority of the Committee.

**Rankings for Associate Professor (Professional Development)**

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

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

**Rankings for Professor (Professional Development)**

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

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

**5. Evaluation of Teaching**
a. General Comments on Teaching

The Department of Religious Studies regards high quality teaching and student learning to be of foremost importance to its mission. Teaching is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such, the Department recognizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement as central in the evaluation of its faculty members. 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 evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate’s submission of documentation organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the College manual (section V.F.). Types of evidence include:

1. Courses Taught During the Last Four Academic Years
2. Perceptions of Students
3. Honors or Special Recognitions for Teaching
4. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, and Dissertations
5. Published Materials (as related to teaching)
6. Teaching Portfolio

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

7. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, such as:

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

(b) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of established courses (to be reflected in course syllabi and other curricular materials);
(c) the maintenance of high standards for the material taught and expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions, syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other examples);

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

(e) guest lectures in classes; and

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

b. Evaluation Process for Teaching

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

1) Course Content. Effective course content is evidenced by demonstrating coherence between reading assignments, lecture materials, and graded assignments. Clear organization of the syllabus and effective communication to students regarding their responsibilities and expectations are also indications of thoughtful course content development. In addition to these elements, the category of course content also takes into consideration the level of rigor incorporated into the course through such things as the nature and amount of reading required of students, types of assignment and tests. Pedagogical innovation also belongs to the category of course content.

2) Course Development: Effective course development is evidenced by the candidate’s instructional contribution to the range and scope of courses offered by the department and the way in which those courses fulfill the mission of the Department and serve to address its curricular needs. Effective course development should enhance the Department’s offerings and, when possible, align with University Teaching Initiatives such as CTW or WAC courses and/or provide signature experience activities such as field work or study abroad programming. Evidence of course development that aligns with the University’s Strategic Plan will also be considered in high regard.

3) Perception of Students. The Department understands the category of student evaluations to be inclusive of the totality of student perceptions of the instructor’s contribution to the learning environment. Therefore, standardized student evaluations are considered only as one element among many that can be used to evaluate a candidate’s performance within this category. In addition to considering the written comments on the standardized student evaluation, candidates may also submit feedback gained from students through other channels, where applicable. Thereafter, the Department Committee will calculate an average score for Question # 17 and a separate average for Questions ## 1-16 of the standardized online student evaluations for each course. These averages should typically be within the mid-4 range in order to demonstrate teaching excellence. The Department
Committee will qualitatively assess these numerical scores by taking into account the level and type of course taught, the number of years in which it was taught, and the nature of the fluctuations in the evaluation scores. Thus, the Department Committee will not focus on Question #17 exclusively in its assessments, but rather will evaluate the students’ perceptions in line with criteria such as: student response rate, whether the course was required or elective, the class size, and so on. The Department Committee will attempt to discern a pattern in student perceptions of the overall pedagogical environment created by the candidate, attending to the scores on all questions as well as further evidence provided by students’ written remarks.

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

c. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Teaching

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

Rankings for Associate Professor (Teaching)

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

6. Evaluation of Service

a. General Comments on Service

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

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

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

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

3. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: Consultations, memberships on advisory boards, offices held.
4. Assistance to colleagues: Consultations concerning student issues, collaborations with other University departments and programs.

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

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

b. Evaluation Process for Service

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

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

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

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

2. Quantity of Service Work Performed: Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with rank? Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with the fair distribution of responsibilities in the Department? Does he or she consistently accept reasonable service requirements when asked? If being considered for promotion to Professor, has the candidate assumed major service roles at the College and/or University levels? Does the candidate recognize a range of service...
responsibilities—not merely to the Department but to colleagues and the profession? Does the candidate show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

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

c. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Service

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

Ranking for Associate Professor (Service)

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

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

Ranking for Professor (Service)

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available only to those candidates who have been evaluated as at least very good in service. Candidates will be judged very good if they have been consistently effective in providing assistance to colleagues, sometimes in a leadership capacity, and if they have consistently, willingly and responsibly performed several department service tasks. Candidates are expected to have contributed service at the college or university levels in addition to supporting department programs. They should have provided significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations, including some leadership service. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible. The department considers both quality and quantity of service.
In cases in which the evaluation of quality and quantity of Service do not coincide, the overall final assessment shall come from the committee selecting the higher of the two ratings.

8. Post-Evaluation Procedures

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

The Department Chair will review the Committee’s letter and conduct an independent review of the candidate’s qualifications in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service. In conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria specified in this document. The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee expressing his or her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. The Committee’s letter(s), the Department Chair’s letter, and the candidate’s external letters and dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date specified by the Departmental Chair, in a timely fashion, copies of the recommendations of the Departmental Committee and Department Chair. The candidate can respond in writing to any of these recommendations by writing to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than the date specified in the College Manual.

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

Process

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

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

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

The Chair will forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and a member of the Dean’s Office will meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.
APPENDIX I. The Assessment of Journals and Presses

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

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

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

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

1. **Top Tier:** the journal or press published is considered one of the top 1-3 in a given (sub) field
2. **Highly Regarded:** the journal or press publishes highly regarded work in a given (sub) field
3. **Not Highly Regarded:** the journal or press publishes work that is below the professional standard normal to the (sub) field.
4. **Unable to Rank:** the scholar may decline to rank a journal/press
The Department will assemble the solicited assessments by external reviewers at the next Department faculty meeting (normally in August). In cases of disagreement among external reviewers, the Department will vote on how to translate the external assessment into departmental criteria. The judgment of the majority will determine the provisional final assessment. "Unable to Rank' is not a departmental criterion, but is reserved for the use of 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 as 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.