

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

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

Policy Title:	Department of Sociology Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	5
Department Approval:	03/29/2013
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.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

INTRODUCTION

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism of ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the university. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Great care is taken to ensure accurate assessments and proper outcomes. It is not our intention in this set of guidelines to enumerate every step necessary for promotion and tenure. Rather, this document is an expression of the philosophy that will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates with a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the process that will be followed in the Department. Candidates are directed to both *the GSU Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors* (University Manual) and the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual* (College Manual) for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and College expectations.

The Department of Sociology will evaluate all candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. Candidates will be reviewed and evaluated by both a departmental committee and by the departmental chair. The College Manual describes the departmental review process and the evaluation standards. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor a candidate must be evaluated as **excellent** in professional development and teaching according to departmental guidelines and evaluated as having provided **good** service. To be recommended for promotion and/or tenure at to the rank of professor, a candidate must be judged **excellent** in professional development and teaching and **very good** in the area of service.

24
25

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

The Department of Sociology views professional development as encompassing those activities which advance our discipline by creating or extending sociological knowledge and modes of inquiry. The Department recognizes that sociological scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical versus empirical work, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses as misguided struggles over false dichotomies. Each research topic, method, approach, and technique shall be judged on whether it is appropriate to the stated research goal and whether it produces a valuable result. No one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

The Department's goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship and we will expect every candidate to meet that standard. Quality of publications will be assessed on several factors: 1) the work's recognition in the field, shown through reviews, citations or other evidence; 2) the prestige, standing, or impact scores of the journal in which an article appears or of the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate's explanation of the importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the Committee's independent assessment of the work. Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give little credit to published work that was not

43 refereed. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to instruction unless the text
44 can be shown to make significant contributions to the scholarship of the field. The Department
45 recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals does exist within the field of
46 sociology. However, journal rankings are inherently difficult to establish, and this is most
47 apparent with “specialty” journals, where specialists may come from a variety of different
48 disciplines.

49 Obtaining extramural grant support for one’s research is a highly valued professional
50 development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking grant support will
51 weigh heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation. An assistant professor seeking promotion to
52 associate professor should have developed a research agenda that includes grant-seeking
53 activities, while associate professors seeking promotion to professor are, in most cases, expected
54 to have succeeded in their grant-seeking activities and secured extramural funding for their
55 research. We believe, however, that grant support is a means to an end and is not of the only
56 way to accomplish significant work.

57 The Department of Sociology recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative
58 scholarship. Sociological research is increasingly a team enterprise, and interdisciplinary
59 research—which we strongly support—by definition, results in publications and grants with
60 multiple contributors. We cannot, therefore, assign higher intrinsic value to either single-
61 authored or jointly-authored works. We also know that the ordering of authors or investigators
62 does not convey clear information about participants’ relative contribution to the work. Credit
63 will be assigned based on the candidate’s relative contribution to collaborative work, as
64 described by the candidate in her/his dossier.

65 As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications may
66 appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. While the Department’s primary focus
67 remains the development of the discipline of sociology, we do recognize that sociologists can
68 and do regularly make sociological contributions to other disciplines, and we will not
69 disadvantage publications that appear in non-sociology professional refereed publications.

70 Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and
71 reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for
72 any scholar. Although no specific type of such activities shall be required for promotion and
73 tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion should demonstrate activity in such roles.

74 Finally, the Department of Sociology strongly resists the idea that the evaluation of one’s
75 work can be defined solely by the number of publications, the number or size of grants, or the
76 number of other scholarly activities performed. We expect candidates to demonstrate their
77 scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their refereed publications,
78 external grants, and other research activities.

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

86 Manual.

87 The candidate should submit written evidence of professional development organized as
88 instructed in the College Manual. Evidence of professional development includes: 1)
89 presentations at professional meetings; 2) scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and
90 reviews; 3) awards and grants; 4) significant professional services; 5) recognition by national,
91 scholarly, and professional associations; 6) general recognition within the discipline of
92 sociology; and 7) specialized professional activities in the discipline of sociology.

93

94 **Evaluation of Professional Development**

95

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

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

104 An assistant professor seeking promotion is expected to have developed a focused
105 research agenda demonstrating the candidate's expertise in their specialty area. Examples of such
106 a research agenda may include: a significant number (6-8) of high quality refereed articles
107 published in top-tier general sociology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier
108 specialty sociology or interdisciplinary journals; and/or a book of comparable quality published
109 by major university or commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book
110 chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate
111 that they are of comparable quality.

112 The products of a candidate's research agenda should also include grant-seeking
113 activities that establish the foundation for future extramural support of their research. Such
114 activities may include: serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; serving as principal
115 investigator or co-investigator on submitted small external grants; applying for and receiving
116 internal funding for pilot studies that may provide the foundation for future external grant
117 support; or serving as a consultant on external awards.

118 To qualify as *excellent*, a candidate also should have been very active in other research
119 roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal
120 referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

121

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

123 As noted in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is a
124 recognition awarded to candidates who have distinguished record of achievement and standing in
125 their professions and at Georgia State University. The University Manual states that both the
126 quality and the level of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of professor
127 must substantially surpass those required for a recommendation of associate professor. A
128 professor is expected to have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and

129 have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research.
130

131 As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is available only
132 to those whose professional development is judged as *excellent*. To qualify as *excellent*, the
133 candidate should have published: a significant number of high quality refereed articles in top-tier
134 general sociology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty sociology or
135 interdisciplinary journals; and/or a book (or books) of comparable quality published by a major
136 university or commercial academic press. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be
137 considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they have been
138 subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, most candidates should have
139 served as a principal investigator on external grants of a caliber that demonstrate the national
140 prominence of their scholarship. This includes grants from federal agencies, prestigious
141 foundations, or significant levels of state funding. A co-investigator may be considered the
142 equivalent of a principal investigator if the candidate demonstrates a significant leadership role
143 in the project. Candidates who have not served as principal investigators on grants should
144 present comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their
145 research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial intellectual
146 contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more nationally prominent
147 fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles reprinted in an high quality
148 edited research volumes. In addition, candidates should demonstrate activity in additional
149 research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant,
150 journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

151 TEACHING

152
153
154 The quality of instruction of faculty members is of paramount importance to the
155 department and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. Teaching activities include
156 both classroom-related instruction and the supervision of individual student projects. The
157 candidate for promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized
158 according to the categories mandated in the College Manual: 1) courses taught during the last
159 four academic years; 2) perception of students; 3) honors or special recognition for teaching or
160 mentorship; 4) independent studies, practica, honors, theses, and dissertations; 5) published
161 materials relevant to teaching; 6) teaching portfolio; and 7) additional evidence of teaching
162 effectiveness. The candidate may not solicit letters to include in any of these categories.

163 164 165 Evaluation of Teaching

166
167 The Department will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the College
168 Manual's evaluative standards based on the evidence submitted. Teaching includes both
169 activities that relate to classroom instruction and the mentoring of individual students. Both are
170 important to effective teaching and student learning. Therefore, the committee recognizes that
171 the balance between the two varies. Thus, effective classroom teaching may be given more

172 weight and significance for a candidate with extensive classroom teaching experience and
173 evidence of high quality classroom teaching but less mentoring activities; and comparably
174 mentoring may be given more weight and significance for a candidate who has been very
175 actively involved in directed theses and dissertation, or co-authoring publications and
176 presentations with students, or in other activities related to individual student learning.
177

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

179 The candidate will usually be judged to be *excellent* in teaching when the student
180 evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is
181 normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and; the course material presented must show thorough
182 preparation. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate effective mentoring of students. For
183 candidates for promotion to associate professor this entails directing a dissertation or at least two
184 theses, as well serving on dissertation and thesis committees and engaging in other student
185 mentoring activities. The candidate may also have published a textbook, or published a teaching-
186 related article, or won one or more teaching awards, or presented papers at professional meetings
187 with students, or co-authored with one or more students. Once again, while candidates must
188 demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students the
189 relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.
190

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

192 The candidate will usually be judged to be *excellent* in teaching when the student
193 evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is
194 normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and course material presented show thorough
195 preparation. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate effective mentoring of students. For
196 candidates for promotion to the rank of professor this entails having directed completed, as well
197 as ongoing, dissertations and theses which demonstrate a trajectory of active and effective
198 teaching. The candidate may also have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related
199 article, or won one or more teaching awards, or presented papers at professional meetings with
200 students, or co-authored with one or more students. As noted above, while candidates must
201 demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the
202 relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.
203

204 **SERVICE**

205
206 Service to one's colleagues, to our department, to the College, and to the University is
207 very important element in judging faculty contributions and performance. Faculty also provide
208 service within our discipline, or in interdisciplinary realms, usually by participating in the
209 operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition,
210 sociology, as a field of study concerned with social issues and problems, is quite conducive to
211 useful, discipline-relevant forms of community service, so efforts at applying sociological
212 knowledge and methods to address community concerns are highly valued in our department.
213 As mandated by the College Manual, the candidate must submit written evidence of service
214 activity related to his/her areas of professional competence.

215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257

Evaluation of Service

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

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of **associate professor** the candidate must be evaluated as *good* in service. A candidate will be judged *good* if s/he has been active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service tasks that are assigned to him or her.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of **professor** the candidate must be evaluated as *very good* in service. A candidate will be judged *very good* if s/he has: 1) been active in assistance to colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in departmental service such as by serving on the executive committee, serving as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad hoc committee, serving effectively in one or more of the following roles: undergraduate director, graduate director, chair of a recruitment committee or other major ad hoc committee, or serving as the head of either of the department's three areas of concentration (family and life course, race and urban, gender and sexuality); and 3) given significant service on college or university committees or serving on committees for regional, national, or international professional societies.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Department of Sociology is governed by the College Manual. Applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged by a committee composed of all tenured faculty in the Department holding the rank of associate professor or professor. Applications for promotion to the rank of professor and for tenure at that rank will be judged by a committee composed of all professors holding the rank of professor. Each committee will elect its own chair, meet and deliberate, and report its evaluation and recommendation by letter to the department chair. All deliberations in the promotion and tenure process are confidential.

An important part of the departmental evaluation is the assessment of each candidate's credentials by sociologists outside of Georgia State University. The candidate must submit with his/her dossier a list of eight scholars in the candidate's specialty area who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's performance in the area of professional development and his/her reputation within the discipline. The departmental chair, together with the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, will, without input from the candidate, prepare a list of eight additional scholars who could perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the College Manual. Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, who will select from them at least five persons to perform an outside review. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University. The department chair will review the candidate's dossier before it is sent to the outside reviewers.

258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295

APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development contributions are insufficient.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has produced a focused research agenda demonstrating expertise in her/his specialty area(s). Examples of such a research agenda may include: a number of high quality refereed articles published in top-tier general sociology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty sociology or interdisciplinary journals; and/or a book of comparable quality published by major university or commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the faculty member demonstrates that they are of comparable quality. The research agenda ideally will include grant-seeking activities that establish the foundation for current and/or future extramural support of research. Such activities may include: serving as a principal investigator or co-investigator on awarded grants and/or other sponsored projects; serving as a principal investigator or co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving internal funding for pilot studies that may provide the foundation for future external grant support; or serving as a consultant on external awards. The faculty member may also be active in other research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

296 **B. Teaching**

297

298 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
299 student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental
300 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
301 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

302

303 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
304 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental
305 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
306 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

307

308 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty
309 member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid
310 content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to
311 the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor.
312 The learning environment in this faculty member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations,
313 achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

314

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

323

324 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent
325 involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate
326 student research papers, honors and master's theses, and dissertations. The faculty member's
327 student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member
328 demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. Such a
329 faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a
330 teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical
331 publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation and creativity in
332 teaching. The faculty member may also demonstrate effective mentoring of students by serving
333 on and chairing thesis and dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring
334 activities. The candidate may also have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related
335 article, won a teaching award, presented papers at professional meetings with students, and/or
336 co-authored with one or more students. While candidates can demonstrate excellence in both
337 classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom
338 instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

339 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent* at either level, the faculty
340 member's student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has
341 won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for
342 superior instruction.

343

344

345 **C. Service**

346

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

350

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

354

355 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
356 and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

357

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

360

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

364

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

369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405

APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development contributions are insufficient.

Very Good: The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The articles, book chapters, and/or books of the faculty member judged as *excellent* are published by journals/presses that are held in esteem by the profession. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they have been subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, the faculty member ideally serves or will have served as a principal investigator on an external grant or grants of a caliber that demonstrates a significant leadership role in the project. The faculty member who has not served as principal investigator on a grant may present comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial intellectual contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles reprinted in high quality edited research volumes. The faculty member is active in additional research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues, and so on.

406 **B. Teaching**

407

408 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
409 student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental
410 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
411 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

412

413 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
414 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental
415 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
416 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

417

418 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty
419 member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid
420 content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to
421 the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor.
422 The learning environment in this faculty member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations,
423 achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

424

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

433

434 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent
435 involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate
436 student research papers, honors and master's theses, and dissertations. The faculty member's
437 student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member
438 demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply her or his assigned courses. Such a
439 faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a
440 teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical
441 publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation and creativity in
442 teaching. The faculty member demonstrates effective mentoring of students by serving on and
443 chairing thesis and dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring activities.
444 The faculty member may have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related article, won
445 a teaching award, presented papers at professional meetings with students, and/or co-authored
446 with one or more students. While candidates can demonstrate excellence in both classroom
447 teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction
448 and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

449 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's student
450 evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a
451 significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical
452 studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
453

454
455 **C. Service**
456

457 **Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other
458 significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental
459 committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.
460

461 **Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other
462 significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental
463 committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.
464

465 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
466 and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.
467

468 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service
469 and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels, as well as
470 participating in professional associations.
471

472 **Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has
473 involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such
474 leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as *very good*.
475

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