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.
I. Introduction

This document contains the specific guidelines that apply to and govern all recommendations for promotion and tenure made by the Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) to the Dean’s Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. This set of guidelines elaborates for the Institute the procedures and standards set forth in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, with the proviso that everything therein affirmed about "department/school" is understood to include "institute." Should any conflict arise, the College Manual will take precedence. All procedures hereinafter discussed must take place according to the deadlines specified in that manual.

This document will apply to all Institute core faculty, understood as all those who are hired as faculty in the Institute. For any faculty housed in other departments but with a joint appointment (see the Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies' Bylaws) in the Institute, work for the Institute will be evaluated by the Director and the evaluation sent to the department chair. Such joint appointments will be made by the Dean of Arts and Sciences upon the recommendation of the Director and relevant department chairs and deans. The appointments will normally be made for one year and are renewable. These individuals and others with affiliate or associate status (see the Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies' Bylaws) in the Institute may request an overall evaluation of their work in the Institute for their P&T reviews. This request must be made in a letter to the Director indicating the purpose of the evaluation and to whom it should be sent. WGSS affiliates are full-time faculty selected by the Director in consultation with the Executive Committee and approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences, a status normally granted for three years and renewable. Affiliate faculty normally serve on WGSS committees and teach WGSS courses that are cross-listed with WGSS in accordance with College and University workload policies. WGSS associates are full-time faculty housed in other departments or institutes who commit a portion of their work to WGSS, a renewable status granted for 10-24 months. Associates are selected by the Director in consultation with the Executive Committee and approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and any other appropriate dean.

In the case of faculty who are joint-appointed but housed in the Institute, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider the candidate's specific work in the Institute (whether research, teaching, or service) as well as the work in the other department and individuals from the other department may be asked to serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee. If ever joint-appointed faculty are hired who are housed equally in both departments, special promotion and tenure committees reflecting both departments should be constituted for them and other procedures should be altered accordingly. In the event that such a joint appointment is made to an individual outside the College of Arts and Sciences, the promotion and tenure procedures should follow the guidelines set out in this document together with any additional considerations negotiated by the two departments with the candidate prior to hiring.
II. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

A. Candidacy and Outside Evaluations

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion shall identify themselves and assemble their dossiers according to the guidelines and deadlines published in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual.

The candidate should submit all of her/his academic work, whether it seems to be specifically connected with the field of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies or not. As a dynamic and growing area of academic inquiry, women’s, gender, and sexuality studies can be broadly defined as a field that has a focus on women, gender, or sexuality and explores such topics as social justice, culture, class, race and ethnicity, identity and subject formation, and other social phenomena. To the extent that women's, gender, and sexuality studies is interdisciplinary as well as disciplinary, cross-cutting or intersecting research, teaching, and service are to be expected. The fact that these activities cut across many fields is what makes women's, gender, and sexuality studies exciting but also more complicated than much traditional disciplinary work. Although a candidate’s work is expected to demonstrate engagement in and advancement of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies, it is important to acknowledge and include both work specific to women's, gender, and sexuality studies and work that is done in other fields, noting the relevance to women’s, gender, and sexuality studies wherever such exists.

The Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies recognizes that women’s, gender, and sexuality studies 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, scholarship of discovery versus scholarship of integration, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses as misguided struggles over false choices. Each topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore, that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways, that contributions may affect study, practice, or policy, and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of women's, gender, and sexuality studies, the Institute will secure, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee for a candidate will pay careful attention to, the letters of outside evaluation assessing the candidate’s published work or creative activity. Outside evaluation will be sought from lists of names submitted by the candidate and by the Director of the Institute, as specified in the GSU and College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manuals. These individuals will be expert in the field(s) represented in the candidate's work. Although they should be asked specifically to comment on the candidate’s work in the field(s) in which they share expertise as they assess the candidate's professional development, all reviewers may not be equally expert in all areas related to the candidate’s expertise.
B. Promotion and Tenure Committees

To consider any Institute-housed faculty member’s candidacy for tenure and/or for promotion to assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, a promotion and tenure committee shall be formed consisting of all faculty with formal appointment in the Institute at or above the level to which the candidate aspires (or, in the case of a tenure-only candidate, of all those at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered for tenure). Others may be drawn, after consultation between the director and the candidate and with the approval of the Dean’s office, as needed from the affiliated faculty (see definition thereof in the Bylaws) of the proper rank. If there are fewer than three Institute faculty and appropriate affiliated faculty at the specified rank are deemed not sufficient to constitute a committee, the Dean, in consultation with the Director, will augment the faculty review committee with members at the appropriate rank from other departments.

In advance of meeting to consider the candidate, the committee shall select a chair, who will then ensure that each member of the committee has access to all the material submitted by the candidate as well as to any letters solicited by the Dean's office from outside evaluators. The committee shall then discuss the material submitted and vote on the candidate in each of the three areas to be evaluated: professional development, teaching, and service. Candidates will be evaluated as either having met or having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in each of the following three areas: professional development, teaching, and service. This determination will be made by majority vote and will take into consideration the standards appropriate for the rank to which the candidate desires promotion or the rank at which tenure is to be awarded.

The chair or a designated member of the committee in consultation with those voting with the majority of the committee will draft a letter reflecting the committee's judgment in each of the three areas together with as much supporting argument as needed. Each member of the committee must either sign this letter or write and sign a minority report. The committee's letter together with any minority reports will be sent to the Director of the Institute and then shall be forwarded with the Director's own letter of evaluation to the appropriate area committee on promotion and tenure of the College. If there is no majority, reports reflecting the split shall be written, signed by those in agreement, and forwarded. Minority opinions may still be written.

C. Requisite Levels of Evaluation

Following Board of Regents, University, and College requirements, standards of evaluation differ, depending on the level for which an individual is being considered. The levels and their standards are indicated as follows:

**Associate Professor:** To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in professional development and teaching. In keeping with university standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has already
contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in his/her field. As part of the college and departmental reviews, the candidate will be evaluated on evidence that his/her current trajectory in both professional development and teaching will support successful progress toward the rank of professor after promotion to associate professor with tenure. The candidate must also be evaluated as having provided at least good service to merit promotion to and/or tenure at this level.

Professor: To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least very good in service, with the proviso that the quality and the number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. In keeping with university standards as described in the GSU and College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manuals, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research, scholarship, and creative activities.

D. Areas of Evaluation

The Institute will evaluate all candidates in the three areas of professional development, teaching, and service. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the Institute should specify what is distinct, unique and individual about her/his area of specialization within her/his field and instructional area. Distinctive aspects and features of specialization within each field and within areas of professional development, teaching, and service need to be clarified and documented for the departmental and college promotion and tenure committees. The burden for designating and elaborating such area distinctions lies with the candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion.
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

General Remarks

Professional development is a major concern in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. It is essential that faculty members in the Institute maintain a high level of scholarly and/or creative activities that advance the field of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies and the candidate’s specialization within her/his particular areas of inquiry by creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. Specifically, these activities should evidence demonstrable professional growth by the faculty member.

In the fields represented within the area of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies, as well as beyond it, professional development can involve a range of professional activities from scholarly research and publication to creative activities. It is appropriate, therefore, that criteria and methods for demonstrating and measuring professional development will come from the fields within which the candidate works. Since the evaluation standard for professional development for both scholarly and artistic works must be appropriate, outside reviewers will be chosen for their expertise in the area of the candidate’s scholarly or artistic work. Their reviews will supplement the understanding of that work by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Institute. The Institute committee should consider that such letters are sometimes more and sometimes less reliable than internal appraisals of a candidate’s work: more reliable when the reviewer is a more objective and expert judge and understands sufficiently the context and conditions in which the work was produced; less reliable when the reviewer does not meet one or both of these criteria. Therefore, the Institute committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly and shall use these letters to assist in the fullest possible appraisal of a candidate’s record.

The Institute recognizes that professional development can take many forms and employ a variety of methods. Each topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate and whether it produces a valuable societal or scholarly product. We believe, therefore, that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

Similarly, books are not inherently to be preferred over articles, though it is desirable that both be peer reviewed. Nor should grants, though highly valued as professional development activity, be preferred to publications, particularly since grants are relatively scarce for some sorts of research and writing/creative activities. While the Institute acknowledges that grant support is only a means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research and creative activity, it encourages and values prestigious fellowships and awards that recognize scholarly accomplishment and potential, such as those granted by the Fulbright Program, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Rockefeller Foundation, and others.

While loose hierarchies of scholarly journals, publishers, granting agencies, and venues for performance and showing creative work may exist in each field, there is generally
disagreement about such rankings. 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 women’s, gender, and sexuality studies shows, sometimes cutting-edge work can only be made available outside and independently of the most prestigious venues. In addition, given the interdisciplinary nature of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies, some of a candidate’s work may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines and areas of study and have little recognizable women’s, gender, and sexuality studies content. We recognize that those in women’s, gender, and sexuality studies often work in other fields as well, and we will not disadvantage such work. Likewise, a candidate’s creative collaborations with other artists outside as well as within women’s, gender, and sexuality studies will be given consideration. However, a candidate’s work should demonstrate advancement of scholarly inquiry within the field of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies, as it is broadly defined.

Though both individual and cooperative scholarship and creative works have value, the Institute recognizes the occasional difficulty of determining the relative contributions of co-authors or co-creators. Order of authorship does not necessarily convey accurate information about relative contributions to a multiply-authored work. For fair assessment, each candidate must define their contribution to co-authored or collaborative scholarship and explain its significance in their promotion and tenure dossiers. Contributions to professional associations of an administrative nature shall be counted in the category of service rather than professional development. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations count in the professional development category.

Many of the most innovative projects in the field of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies combine theory and practice. The Institute encourages such work and recognizes that there may be overlaps in the categories of scholarly works and creative projects. Those achievements which fall into the two categories will be evaluated using criteria drawn from both.

Criteria for evaluating creative projects will include consideration of the length and complexity of the project, the means of disseminating the work to an audience, and the evaluation of the completed work by outside peer review. For creative projects, a loose analogy might be drawn between a produced short play, short film, or short performance and a journal article or book chapter. Similarly, a loose analogy might be drawn between the production of a full-length film or full-length play and a book. Dissemination venues may be to an on-campus, local, regional, national and/or international audience, generally in a hierarchy of rising valuation. In some cases, there may be special value to on-campus productions, but that value must be demonstrated and judged by the above criteria and outside peer review. For those projects that fall outside traditional creative categories, such as multimedia and digital projects, it will be necessary for candidates to establish the status of their work in relation to generally understood standards of their field.

Evaluations will be based on the reputation of the producer or distributor of the work and their standards of selection. Supporting materials for creative projects might include reports
invited by the Institute from outside peer reviewers in the professional and/or academic sphere, size and significance of award competition, approximate purchase price of scripts where appropriate, and/or published reviews if available. The evaluation of a written screen or stage play may be more difficult to obtain than that of a live production or media product. Scripts that win awards but are not published or produced or that are optioned or purchased outright may be submitted as part of a dossier. The production of a conference paper and/or published article based on a creative production could lend additional merit to the dossier. In addition, a multimedia product might be submitted to a conference and thereby become a part of the normal conference reputation and refereeing procedure. Other supportive information for evaluative creative work might include special awards, recognitions, or citations.

Scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential to many areas of the humanities and social sciences. Work published in a digital medium should be valued as being equal to print publications, and the candidate should indicate the peer review and publication guidelines for the digital media. Candidates should make a case for the quality of the project, its distinctive contribution to knowledge and the candidate’s professional development, and provide evidence of peer review (e.g., citation of the project in other venues).

Finally, evaluations will be based on qualitative considerations of the work submitted and not just its quantity. Evaluation of an individual faculty member’s professional development will focus on the entire profile of that individual’s contribution.

Categories of Professional Development

The candidate must submit written evidence of professional development according to the categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.).

Evaluation of Professional Development

Based on the evidence submitted, the Institute committee will evaluate the candidate’s professional development.

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

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be at least excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least good in service. Candidates already at the rank of associate professor applying for tenure must also be evaluated as having provided very good service in order to be recommended for tenure at this level. Following university standards, the recommended candidate for promotion to associate professor will have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of the field as determined by peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in the field.
A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged as excellent in professional development only if the committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarly and/or creative work is highly accomplished. A candidate should have been very active in other research and/or creative roles. There are obviously many ways for a candidate to provide justification for such a conclusion. A candidate, for example, might have published a book and several articles or chapters, all of very good quality; a significant number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of distinguished quality; or a larger number of articles and/or chapters of very good quality and comparable to more than a book. A candidate may also have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as intramural research, conference session organization or participation, creative event production, editing or refereeing for a journal, or reviewing grants or books. For a candidate whose field is creative, published and produced creative works will be evaluated as described in the preceding General Remarks.

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

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is available only to those candidates whose professional development and teaching are both judged as at least excellent and whose service is judged to be at least very good. The recommended candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is expected to have established a national/international reputation in their field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive professional development.

The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development only if the committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarship or creative activities are highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a large number of influential refereed articles or chapters of excellent quality; or a larger number of articles or chapters of very good quality and comparable to more than a book; or a book and a significant number of articles or chapters, all of very good quality. To qualify as excellent, a candidate could also have secured extramural funding to support his/her research and should have been highly active in additional research roles, such as reviewing grants and books, serving on editorial boards, or presenting research in professional and academic venues. For a candidate whose field is creative, published and produced creative works will be evaluated as described in the preceding General Remarks.
The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Institute and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. Candidates for promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the college manual (section V.F.).

The Institute committee will evaluate the quality of teaching based on the evidence submitted. For promotion to associate professor or professor, a successful candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in teaching.

A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged to be excellent in teaching if the judgment of the committee on the basis of the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is effective. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show diligent preparation and be current in the field; 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.

A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor will be judged to be excellent in teaching if the judgment of the committee on the basis of the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is superb. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show impressive preparation and be current in the field; and the candidate must demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates will either 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.
Service to one’s colleagues, to the Institute, to the College, and to the University is a very important element in judging faculty’s contributions and performance. Faculty also owe service to their academic discipline or area(s) of study, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition, women’s, gender, and sexuality studies, as a field of study concerned with the workings of gender and sexuality in society, is quite conducive to practical forms of community service, so efforts at applying the field’s knowledge and methods to address community concerns are highly valued in our Institute.

Neither the College nor the Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. The information given below indicates what we in the Institute consider important forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality when evaluating candidates’ work in the area of service.

Categories of Service

The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to their areas of professional expertise according to the categories of service in the college manual (section V.G.).

Evaluation of Service

Based on the evidence submitted, the institute committee will evaluate the candidate’s 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 at least good in service. Candidates will be judged good if they have either been very effective in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed several institute service tasks, are active in institute service tasks and serve on a college, university, or system committee, or are active in institute service tasks and have had significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews). Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.

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 at least very good in service.

Candidates will be judged very good if they have effectively taken a major role in department or institute service or have significant service on college or university committees. Candidates may have served as an officer or board or committee member of a regional or
national professional association. They may also show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews). Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A1. 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 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, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; however 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 significant body of original research. This body of scholarship, which may include a book or comparable body of articles and book chapters, has contributed to the advancement of her/his field. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications in sub-fields in which scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential. Further evidence for a rating of excellent includes documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation and/or the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies; these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and significance of the candidate’s research. 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.
A2. Professional Development in the Creative Arts

**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 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, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; however, there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent creative profile in the near future.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a body of work that shows national recognition and strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near future. A significant body of creative work may include a full-length book, play, or film, or a number of short pieces in the genre within which the faculty member works. This work or collection of works will directly demonstrate her/his emerging national reputation. Peer-reviewed digital and other new media forms of publication are also valid venues. Securing external support, an extremely competitive undertaking, is valued highly as acknowledgment of success and prominence. 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 her or his field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of excellent.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

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

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

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, as well as honors and master’s theses. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. For example, the faculty member may have created new courses, significantly revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into course syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and exercises into course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the unit’s overall instruction and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of research or pedagogical expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to her/his research. Through these activities, the faculty member shows creative reflection and action in teaching.
Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent* at either level, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

C. Service

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

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

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

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department level as well as on the college or university levels. The faculty member engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in professional associations, serving on editorial review boards, and/or a significant amount of review work (e.g., for presses in the form of unpublished manuscripts).

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: In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and/or international professional organizations.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A1. 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 faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects. Included here is the circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed, or positively reviewed and/or contracted by a press in the period under review.

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 faculty member’s books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research since her or his last promotion, which may include a book-length project, a number of book chapters or peer-reviewed articles, co-authored or co-edited projects, or some combination of these. Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field. Evidence may include national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and winning prestigious fellowships or grants.
A2. Professional Development in the Creative Arts

**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 faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

**Very Good:** The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady creative development that falls short of completion of a major body of work. Included here is the circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed in the period under review.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a body of work that has led to national recognition and shows strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. Such a body of creative work will have been produced since her or his last promotion and may include a full-length book, play, or film, or a number of short pieces in the genre within which the faculty member works. Further, the faculty member’s work has received significant reviews, arts-based awards (as appropriate to the field), reprints, and/or citations. Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in her or his field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of excellent.

B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor.

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

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

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of honors and master’s theses to completion. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the course size and level. The faculty member evaluated as *excellent* also will have demonstrated a creative and reflective pedagogy that may include a substantial variety of activities related to instruction. For example, the faculty member may have created new courses, significantly revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into course syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and exercises into course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the unit’s overall instruction and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of research or pedagogical expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to her/his research. Such a faculty member will also have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs in a timely fashion; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; presenting or publishing their work, completing their programs, and advancing into subsequent programs or into the profession. Such a faculty member advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

**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 will have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

**C. Service**

**Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.
**Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective documented contributions to the work of those committees.

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

**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department level as well as on the college or university levels. The faculty member engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in professional associations, serving on editorial review boards, a significant amount of review work (either for presses in the form of unpublished manuscripts or for universities by serving as an external reviewer), or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews).

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