

GERONTOLOGY INSTITUTE  
 PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES  
  
 COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
 GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Policy Title:	Gerontology Institute Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	4
Department Approval:	09/23/2013
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.

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2       The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism of  
3 ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the university. It is intended to be both  
4 rigorous and fair. Great care is taken to ensure accurate assessments and proper  
5 outcomes. It is not our intention in this set of guidelines to enumerate every step  
6 necessary for promotion and tenure. Rather, this document is an expression of the  
7 philosophy that will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates a clear  
8 statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the process that will be  
9 followed in the Institute. Candidates are directed to both the *Georgia State University*  
10 *Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors (University*  
11 *Manual)* and the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (College*  
12 *Manual)* for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure  
13 and/or promotion and for details of the University and College expectations.

14       The Gerontology Institute will evaluate all candidates in three areas of  
15 professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. As will be described  
16 later in these guidelines, the Institute values all of these areas highly and has  
17 established specific expectations for performance by its members in each one.  
18 Candidates will be reviewed and evaluated by both an Institute committee and by the  
19 Institute Director. The College Manual describes the review process and the evaluation  
20 standards. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate  
21 professor, a candidate must be evaluated as **excellent** in professional development and  
22 teaching according to departmental guidelines and evaluated as having provided **good**

23 service. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a  
24 candidate must be judged **excellent** in professional development and teaching and  
25 **very good** in the area of service.

26

27

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

28 The Gerontology Institute views professional development as encompassing any  
29 activity that advances our discipline by creating or extending gerontological knowledge  
30 and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is research,  
31 professional development also includes all other activities that support or enhance  
32 research in the field of aging, including reviewing, editing, and refereeing. The  
33 Gerontology Institute recognizes that gerontological scholarship comes in many forms  
34 and employs a variety of methods, including basic or applied research, theoretical or  
35 empirical work, scholarship of discovery or scholarship of integration, qualitative or  
36 quantitative methods, and primary or secondary analyses. Each research topic, method,  
37 approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate to the  
38 stated research goal and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore,  
39 that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways and that no  
40 one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

41 Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely  
42 heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give little credit to published work that  
43 was not refereed. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to  
44 instruction unless the text can be shown to make significant or seminal contributions to

45 the scholarship of the field.

46         Obtaining extramural grant support for one's research is a highly valued  
47 professional development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking  
48 external grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh heavily as evidence  
49 of scholarly reputation. Assistant professors seeking promotion to the next higher rank  
50 are expected to begin a focused line of research, which usually involves seeking  
51 internal grant support and extramural grants. Grant support, however valuable, is only a  
52 means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research.

53         Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings  
54 and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected  
55 activities for any scholar. Although no specific type of such activities is required for  
56 promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in  
57 such roles.

58         The Institute recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals does  
59 exist within the field of gerontology. The difficulty of ranking journals is most apparent  
60 with "specialty" journals, where specialists in one sub-field are technically unable to  
61 draw comparisons between their own journals and those of another sub-field. The  
62 Institute's goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship, and we will expect  
63 every candidate to meet that standard. Quality of publications will be assessed on  
64 several factors: 1) the work's impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, or  
65 other evidence; 2) the prestige or standing of the journal in which an article appears or  
66 the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate's explanation of the

67 importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the committee's  
68 independent assessment of the work.

69         The Gerontology Institute recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative  
70 scholarship. While we acknowledge the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of  
71 determining the relative contributions of several co-authors, modern gerontological  
72 research is increasingly a team enterprise, and interdisciplinary research—which we  
73 strongly support—by definition, results in publications with multiple authors. We do  
74 assume that a candidate who chooses to collaborate should be able to publish a greater  
75 number of items than one working alone. We also know that order of authorship does  
76 not necessarily convey information about relative contribution to the work. Credit will be  
77 assigned based on the candidate's relative contribution to a multiple-authored work.  
78 Again, the quality of the work will be assessed independently.

79         As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate's publications  
80 may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. While the Institute's primary  
81 focus remains the development of the field of gerontology, we do recognize that  
82 gerontologists can and do regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of other  
83 disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in non-gerontology  
84 professional publications.

85         Finally, perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of  
86 publications required for promotion and tenure. The Gerontology Institute strongly  
87 resists the idea that the evaluation of one's work can be defined solely by numbers of  
88 publications or other scholarly activities, the number or size of grants, or the number of

89 other scholarly activities. In other words, there is no magic number. As discussed below,  
90 we expect candidates to demonstrate both the quality and quantity of their scholarly  
91 productivity.

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

100

### 101 **Categories of Professional Development**

102 The candidate for promotion and tenure should submit written evidence of  
103 professional development organized in the following categories (as outlined in the  
104 *College Manual* and relevant to the discipline): 1) presentations at professional  
105 meetings; 2) scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and reviews; 3)  
106 achievements in the visual and performing arts; 4) awards and grants; 5) significant  
107 professional services; 6) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional  
108 associations; 7) general recognition within the discipline of gerontology; and 8)  
109 specialized professional activities in the discipline of gerontology.

110

111 **Evaluation of Professional Development**

112

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

114           Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires that a faculty member be  
115 recognized by scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has  
116 contributed to the advancement and development of gerontology and demonstrates a  
117 strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory in terms of high quality and productive  
118 research and scholarship. As stated in the *College Manual*, promotion to this level is  
119 available only to those who are judged to be **excellent** in professional development.

120           Following college and university standards, a candidate for promotion to the rank  
121 of associate professor must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work  
122 that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by  
123 peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in  
124 his/her field. Finally, the candidate's body of work should indicate a trajectory of  
125 continued scholarship to support future promotion to professor.

126           An assistant professor seeking promotion is expected to have developed a  
127 focused research agenda demonstrating the candidate's expertise in their specialty  
128 area. Examples of such a research agenda may include: a significant number (6-8) of  
129 high quality refereed articles published in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-  
130 tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary  
131 journals; and/or a book of comparable quality published by major university or  
132 commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be

133 considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they  
134 are of comparable quality.

135         The products of a candidate's research agenda should also include grant-  
136 seeking activities that establish the foundation for future extramural support of their  
137 research. Such activities may include one or more of the following: serving as a  
138 principal investigator or co-investigator on an externally funded grant; serving as  
139 principal investigator or co-investigator on contracts, subcontracts, or foundation  
140 awards; serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving  
141 internal funding for pilot studies that may lead to future external grant support; or  
142 serving as a consultant on external awards.

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

146

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

148         As stated in the *College Manual*, promotion to the rank of professor is recognition  
149 by the Institute and the university that a faculty member's scholarship is of such high  
150 quality and importance that s/he has achieved and sustained a national and/or  
151 international reputation as a leading scholar in his/her field and have a high probability  
152 of continued high quality and productive research and scholarship.

153         To qualify as excellent, the candidate should have published: a significant  
154 number of high- quality refereed articles in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-



155 tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary  
156 journals; and/or a book (or books) of comparable quality published by a major university  
157 or commercial academic press. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be  
158 considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they  
159 have been subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, candidates  
160 should normally have served as a principal investigator on external grants of a caliber  
161 that demonstrates the national and/or international prominence of their scholarship. This  
162 includes grants from federal agencies, prestigious foundations, or significant levels of  
163 state funding. A co-investigator may be considered the equivalent of a principal  
164 investigator if the candidate demonstrates a significant leadership role in the project.  
165 Candidates who have not served as principal investigators on grants should present  
166 comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their  
167 research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial  
168 intellectual contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more  
169 nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles  
170 reprinted in high quality edited research volumes. In addition, candidates should  
171 demonstrate activity in additional research roles, such as editorial board member,  
172 conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book  
173 reviewer.

174

175

176

## 177 TEACHING

### 178 **Categories of Teaching**

179 The quality of instruction of faculty members is of paramount importance to the  
180 Institute and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. The candidate for  
181 promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized  
182 according to the following categories (as mandated in the *College Manual*): 1) courses  
183 taught during the last four academic years; 2) perception of students; 3) honors or  
184 special recognition for teaching or mentorship; 4) independent studies, practica, honors,  
185 theses, and dissertations; 5) published materials relevant to teaching; 6) teaching  
186 portfolio; and 7) additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. The candidate may not  
187 solicit letters to include in any of these categories.

188

### 189 **Evaluation of Teaching**

190 The Institute will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the *College*  
191 *Manual's* evaluative standard based on the evidence submitted. The committee will be  
192 mindful of the vagaries inherent in student evaluations; the student evaluation averages  
193 mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to reify the numbers.

194 Teaching includes both activities that relate to classroom instruction and the  
195 mentoring of individual students. Both are important to effective teaching and student  
196 learning. Therefore, the committee recognizes that the balance between the two varies.  
197 Thus, effective classroom teaching may be given more weight and significance for a  
198 candidate with extensive classroom teaching experience and evidence of high quality

199 classroom teaching but less mentoring activities; and comparably mentoring may be  
200 given more weight and significance for a candidate who has been very actively involved  
201 in directed theses and dissertation, or co-authoring publications and presentations with  
202 students, or in other activities related to individual student learning.

203

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

205 The candidate will usually be judged to be *excellent* in teaching when the  
206 student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the  
207 overall average is normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and; the course material  
208 presented must show thorough preparation. In addition, the candidate should  
209 demonstrate effective mentoring of students. For candidates for promotion to associate  
210 professor this entails directing at least two theses, as well serving on thesis and  
211 dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring activities. The  
212 candidate may also have accomplished one or more of the following: published a  
213 textbook; published a teaching-related article; won one or more teaching award;  
214 presented papers at professional meetings with one or more students; co-authored with  
215 one or more students. Once again, while candidates must demonstrate excellence in  
216 both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students the relative emphasis on  
217 classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

218

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

220 The candidate will usually be judged to be *excellent* in teaching when the

221 student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the  
222 overall average is normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and course material  
223 presented show thorough preparation. For promotion to the rank of professor  
224 candidates must also demonstrate a trajectory of active and effective mentoring of  
225 individual students. This entails having directed completed and ongoing theses as well  
226 serving on thesis and dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring  
227 activities. The candidate may also have accomplished one or more of the following:  
228 published a textbook; published a teaching-related article; won one or more teaching  
229 award; presented papers at professional meetings with one or more students; co-  
230 authored with one or more students. As noted above, while candidates must  
231 demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of  
232 students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may  
233 vary by candidate.

234

235

### **SERVICE**

236 Service to one's colleagues, to our Institute, to the College, and to the University is very  
237 important elements in judging faculty contributions and performance. Faculty members  
238 also owe service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of  
239 professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition,  
240 gerontology, as a field of study is concerned with aging and age-related issues at the  
241 individual, institutional, and societal levels gerontological endeavors are very conducive  
242 to a variety of forms of community service. Efforts at applying gerontological knowledge

243 and methods to address community concerns are highly valued by the Institute. As  
244 mandated by the *College Manual*, the candidate must submit written evidence of service  
245 activity related to his/her areas of professional competence.

246

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

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

252

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

254 For promotion/tenure to the rank of Professor the candidate must be evaluated  
255 as at least **very good** in service.

256 A candidate will be judged **very good** if s/he has: 1) been active in assistance to  
257 colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in Institute service by serving on the  
258 executive committee, as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad  
259 hoc committee (e.g., curriculum, graduate admissions, awards); 3) served effectively in  
260 one or more of the following roles: graduate director, undergraduate director, research  
261 director, chair of a recruitment committee, or other major ad hoc committees; and 4)  
262 given significant service on college or university committees or serving as officers in  
263 regional, national, or international professional societies.

264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285

## EVALUATION PROCESS

The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Gerontology Institute is governed by the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual*. Until which time the Gerontology Institute has sufficient numbers of faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members, the dean, in consultation with the director, will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments. 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 promotion and tenure evaluation is the assessment of the candidate's credentials by gerontologists outside 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 Institute director, together with the Institute's 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 Institute's director will review and check the candidate's dossier before it is sent to the outside reviewers.

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

**APPENDIX I:****Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323

**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 limited.

**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 significant number of high quality refereed articles published in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology 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 an externally funded grant; serving as principal investigator or co-investigator on contracts, subcontracts, or foundation awards; serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving internal funding for pilot studies that may lead to future external grant; or serving as a consultant on external awards. The faculty member should also be active in other research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.



324 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has met the criteria for *excellent* and has achieved  
325 eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory  
326 reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

327

328

## 329 **B. Teaching**

330

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

336

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

342

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

350

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

360 **Excellent:** The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly  
361 involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective  
362 faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or  
363 execution with evaluation scores in the mid-4.0 out of 5 range or higher. In addition, the  
364 candidate should demonstrate effective mentoring of students. The faculty member's  
365 teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with  
366 individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student  
367 research papers, honors and master's theses and capstone projects. The faculty  
368 member may also demonstrate effective mentoring of students by serving on and  
369 chairing thesis committees. The candidate may also have published a textbook, or  
370 published a teaching-related article, won a teaching award, presented papers at  
371 professional meetings with students, and/or co-authored with one or more students.  
372 While candidates can demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual  
373 mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual  
374 mentoring may vary by candidate.

375

376 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's  
377 student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has  
378 won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published award winning  
379 textbook, or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

380

381

### 382 **C. Service**

383

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

387

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

392

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

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

398

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

403

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

**APPENDIX II:  
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

408  
409  
410

411 **A. Professional Development**

412  
413  
414

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

415  
416

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

417  
418  
419

**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 limited.

420

421  
422  
423

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

424  
425  
426

**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.

427  
428  
429

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 in journals and by presses that are held in esteem within gerontology. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be

430  
431  
432

considered the equivalent of journal articles if the faculty member demonstrates 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 external grants of a caliber that demonstrates the national and/or international prominence of their scholarship. This includes grants from federal agencies or prestigious foundations.

433  
434  
435

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 also is active in additional research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

436  
437  
438  
439  
440

441  
442

443 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has met the criteria for *excellent* and achieved  
 444 eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong  
 445 reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues, and so on.

446

447

## 448 **B. Teaching**

449

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

455

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

461

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

469

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

479 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and  
 480 prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of  
 481 undergraduate and graduate student research papers, honors and master's theses, and  
 482 capstone projects. The faculty member demonstrates effective mentoring of students by  
 483 serving on and chairing thesis committees and engaging in other student mentoring  
 484 activities such as serving on or chairing dissertation committees. The faculty member's  
 485 student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty  
 486 member may have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related article, won a  
 487 teaching award, presented papers at professional meetings with students, and/or co-  
 488 authored with one or more students. While candidates can demonstrate excellence in  
 489 both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on  
 490 classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

491  
 492 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's  
 493 student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will  
 494 have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly  
 495 regarded pedagogical studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior  
 496 instruction.

497  
 498  
 499 **C. Service**

500  
 501 **Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no  
 502 other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other  
 503 departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

504  
 505 **Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few  
 506 other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other  
 507 departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those  
 508 committees.

509  
 510 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental  
 511 duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

512  
 513 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and  
 514 effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the  
 515 university levels as well as participating in professional associations.

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

520

521 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the  
522 faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service  
523 accomplishments, often leadership roles, beyond the department and throughout the  
524 college and university, as well as in national and international professional  
525 organizations.