

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

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

Policy Title:	Department of Mathematics and Statistics Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	4
Department Approval:	02/15/2013
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.

PROLOGUE

As an essential academic department in a major research university, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics has responsibilities in scholarship, teaching, and service. In meeting these responsibilities, the department's overall goals are excellence in creating and disseminating knowledge, in teaching at all levels, and in service to the profession, the University, and the community. The general responsibility of scholarship at a research university and the specific responsibility of effective teaching require that faculty be engaged in research which is at national and international levels. Thus, the department believes that the "teacher-scholar" is the most appropriate model for faculty in a university setting. While it is responsible for essentially all mathematics/statistics classes at Georgia State University, the department has strong undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as cutting-edge research in mathematics and its applications. Its faculty members are expected to be part of these activities.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has formulated these promotion and tenure guidelines in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Promotion and tenure recommendations from the Department will be based upon a candidate's past performance in three broad areas: professional development, teaching, and service. Judgment of activities in these areas should be made by those closest to the situation and most knowledgeable in the candidate's discipline. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee of Tenured Associate Professors and Professors (TAPP), the Chairperson of the Department, and the College Area Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the candidates according to the criteria specified in this document and the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. Any faculty member who might be considered for promotion and/or tenure should study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures that are outlined in both documents.

DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA

Three areas to be considered for each candidate for promotion and/or tenure are professional development, teaching and service. Specific items to be considered are listed in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual, and summarized in the sections below. Candidates should consult the college manual concerning the format and organization of the materials to be submitted to the Department and College Promotion and Tenure Committees. Candidates shall be aware that the Department's TAPP Committee will do a critical and thorough evaluation of their dossier. In all cases, candidates must satisfy the minimum requirements set forth by the Board of Regents, Georgia State University, and the College of Arts and Sciences. Each case for promotion will be considered on its own merits based on the materials submitted by a candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to build his or her case for promotion and/or tenure.

The criteria set out below are intended to elaborate those provided in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professional Development

To be rated *excellent* in professional development, the candidate should have a nationally/internationally recognized research program, which consists of significant publications, nationally competitive grants and/or grant activity record, and presentations at national/international research conferences, or research and education institutions.

1. Professional accomplishment is indicated most clearly by publications in peer-reviewed journals. While it is difficult to rank the quality of journals accurately, candidate's productivity will be mainly evaluated on publications in major and topline research journals in the candidate's research areas. Other publications can include peer-reviewed conference proceedings and invited chapters and/or books appropriate to the discipline.
2. Grants are defined as from external sources, including federal grants, travel grants, exchange grants, and industrial grants. The size and duration of grants are a consideration in assessing the level of professional activity. Grant activities include submitting grant proposals to external sources. GSU internal grants are considered and should be sought where appropriate but are largely viewed as seed grants that support the preparation of external grant proposals. It is recognized that research sub-areas may differ in the availability of certain types of grant programs, and that this is a consideration in evaluation of grants and grant activities.
3. Presentations include contributed and/or invited talks at professional conferences and symposia and colloquia/seminars at other universities and research institutes.

73 Note: Election to offices, committee activities, and important service to professional
 74 associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer reviewing as related to
 75 research and other creative activities, may also indicate the scholarly efforts of the candidate. It
 76 should be noted though that many activities related to professional associations should be listed
 77 under service if scholarship is not involved.

78

79 **Teaching**

80

81 Items of consideration include:

82

83 (a) evidence of teaching effectiveness.

84 All candidates must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness, which includes evidence
 85 of student learning outcomes, summaries of student evaluation, representative syllabi,
 86 selected examinations, and samples of other materials developed by the teacher.

87

88 (b) development of courses and curriculum.

89

90 (c) significant participation in and successful direction of Master's theses and/or Ph.D.
 91 dissertations.

92

93

94 (d) significant participation in the direction of student research projects, membership on
 95 MS/Ph.D. thesis/dissertation committees, direction of independent studies, and
 96 participation on graduate examinations.

97

98 Significant and successful direction of graduate students is expected of faculty, as defined
 99 in the College workload policy. Significance is indicated by the quality and quantity of
 100 graduate students directed. The number of graduate students directed by faculty may
 101 depend on the sub-area of research specialization and the availability of students given
 102 that nature of our graduate training programs, and this should be considered in
 103 evaluation.

104 Successful direction of graduate students is indicated by completion of degree in a timely
 105 fashion and the publication of their research activities in peer-reviewed journals as
 106 appropriate. Providing financial support for graduate students from the faculty member's
 107 research grants is considered here.

108

109 Significant participation refers to the number of efforts, the time expended, the role
 110 played by the candidate, and the quality of activities.

111 (e) instructional grants and/or publications in instructional journals.

112

113 To be rated *excellent* in teaching, the candidate must be an innovative and effective teacher and
 114 must provide instructional leadership in the university community. Evidence for an evaluation of
 115 *excellent* in teaching should contain at least 4 of the 5 items above and must include item (a).

116

117 Note: Candidates are encouraged to submit evidence of any other activity related to teaching
 118 they deem appropriate.

119

120

121 **Service**

122

123 To be rated *very good* in service, the candidate should be a leader and team member. The
 124 evidence for an evaluation of *very good* in service is a substantial contribution to item a) below
 125 and at least one of the other two categories.

126

127 To be rated *good* in service, the candidate should demonstrate a consistent record of effective
 128 service in carrying out assigned tasks. The evidence for an evaluation of *good* in service is a
 129 positive contribution to item a) below and at least one of the other two categories.

130

131 Items of consideration include:

132

133 (a) Departmental service

134

135 (b) College, University, Senate, or System committees

136

137 (c) Professional service

138

139 Additional considerations and notes:

140 1. Community service will be considered if it is discipline related.

141 2. Other items of consideration in this area may include activities that directly support the
 142 University, College or Department, such as student recruitment, teaching test preparation
 143 courses, and involvement with local high schools.

144 **Application and Elaboration of the Criteria**

145

146 The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chairperson of the
 147 Department independently evaluate the credentials of all candidates with all deliberations to be
 148 completed according to the College calendar. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure
 149 Committee in judging professional development determines the extent of the candidate's progress
 150 in developing a research program. This determination is based on judgments concerning
 151 professional activities such as publications, seeking and/or securing extramural funding,
 152 presentations, involvement in professional organizations, and related activities. The peer
 153 recognition associated with these activities and received by the candidate is referred to as the
 154 candidate's professional reputation. The activities and associated professional reputation of
 155 candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to be of national/international scope rather
 156 than local or regional. Research programs are expected to result in publications in major peer-
 157 reviewed journals. The successful candidate is expected to have published (or have manuscripts
 158 in press) several such papers based on research conducted during the candidate's current rank
 159 and/or after the last promotion. Other evidence of achievement may include serving as a referee
 160 for scholarly publications, service as a grant reviewer, honors, awards, fellowships, and
 161 significant citations. As a professional scholar continues to develop, there are several
 162 dimensions to measure the growth of his/her research program. A few of these concerning
 163 research publication include rate of publication, cumulative publication record, significance of
 164 problems, reputation of the publishing journal or serial, applicability of results, longevity of
 165 problems, and breadth of problems. During this continued development, there is normally a
 166 widening variety of professional activities including invited presentations, refereeing papers for
 167 journals, and refereeing proposals for granting agencies. A nationally competitive program of
 168 extramural funding is indicated by a record of successful funding, or when funding has not been
 169 secured, evidence of extensive and consistent efforts to secure extramural funds from national
 170 agencies and/or foundations. To establish such a rating for an unfunded proposal, the candidate
 171 should submit the full set of comments and scores received from the agency. When the
 172 continued growth and development of the candidate's publications are significant enough to
 173 establish the candidate as a national or international scholar, then the candidate is judged as
 174 *excellent* in professional development.

175

176 In the area of teaching, a candidate should exhibit competence, enthusiasm, effectiveness,
 177 and sound standards in both the undergraduate and the graduate instructional programs.
 178 Involvement in teaching at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels is recommended.
 179 Criteria for evaluation of teaching competence include: (a) evidence of teaching effectiveness,
 180 (b) development of courses and curriculum, (c) significant participation in and successful
 181 direction of Master's theses and/or Ph.D. dissertations, (d) significant participation in the
 182 direction of student research projects, membership on MS/Ph.D. thesis/dissertation committees,
 183 direction of independent studies, and participation on graduate examinations, and (e)

184 instructional grants and/or publications in instructional journals. Evidence of teaching
185 effectiveness includes the quality of materials in the teaching portfolio, including course syllabi,
186 class notes, web-based materials, examinations, and student evaluations. Evidence of significant
187 participation in and successful direction of graduate students includes numbers of M.S. and
188 Ph.D. students directed, successful completion of their degrees in a timely fashion, evidence of
189 successful progress toward a degree by passing comprehensive exams or writing a research paper
190 or thesis, and publication of their research activities in peer-reviewed journals as appropriate.
191 The candidate is judged as *excellent* in teaching if there is strong record in four out of (a), (b),
192 (c), (d), or (e) that establishes him or her as an effective and innovative teacher, providing
193 instructional leadership in the university.

194

195 The candidate should strive for a sound service record. Membership, effectiveness, and
196 leadership on departmental and university committees and on committees and offices in
197 professional organizations are activities reviewed in promotion and/or tenure. Assistant
198 Professors or untenured Associate Professors may be judged to have performed service suitable
199 for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor with a rating of *good*.
200 Associate Professors applying for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor must be
201 evaluated as *very good* in service to be recommended for promotion and/or tenure at these levels.

202

203 If the candidate has been given credit towards tenure for professional activities at other
204 institutions, any work done during the period for which credit toward tenure is given will be
205 included in the consideration for promotion and tenure at Georgia State University. Any work
206 done prior to any promotion at the former institution will not be considered for promotion of that
207 candidate at Georgia State University.

208

209 **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

210

211 Candidates are referred to the College Manual for eligibility and credits to be nominated
212 to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. All candidates that are recommended for
213 promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor must be evaluated as *excellent* in
214 professional development and teaching, and as *good* in service.

215 **PROFESSOR**

216

217 Candidates are referred to the College Manual for eligibility and credits to be nominated
 218 to the rank of Professor. The same evaluation measures established for promotion to Associate
 219 Professor apply to promotion to full professor, but the magnitude and history of
 220 accomplishments must be substantially greater. A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the
 221 rank of Professor must present at a minimum clear evidence of an *excellent* record in research
 222 and teaching that surpasses the requirements for rank of Associate Professor and must present a
 223 service record of at least *very good*. Such accomplishments include the establishment and
 224 maintenance at Georgia State University of an original nationally recognized research program
 225 that has resulted in substantial publications, and either grant support or an extensive and
 226 consistent effort to secure extramural funding from national agencies and/or foundations.

227

228 The recognition of the candidate's expertise as evidenced by a history of publication in
 229 quality journals should exceed that requirement for a recommendation to the rank of Associate
 230 Professor. Other evidence of achievement could include membership on editorial boards of
 231 significant journals, serving on grant review panels, membership on program committees or
 232 holding offices in national scientific organizations, and serving as an outside reviewer for
 233 promotion and tenure at other universities. Accomplishments in research or teaching may be
 234 given special consideration.

235

236 Accomplishments in research as documented by national recognition, coupled with
 237 required achievements in teaching and a major service role, may warrant promotion to and/or
 238 tenure at the rank of Professor. Similarly, accomplishments in teaching as documented by
 239 national recognition, coupled with appropriate research and at least a *very good* record in service
 240 may warrant promotion to Professor.

241

242

243 **DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS AND SCHEDULE OF IMPORTANT DATES**

244 The departmental process will follow the College of Arts and Sciences Manual including
 245 the Calendar for the Promotion and Tenure Process. A candidate for promotion must submit
 246 his/her credentials to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee in the same format in
 247 which these credentials are to be submitted to the College Area Committee on Promotion and
 248 Tenure.

249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 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

**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 has a moderate research program with a few publications, meeting presentations, and may have one or more internal grants. The scope and impact of the faculty member's overall 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 publications, presentations and grant activities that are likely to lead to a nationally/internationally recognized research program in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has established a nationally/internationally recognized research program, or there are clear indications that the faculty member is well on the way to establishing a nationally/internationally recognized research program. S/he has produced original research published in peer-reviewed highly regarded journals. Collaborative work should complement the development of an independent research program. Grant support is a significant indication of research productivity. The faculty member should have a demonstrated ability to attract external funding via grant support or positive reviews to grant applications. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes invited talks at professional conferences and symposia and colloquia/seminars at other universities and research institutes. 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 with marked impact on the work of others, as evidenced by publication in topline research journals, external funding as a P.I. for his/her independent research program, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

285 **B. Teaching**

286

287 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
 288 student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental
 289 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
 290 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.
 291 The faculty member has no record of supervision of individual student work.

292

293 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
 294 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental
 295 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
 296 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.
 297 Such a faculty member displays insufficient involvement in supervision of individual student
 298 work.

299

300 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. The supporting
 301 materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to
 302 demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging
 303 institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning
 304 environment in this faculty member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations,
 305 achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive. Such a faculty member
 306 displays limited involvement in supervision of individual student work, mainly as a committee
 307 member rather than a research advisor.

308

309 **Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent and effective teacher. The teaching record shows
 310 evidence of teaching effectiveness. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful
 311 course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in
 312 classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course
 313 evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course.
 314 Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in
 315 the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from two of the
 316 following four areas of teaching, as listed in the current P&T departmental manual: (i)
 317 curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate
 318 students, membership on thesis/dissertation committees and related activities; (iv) instructional
 319 grants and/or publications. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and
 320 student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and
 321 presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about students who have
 322 successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a
 323 degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation
 324 proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality of their

325 publications are important in the review. The faculty member's teaching record may lack the
326 level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically
327 expected for a rating of *excellent*, as described below.

328

329 ***Excellent:*** The faculty member is a highly effective and innovative teacher, showing
330 instructional leadership. Her/his teaching record shows evidence of teaching effectiveness.
331 Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation,
332 and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the
333 pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated
334 taking into account such factors as the type of course. Additional evidence of teaching
335 effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in the portfolio for evaluation. Other
336 supporting material includes evidence from three of the following four areas of teaching, as
337 listed in the P&T departmental manual: (i) curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate
338 students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate students and membership on the thesis/dissertation
339 committees and related activities; (iv) instructional grants and/or publications. Such a faculty
340 member has started to show a prominent involvement with individual student work. Data to be
341 reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as
342 numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and presentations) of students directed
343 in independent studies. Information about students who have successfully completed their
344 degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a degree, such as by passing their
345 qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed.
346 The achievements of the students and the quality of their publications are important in the
347 review.

348

349 ***Outstanding:*** The level of effectiveness and accomplishments demonstrated in the faculty
350 member's record of instruction and student mentoring exceed the criteria for *excellent* described
351 above. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest exceptional
352 performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional preparation; the
353 faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring
354 students, as indicated, for example, by student publications or student awards; and there is other
355 additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the faculty member
356 may receive a significant teaching award or significant instructional grants/publications or
357 invitations to leading workshops and consultation, based upon his or her creativity in teaching.

358 **C. Service**

359

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

363

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

367

368 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
369 and committee responsibilities and is of assistance to colleagues. Additionally, some positive
370 contribution to college/university/system administrative functions or professional associations
371 should be shown.

372

373 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates diligent, collegial service and leadership at the
374 department level. Additionally, a substantial contribution to college/university/system
375 administrative functions or professional associations should be shown.

376

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

380

381 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
382 demonstrates a record of effective leadership in a major role in the department and/or throughout
383 the college and university and/or in national and international professional organizations.

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

386
387
388 **A. Professional Development**
389

390 **Poor:** The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.
391

392 **Fair:** The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.
393

394 **Good:** The faculty member has a moderate research program with a few publications, meeting
395 presentations, and may have one or more internal grants. The scope and impact of the faculty
396 member's overall professional development contributions are limited.
397

398 **Very Good:** The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady scholarly
399 development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects. A continued record of
400 publications in peer-reviewed journals, invited presentations and submitted applications for
401 external funding of his/her research program is expected.
402

403 **Excellent:** The faculty member continues to maintain a nationally/internationally recognized
404 research program and is an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. S/he has produced
405 original research published in peer-reviewed highly esteemed journals by the profession with
406 impact on the work of others in the field. Grant support is a significant indication of research
407 productivity. The faculty member's professional development record should demonstrate a
408 sustained level of grant activity. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes invited talks
409 at professional conferences and symposia and colloquia/seminars at other universities and
410 research institutes.
411

412 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field with marked impact
413 on the work of others, as evidenced by publication in topline research journals in the profession,
414 sustained external funding as a P.I. for his/her independent research program, invited lectures in
415 prestigious venues and so on.

416 **B. Teaching**

417

418 **Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
 419 student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental
 420 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
 421 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.
 422 The faculty member has no record of supervision of individual student work.

423

424 **Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
 425 through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental
 426 curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate
 427 effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.
 428 Such a faculty member displays insufficient involvement in supervision of individual student
 429 work.

430

431 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. The supporting
 432 materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to
 433 demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging
 434 institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning
 435 environment in this faculty member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations,
 436 achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive. Such a faculty member
 437 displays limited involvement in supervision of individual student work, mainly as a committee
 438 member rather than a research advisor.

439

440 **Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent and effective teacher. The teaching record shows
 441 evidence of teaching effectiveness. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful
 442 course development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in
 443 classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course
 444 evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course.
 445 Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in
 446 the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from two of the
 447 following four areas of teaching, as listed in the current P&T departmental manual: (i)
 448 curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate
 449 students, membership on thesis/dissertation committees and related activities; (iv) instructional
 450 grants and/or publications. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi, examinations, and
 451 student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student publications and
 452 presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about students who have
 453 successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful progress toward a
 454 degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis or dissertation
 455 proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality of their

456 publications are important in the review. The faculty member's teaching record may lack the
457 level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically
458 expected for a rating of *excellent*, as described below.

459
460 ***Excellent:*** The faculty member is a highly effective and innovative teacher, providing
461 instructional leadership. Effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course
462 development, preparation, and/or execution. Another set of markers of effectiveness in classroom
463 instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course
464 evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course.
465 Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., learning outcomes) can also be reported in
466 the portfolio for evaluation. Other supporting material includes evidence from three of the
467 following four areas of teaching, as listed in the current P&T departmental manual: (i)
468 curriculum development; (ii) direction of graduate students; (iii) mentoring of undergraduate
469 students, membership on thesis/dissertation committees; (iv) instructional grants and/or
470 publications. Such a faculty member shows a prominent and successful involvement in the
471 direction of individual student work. Data to be reviewed include the following: syllabi,
472 examinations, and student evaluations, as well as numbers and accomplishments (e.g., student
473 publications and presentations) of students directed in independent studies. Information about
474 students who have successfully completed their degrees, as well as those who show successful
475 progress toward a degree, such as by passing their qualifying exams and writing approved thesis
476 or dissertation proposals, will also be reviewed. The achievements of the students and the quality
477 of their publications are important in the review.

478
479 ***Outstanding:*** The level of effectiveness and accomplishments demonstrated in the faculty
480 member's record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for
481 excellent described above. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest
482 exceptional performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows exceptional
483 preparation; the faculty member demonstrates very high levels of involvement and effectiveness
484 in mentoring students, as indicated, for example, by student publications or student awards; and
485 there is other additional evidence of outstanding achievement in instruction. For example, the
486 faculty member may receive a significant teaching award or significant instructional
487 grants/publications or invitations to leading workshops and consultation, based upon his or her
488 creativity in teaching.

489 **C. Service**

490

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

494

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

498

499 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
500 and committee responsibilities and is of assistance to colleagues. Additionally, some positive
501 contribution to college/university/system administrative functions or professional associations
502 should be shown.

503

504 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates diligent, collegial service and leadership at the
505 department level. Additionally, a substantial contribution to college/university/system
506 administrative functions or professional associations should be shown.

507

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

511

512 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
513 demonstrates a record of effective leadership in a major role in the department and/or throughout
514 the college and university and/or in national and international professional organizations.