

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Policy Title:	Department of Political Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	4
Department Approval:	04/29/2013
College Approval:	Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 02/05/2014

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

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

INTRODUCTION

1
2 The purpose of this document is to set forth the guidelines
3 of the Department of Political Science regarding promotion and
4 tenure recommendations. The criteria and procedures here are
5 intended to fulfill the requirements and procedures of the
6 College, University, and Regents. Although the material in this
7 document reflects the policies of the College, it is the
8 responsibility of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure to
9 insure that their candidacy is in conformance with the
10 requirements and procedures of the Department, College,
11 University and Regents.

12 The process of granting promotion and tenure is an
13 essential mechanism for ensuring quality and allocating rewards
14 in the University. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair.
15 Great care is taken to ensure accurate assessments and proper
16 outcomes. It is not our intention in this set of guidelines to
17 enumerate every step necessary for promotion and tenure.
18 Rather, this document is an expression of the philosophy that
19 will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates
20 a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description
21 of the process that will be followed in the Department.
22 Candidates should pay particular attention to the College of
23 Arts and Sciences Manual for Promotion and Tenure for guidance

24 about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for
25 tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and
26 College expectations.

27

28 **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

29 The College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Promotion and
30 Tenure defines the criteria for promotion and tenure.

31 Candidates will be evaluated in professional development,
32 teaching, and service. The evaluations should take into account
33 expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the
34 standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and
35 resources of the Department. Specific guidelines for evaluating
36 candidates are detailed in each Department's promotion and
37 tenure guidelines.

38

39 **CRITERIA BY RANK IN COLLEGE MANUAL**

40

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

42 In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure
43 at the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must be
44 evaluated as **excellent** in professional development and teaching,
45 and as **good** in service.

46

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

48 Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded
49 only to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement
50 and standing in their professions and at Georgia State
51 University. Both the quality and number of achievements required
52 for a recommendation to the rank of Professor substantially must
53 surpass those required for promotion and tenure at the rank of
54 Associate Professor. In order to be recommended for promotion to
55 and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, a candidate must be
56 judged **excellent** in both professional development and teaching,
57 and **very good** in service.

58

59 **DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA**

60 This document defines the terms representing the college
61 standards in each of the three areas (professional development,
62 teaching, and service) in which candidates for promotion and/or
63 tenure will be evaluated. Although the Department has sought to
64 distinguish the three areas, it recognizes that the categories
65 are not entirely exclusive and that some activities may reflect
66 achievement in more than one area.

67

68

69

93 important than whether the scholarship advances the knowledge of
94 the discipline beyond previous work. We believe that success in
95 professional development can be achieved in many ways and no one
96 approach is inherently superior to another.

97 Candidates will be judged on their total scholarship. For
98 example, a person who chooses mainly to write articles for
99 national journals using an anonymous review process conducted by
100 peers could be seen as equally successful with another who
101 publishes books whose publication process has comparable peer
102 review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication
103 outlets (e.g., articles, books (authored or edited), and
104 chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work,
105 just as those who specialize in one form of scholarly
106 expression.

107 A candidate's body of scholarship should be assessed in
108 terms of how it advances the knowledge of political science
109 beyond previous work and, if appropriate, its impact on the
110 practice of politics at the international, national, state or
111 local level. Evidence of such advancement should be shown by
112 1)the presence of peer review, 2) the use of an anonymous review
113 technique, 3) reviews or citations, 4) the prestige of the
114 publisher or journal, 5)the candidate's explanation of the
115 work's importance, and 6) assessments by external reviewers.

116 Since peer review using an anonymous technique is one of the
117 fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on
118 that process, and will give less credit to published work that
119 was not refereed in this manner. In general, textbooks will be
120 considered as a contribution to teaching unless the text can be
121 shown to advance the knowledge of the discipline beyond its
122 status prior to publication.

123 The Department recognizes the lack of a consensus
124 concerning a precise hierarchy of prestigious scholarly journals
125 and presses. With regards to journals, distinctions can be
126 reasonably made and each candidate's record will be reviewed for
127 his or her contributions in three types of scholarly outlets:
128 1)highly respected journals in the discipline and fields of
129 political science, 2)less prestigious but respected disciplinary
130 and field journals, and 3)journals targeted to the candidate's
131 sub-field specialty or specialties. The Department particularly
132 encourages and values publication in the first category of
133 journals, but publication in the other two categories will be
134 valued as well.

135 The Department of Political Science recognizes the value of
136 both individual and cooperative scholarship. The Department
137 typically expects some individual scholarship but also
138 recognizes that modern social scientific research is often a

139 team enterprise and can involve interdisciplinary research.
140 Thus, we also value such collaborative efforts. Given that order
141 of authorship does not necessarily convey information about
142 relative contribution to the work, candidates should establish
143 their relative contribution to coauthored work. Again, the
144 quality of the work will be assessed independently.

145 As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a
146 candidate's publications may appear in the scholarly outlets of
147 other disciplines. While this Department's primary focus remains
148 on the development of the discipline of political science, we
149 recognize that political scientists regularly make contributions
150 to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we shall not
151 disadvantage such work appearing in non-political science
152 professional publications. The candidate and the outside
153 evaluators should provide guidance in assessing the importance
154 of non-mainstream publications and research. Even so, candidates
155 should remember that achievement of a national reputation in
156 political science is the goal of professional development in
157 this Department.

158 Perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the
159 number of publications required for promotion and tenure. The
160 Department of Political Science strongly resists the idea that
161 qualitative evaluations (e.g., achievement of national

162 reputation) can be defined solely by numbers of publications or
163 other scholarly activities. In other words, there is no
164 necessary number. We expect that candidates will demonstrate
165 their scholarly productivity through both the quality and
166 quantity of their publications and other research activities.
167 For example, it is possible that a smaller number of works of
168 outstanding quality will be evaluated as equal or superior to a
169 much greater number of publications of lesser quality.

170 Obtaining extramural grants in support of one's research is
171 a valued professional development activity, especially for
172 tenured faculty, and success in seeking grant support,
173 particularly from national sources using peer review and an
174 anonymous review system, will weigh heavily as evidence of
175 professional development. Grant support, however, is only a
176 means to an end and is no substitute for the products of
177 research.

178 Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for
179 professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the
180 work of others also are valued and expected activities for any
181 scholar. Although no specific type of such activities is
182 required for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for
183 tenure and promotion will be active in such roles. In these
184 roles as well as the others outlined above, the candidate should

185 demonstrate a pattern of consistent professional development
186 that reflects intellectual growth, increasing sophistication,
187 and an active, ongoing research agenda.

188

189 **Evaluation of Professional Development**

190 The candidate for promotion and/or tenure should submit written
191 evidence of professional development organized in the categories
192 set forth in the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and*
193 *Tenure Manual*. Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental
194 committee will evaluate the candidate's professional development
195 according to the College Manual's evaluative categories.

196

197 **Promotion and Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

198 To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the
199 rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as
200 **excellent** in professional development. In keeping with
201 University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed
202 to have developed a substantial body of work that has already
203 contributed to the advancement of the discipline of political
204 science. The candidate should also have demonstrated a
205 continued upward trajectory of high quality scholarship and
206 should be in the process of establishing a national reputation
207 in a field. As part of the departmental review, the candidate

208 will be evaluated on evidence that his/her current trajectory in
209 professional development will support successful progress
210 towards the rank of professor after promotion to associate
211 professor with tenure.

212 The candidate will be judged **excellent** in professional
213 development if he/she is achieving a national reputation in a
214 field of the discipline and shows a continued upward trajectory
215 of high quality research and scholarship. Such a candidate, for
216 example, might have published a significant number (6) of
217 articles in respected journals with a national reputation that
218 use an anonymous peer review process, or he/she might have
219 published one research book in a respected academic press that
220 uses an anonymous review process and a small number (1-2) of
221 additional articles in respected peer-reviewed journals with a
222 national reputation. Editing a published book will be considered
223 in the candidate's favor but will not substitute for authorship
224 or co-authorship of a complete research book. Peer reviewed book
225 chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if
226 the candidate can demonstrate that they are of comparable
227 quality. These examples are only guidelines; they should not be
228 taken as excluding other forms of publications or other
229 combinations. Furthermore, the merit of each work may be
230 determined only after its production.

231 In evaluating a candidate's dossier, the committee will
232 take due consideration of the guidelines outlined in the above
233 section on professional development. In particular, the
234 committee will consider the prestige and quality of the journals
235 or presses in which a candidate's work appears, the candidate's
236 specific contributions to co-authored works, and the impact of
237 the candidate's work on his/her field or subfield. Both
238 scholarly citations and the comments of the external reviewers
239 will factor heavily into the committee's evaluation of impact.
240 The committee will also remain cognizant that different
241 scholarly practices and citation norms may exist in different
242 subfields of political science.

243 In addition, to qualify as excellent, a candidate should be
244 very active in other research roles that provide evidence of
245 progress towards a national reputation. These could include
246 conference participant, book reviewer, intramural research grant
247 recipient, extramural research grant recipient, extramural
248 research grant seeker, invited presenter, leader in APSA
249 sections and other professional organizations, and book
250 manuscript and/or journal referee. A candidate should also be
251 able to point to an active, ongoing research agenda as evidence
252 of his/her positive trajectory.

253

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

255 To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the
256 rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as **excellent** in
257 professional development. In keeping with University standards,
258 both the quality and the level of achievements in the area of
259 professional development must substantially surpass those
260 required for promotion and tenure at the rank of associate
261 professor. For example, since promotion to associate professor,
262 the candidate may have published one research book with a
263 respected academic press and a small number (1-2) of refereed
264 articles in nationally or internationally respected journals, or
265 the candidate might have published a significant number (6)
266 refereed articles in nationally or internationally respected
267 journals. Editing a published book will be considered in the
268 candidate's favor but will not substitute for authorship or co-
269 authorship of a complete research book. Peer reviewed book
270 chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if
271 the candidate can demonstrate that they are of comparable
272 quality.

273 A professor is expected to have established a
274 national/international reputation in his/her field and have a
275 high probability of continued high quality and productive
276 research and scholarship. Thus, promotion to the rank of

277 professor is a recognition by the Department and the University
278 that is awarded to candidates who have distinguished records of
279 achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia
280 State University.

281 The candidate for promotion to the rank of professor will
282 be judged **excellent** in professional development if the
283 candidate's accomplishments are of such significance and quality
284 that he/she has achieved and is highly likely to maintain a
285 national/international reputation as a respected scholar and
286 researcher in a field of the discipline. The candidate should
287 be able to document evidence of recognition from respected
288 scholars. This evidence should include most of the following:
289 considerable citations of her/his work by scholars in the field,
290 editorial board membership(s), a steady record of reviewer
291 experience, frequent participation in conferences, receipt of
292 extramural grants, receipt of professional awards, leadership
293 positions in professional organizations, and recognition as an
294 expert for the purpose of providing knowledge. The committee
295 will also remain cognizant that different scholarly practices
296 and citation norms may exist in different subfields of political
297 science.

298

299

300 **TEACHING**301 **Evaluation of Teaching**

302 The teaching quality of faculty members is of paramount
303 importance to the Department and the University. The candidate
304 for promotion and/or tenure should submit written evidence of
305 successful teaching organized in the categories set forth in the
306 *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual*.
307 Candidates should present evidence of effectiveness in and
308 commitment to teaching and its improvement. The departmental
309 committee will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with
310 the College Manual's evaluative categories based on the evidence
311 submitted. In making its rankings the departmental Committee on
312 Promotion and Tenure should consider the evidence to determine
313 the success of the candidate in teaching and his or her
314 commitment to teaching and its improvement. Teaching should be
315 considered both within the classroom and outside the classroom,
316 and the committee may need to give more or less weight to each
317 component depending on the circumstances of individual
318 candidates.

319 Within the classroom, a faculty member should be prepared
320 for class, should teach courses reflecting the current state of
321 the discipline, should have syllabi prepared according to the
322 standards of the College, should be available to students

323 outside the classroom, should give assignments that are well
324 prepared and used effectively to encourage learning and
325 analytical thinking, should have his/her students do work that
326 teaches analytical thinking and improves writing skills, and
327 should provide a positive learning environment. The committee
328 should also consider the candidate's efforts and commitment to
329 teaching success and innovation by evaluating evidence of
330 teaching preparation and pedagogical creativity, such as the
331 creative use of technology, assignments, learning exercises, or
332 other in-class techniques to enhance student learning. In
333 considering student perceptions of the candidate's teaching
334 through student course evaluations, the committee will take into
335 account such factors as the type of course.

336 Outside the classroom, a faculty member should strive to
337 support student learning through such activities as writing and
338 evaluating graduate comprehensive examinations, chairing or
339 serving on honors thesis, masters thesis, and doctoral
340 dissertation committees, sponsoring student organizations or
341 teams, preparing graduate students for the job market, advising
342 graduate and undergraduate students, developing and revising
343 curricula and courses, aiding in instructional leadership and
344 coordination, leading departmental seminars on pedagogy and
345 advising, developing and supervising internships, developing and

346 supervising directed readings and independent studies,
347 publishing textbooks or pedagogical research, receiving grants
348 for instructional purposes, participating in pedagogical
349 continuing education, and helping graduate students in
350 presenting papers, publishing, and/or job placement. Faculty
351 members can also show evidence of outside the classroom teaching
352 success by highlighting successful student endeavors connected
353 with their supervision.

354 In rating the candidates, the committee needs to consider
355 their academic rank and the availability of graduate students
356 with compatible research interests. Other things equal,
357 candidates for professor should have considerably more
358 involvement with graduate students than candidates for associate
359 professor.

360

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

362 To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the
363 rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as
364 **excellent** in teaching. To achieve an evaluation of excellent, a
365 candidate for promotion and tenure at the rank of associate
366 professor must demonstrate success in teaching, effort at
367 improvement in teaching, and a strong commitment to student
368 learning.

369

370 **Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

371 To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the
372 rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as **excellent** in
373 teaching. To achieve an evaluation of excellent, a candidate for
374 promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate considerable
375 success in teaching, effort at improvement in teaching, and a
376 strong commitment to student learning.

377

378

379

SERVICE

380 Service to colleagues, to our Department, to the College,
381 to the University, and to the discipline of Political Science is
382 a very important element in judging a faculty member's
383 contributions and performance. As members of a discipline
384 concerned with policy issues and conflict resolution and as a
385 faculty at a public university, we value opportunities to serve
386 the community outside the University at the local, national or
387 global level.

388 Neither the College nor the Department of Political Science
389 asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from
390 faculty in junior ranks as is asked from those in senior ranks.
391 The information given below indicates what we in the Department

392 of Political Science consider to be important forms of service
393 for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for
394 judging different levels of quality when evaluating a
395 candidate's work in the area of service.

396

397 **Evaluation of Service**

398 The candidate for promotion and/or tenure should submit written
399 evidence of successful service organized in the categories set
400 forth in the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure*
401 *Manual*. Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental
402 committee will evaluate the candidate's service according to the
403 College Manual's evaluative categories.

404

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

406 For promotion and tenure at the rank of associate professor, the
407 candidate must be evaluated as **good** in service. A candidate for
408 promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor
409 will be judged **good** if she or he is active in assistance to
410 colleagues, responsibly carries out the departmental service
411 tasks that are assigned to him or her, and demonstrates a
412 commitment to the betterment of the Department.

413

414

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

416 For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must
417 be evaluated as **very good** in service. A candidate for promotion
418 to and/or tenure at the rank of professor will be judged **very**
419 **good** if she or he is active in assistance to colleagues and has
420 taken an effective leading role in departmental service. This
421 should include one or more of the following: service as
422 undergraduate director, graduate director, or department chair;
423 chairing a recruitment committee or an important departmental
424 standing or ad hoc committee; and/or serving on the departmental
425 executive committee. In addition, to be judged **very good**, a
426 candidate should perform significant service roles at the
427 College, University, or System levels. Finally, he or she should
428 show significant service to community, governmental, or
429 professional organizations, or have significant contact with
430 media representatives. Under certain circumstances, significant
431 leadership roles in one area (College, University, System,
432 professional, community, or governmental) can substitute for a
433 lesser service role in another area.

434

435

436

437

438

EVALUATION PROCESS

439 The process and schedule for applying for promotion and
440 tenure in the Department of Political Science is governed by the
441 College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual.

442 Applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor and
443 for tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged by
444 a committee composed of all tenured faculty in the Department
445 holding the rank of associate professor or professor.

446 Applications for promotion to the rank of professor and for
447 tenure at that rank will be judged by a committee composed of
448 all tenured professors. Each committee will elect its own chair
449 and, after deliberation, report its evaluation in each area and
450 its recommendation by letter to the department chair.

451 An important part of the departmental evaluation is the
452 assessment of the candidate's credentials by political
453 scientists outside Georgia State University. The candidate must
454 submit a list of the names of at least eight scholars in the
455 candidate's specialty area outside of Georgia State University
456 who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's performance in the
457 area of professional development and her/his reputation within
458 the discipline. The department chair, together with the relevant
459 departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, will, without
460 input from the candidate, prepare a list of at least eight names

461 of colleagues outside of Georgia State University who could
462 perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these
463 lists are included in the College Manual. Both lists will be
464 submitted to the Office of the Dean, which will select the
465 reviewers according to the procedures laid out in the College
466 Manual. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be
467 considered at all levels of review in the University. The
468 calendar for this review process is in the College Manual.

469

470 **PROCESS FOR REVISING THESE GUIDELINES**

471 Any revisions to the Department's Promotion and Tenure
472 Guidelines will be governed by the following process:

- 473 1. Upon the request of the department chair, the faculty will
474 elect a Promotion and Tenure Manual Revision Committee from
475 among its members. This committee should include faculty at
476 the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and
477 professor. The committee will then select a chair holding
478 the rank of professor or associate professor with tenure.
- 479 2. The Promotion and Tenure Manual Revision Committee will
480 discuss changes to the Promotion and Tenure Manual,
481 consulting the department chair and representatives of the
482 College and University when appropriate. When the committee
483 has reached agreement, it will present the faculty with its

- 484 proposed revisions. All meetings of the committee will be
485 announced and open to all members of the faculty.
- 486 3. The full faculty will be given adequate time to consider
487 these changes, and the committee will give any feedback
488 careful consideration.
- 489 4. Once this process is complete, the committee will present a
490 final proposal to the Department. This proposal will be
491 adopted upon two-thirds vote of all current members of the
492 Department holding the ranks of assistant professor,
493 associate professor, or professor.
- 494 5. Should the proposal fail to be adopted, the committee will
495 solicit another round of comments from the faculty and
496 produce a further revision.
- 497 6. Once the revisions have been approved by the faculty, they
498 will be forwarded to the College for its approval. Any
499 substantive changes made in response to College input will
500 need to be approved by the faculty by a two-thirds vote as
501 outlined above.

502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523

APPENDIX I:

Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development contributions are 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. The faculty member has published some high quality refereed articles and/or book chapters of comparable quality published by respected university or commercial academic presses. The faculty member may also have applied for internal or external research fellowships or grants. S/he would have performed several additional research roles, including active

524 participation in national professional organizations, such as
525 presenting papers or serving as a journal or grants referee.

526 **Excellent:** An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty
527 member's current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely
528 to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for
529 tenure, should the faculty member's upward trajectory continue.
530 The faculty member has published a number of journal articles in
531 respected, peer-reviewed journals, a mixture of such journal
532 articles and peer-reviewed book chapters of comparable quality,
533 or has a published book or a book in press at a university or
534 commercial academic press. In addition, the faculty member
535 presents evidence that testifies to her/his scholarly reputation
536 and the significance of her/his research. Such evidence might
537 include the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or
538 awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or
539 international agencies; citations of the work of the faculty
540 member in the products of other scholars; service on editorial
541 boards and as a reviewer of grants and manuscripts for scholarly
542 publication; and by invitations to contribute to collaborative
543 scholarly endeavors. This list is not intended to be exclusive
544 of other possible evidence.

545 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or
546 her field, as evidenced by national or international awards,

547 laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures
548 in prestigious venues and so on.

549 **B. Teaching**

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

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

564 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance barely
565 exceeds adequate. This faculty member's supporting materials
566 provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent,
567 valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional
568 pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging

569 institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time
570 college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty
571 member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations,
572 achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly
573 positive.

574 **Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose
575 supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent
576 preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of
577 students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of
578 the department. Class assignments are creative and
579 methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student
580 learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, s/he
581 may have little involvement with the type of individual student
582 work that contributes to a rating of *excellent*, and/or the
583 faculty member's student evaluations show inconsistencies or
584 scores that tend to fall somewhat lower than the mid 4-out-of-5
585 range, or that are considerably lower than departmental norms
586 for large introductory core courses.

587 **Excellent:** Beyond being a highly competent teacher in the
588 classroom, the faculty member's teaching record shows active
589 preparation and involvement with individual student work,
590 including directing undergraduate and graduate student research
591 papers, serving on graduate qualifying examination committees,

592 or directing or serving on honors theses, non-thesis projects,
593 master's theses, and dissertation committees. The faculty
594 member's student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-
595 out-of-5 range or higher.

596 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*
597 at either level, the faculty member's student evaluations will
598 often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member also
599 demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or
600 her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive
601 invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation
602 as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops,
603 consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon
604 his or her teaching prowess and that show innovation and
605 creativity in teaching.

606 The faculty member may have won a significant teaching award
607 from a prestigious outlet or been otherwise recognized for
608 superior instruction.

609 **C. Service**

610 **Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings
611 but manifests no other significant service accomplishments.

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

617 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes
618 assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and
619 actively assists colleagues.

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

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

628 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above
629 as *excellent*, the faculty member demonstrates a record of
630 sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the
631 department and throughout the college and university, or in
632 national and international professional organizations.

633
634

635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654

APPENDIX II:

Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited. The faculty member may attend conferences and annual meetings and may write reviews and be active in media contacts, but may have very few scholarly publications in the period under review.

Very Good: The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of maintaining a scholarly profile of national prominence.

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 books,

655 book chapters, and/or articles of the faculty member judged as
656 *excellent* are published by presses and in journals that are held
657 in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the
658 faculty member's work attest to this reputation. Other important
659 evidence might include the securing of fellowships, grants,
660 contracts, and/or awards from external agencies, invitations to
661 participate in collaborative endeavors with other scholars, a
662 steady record of reviewer experience, frequent participation in
663 conferences, recognition as an expert for the purpose of
664 providing knowledge, and leadership positions in professional
665 organizations.

666 **Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or
667 her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, a
668 very strong record of publication, receipt of prestigious
669 extramural support, strong reviews in major publication outlets,
670 invited lectures at prestigious venues and so on.

671 **B. Teaching**

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

677 that results in the deficient transmission of the course content
678 to students.

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

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

696 **Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose
697 supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent
698 preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of
699 students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of

700 the department. Class assignments are creative and
701 methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student
702 learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher,
703 her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of
704 involvement in the supervision of individual student work that
705 is typically expected for a rating of *excellent*, as described
706 below, and/or the faculty member's student evaluations show
707 inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5
708 range.

709 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows extensive
710 preparation and extensive involvement with individual student
711 work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction
712 of honors theses, non-thesis projects, master's theses and/or
713 dissertations to completion; or high level of involvement on
714 such committees. The faculty member's student evaluation scores
715 will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. Faculty
716 members can also show evidence of outside the classroom teaching
717 success by highlighting successful student endeavors connected
718 with their supervision.

719 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of
720 *excellent*, the faculty member's student evaluations will often
721 be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member also
722 demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or

723 her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive
724 invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation
725 as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops,
726 consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon
727 his or her teaching prowess and that show innovation and
728 creativity in teaching. The faculty member may also have won a
729 significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published
730 highly regarded pedagogical studies, or been otherwise
731 recognized for superior instruction.

732 **C. Service**

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

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

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

745 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial,
746 diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department
747 and either the college or the university levels as well as
748 participating in professional associations and beginning to take
749 service roles in professional organizations.

750 **Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a track record of
751 effective leadership that has involved significant departmental
752 or other college or university administrative functions. In
753 addition, s/he should show significant service to community,
754 governmental, or professional organizations, or have significant
755 contact with media representatives. Such leadership is in
756 addition to the level of service described above as *very good*.
757 Under certain circumstances, significant leadership roles in one
758 area (College, University, System, professional, community, or
759 governmental) can substitute for a lesser service role in
760 another area.

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