

**DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES  
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

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

Policy Title:	Department of Religious Studies Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	3
Department Approval:	11/08/2013
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.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Introduction	3
a. General Comments	
b. Tenure	
c. Promotion	
2. The Promotion and Tenure Process in the Department	3
a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process	
b. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure Within the Department	
c. Committee Membership	
3. The Evaluation of Candidates	5
a. Terms Used in Evaluation	
b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	
c. Departmental Evaluation Process	
4. Evaluation of Professional Development	5
a. General Comments on Professional Development	
b. Procedures in the Evaluation of Professional Development	
c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development	
d. Assignment of Final Evaluation Term to an Item in Category A Professional Development	
e. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development	
f. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Professional Development	
5. Evaluation of Teaching	10
a. General Comments on Teaching	
b. Evaluation Process for Teaching	
c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Teaching	
6. Evaluation of Service	12
a. General Comments on Service	
b. Evaluation Process for Service	
c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Service	
7. The Overall Promotion and Tenure Recommendation	14
8. Post-Evaluation Procedures	14
9. The Assessment of Journals and Presses	16
10. Third-Year Promotion and Tenure Review	18

## **1. Introduction**

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring the quality of scholarship, teaching, and service in the university. The process is intended to be both thorough and fair. The promotion and tenure policies of the Department of Religious Studies have been formulated in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Georgia State University Promotion & Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors, and the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. The policies, procedures, and standards of the Regents, University and College take precedence over and govern the material in this manual.

As a result, individuals using these guidelines are urged to consult these other documents from beginning to end. To avoid repetition and potential inconsistencies, many details essential to the promotion and tenure process and delineated in these other manuals have not been included here. It is particularly important that the following guidelines be read in tandem with the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The departmental guidelines contained in this document are designed to provide information concerning specific expectations for performance and achievement for promotion and tenure to candidates from the Department of Religious Studies and to guide the deliberations of members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and the department chair. It is important that all of these parties become thoroughly familiar with these guidelines, as well as with those contained in the College and University manuals. Candidates are specifically directed to the College manual for guidance about preparing, formatting and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion.

The content, guidelines, and standards in this document will be reviewed at any time if so requested by the Chair of the Department or by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track departmental faculty. Any changes in policies or procedures will require a two-thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track members of the Department, and any changes in substantive standards will require a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured members of the Department. As specified in the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, any changes proposed by the Department only become effective upon approval of the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Board.

## **2. The Promotion and Tenure Process in the Department**

### **a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process**

Recommendations with regard to promotion and tenure begin at the departmental level. Both the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair provide independent evaluations and make independent recommendations about a candidate to the College's relevant area committee. The College Committee subsequently makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President, and the President makes the final decision.

47 b. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure Within the Department  
48

49 No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the Department Chair will remind all  
50 faculty in the Department who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure that they may so apply.  
51 All eligible faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must state  
52 their intention in writing no later than the date specified in the College Manual. Those who wish  
53 to apply must provide the Department Chair with a list of eight possible outside reviewers for  
54 professional development. The chair will also provide a list of eight possible reviewers. For  
55 details on this process, see the College Manual (section V.H.). The reviewers should not be from  
56 institutions in Georgia, should not have taught at the institution from which the candidate  
57 received his or her Ph.D. during the time the candidate was at that institution, and should be from  
58 national research universities and national liberal arts colleges that qualify as aspirant peers to  
59 Georgia State University. In cases involving promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers may  
60 be either associate or full professors, though the candidate should give first preference to full  
61 professors; in cases of promotion to Professor, reviewers must be full professors. The Office of  
62 the Dean will be responsible for selecting and contacting the external reviewers.  
63

64 No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must provide the Chair of  
65 the Department with copies of his or her professional development materials to be sent to the  
66 outside evaluators. For details on this process and the nature of the materials to be included, see  
67 the College Manual (section V.I.).  
68

69 No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must submit his or her  
70 dossier to the Department Chair. The material must be in the format required by the College  
71 Manual (sections V.A. – V.G.). At this time, candidates must also submit their Teaching  
72 Portfolio as a component of the promotion and tenure process. By departmental policy, this  
73 portfolio must include: (a) the latest version of syllabi for all courses taught during the past four  
74 years, (b) a representative sample of materials given to the students in all of these courses (e.g.,  
75 tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments), and (c) the numerical and written  
76 student evaluations for all of these courses.  
77

78 The Department Chair will add the letters from the outside reviewers to the dossier before the  
79 dossier is given to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Portions of the outside  
80 reviewers' letters may be quoted in the evaluation letters written by the Department Committee  
81 and the Department Chair as part of the evaluation process, but the identities of the outside  
82 evaluators must not be explicitly or implicitly revealed.  
83

84 c. Membership of the Department Committee  
85

86 For details on the membership of the Department Committee, see the College Manual (section  
87 III.A.).  
88

89 d. Department Evaluation Procedures  
90

91 The Chair of the Department Committee will call the meeting to evaluate the candidate. Prior to  
 92 meeting, the members of the Committee will familiarize themselves with the College manual,  
 93 departmental guidelines and the candidate's materials.

94  
 95 The Department Committee will meet to discuss and deliberate about each candidate being  
 96 considered for promotion and/or tenure.

97  
 98 Both the Department Committee and the Department Chair will provide recommendations  
 99 regarding promotion and/or tenure. For details on these processes, see the College Manual  
 100 (section III.A.).

101  
 102 Unless otherwise noted in this document, the College Manual, or the University Manual,  
 103 *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* will be followed throughout the deliberations.

104  
 105 Confidentiality: The deliberations of the Committee are strictly confidential. The only  
 106 information the candidate should receive about the deliberations is the letters sent forward to the  
 107 Department Chair. No discussion of substantive aspects of the deliberations should be held with  
 108 any individual who is not part of the formal decision-making process.

109  
 110 e. Conveying the Recommendations of the Department Committee and Chair

111  
 112 Both the Department Committee and the Department Chair will provide letters outlining their  
 113 recommendations with regard to promotion and/or tenure. For details on this process, see the  
 114 College Manual (section III.A.).

115  
 116 **3. The Evaluation of Candidates**

117  
 118 a. Standard Used in Evaluation

119  
 120 Candidates for promotion are evaluated in three areas: professional development, teaching, and  
 121 service (to the department, university, community, and profession). In each of these three areas,  
 122 candidates are evaluated based on whether or not the candidate meets the standard for promotion  
 123 and/or tenure.

124  
 125 Evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration,  
 126 the standards of the candidate's subfield, and the mission and resources of the Department of  
 127 Religious Studies, the College, and of the University.

128 b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

129 *Associate Professor*

130 In order to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor,  
 131 the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional development. The successful  
 132 candidate must present evidence that he or she is recognized as having an emerging national  
 133 reputation according to professionals in his or her field outside of the University and is making

134 significant contributions to the advancement and development of his or her field. In the category  
 135 of teaching, the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* to be recommended for tenure and  
 136 promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. An evaluation of *excellent* in teaching presumes a  
 137 demonstrated ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and  
 138 graduate students and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The  
 139 candidate must also be judged as contributing significantly and positively to the service activities  
 140 of the department and thereby evaluated as at least *good* in the category of service.

141 Further details governing the evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of  
 142 Associate Professor are outlined in sections 4, 5, and 6 below.

### 143 *Professor*

144 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates  
 145 who have distinguished records of achievement and standing at Georgia State University and in  
 146 their professions nationally and internationally. The quality and number of achievements  
 147 required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor surpass those required for a  
 148 recommendation to Associate Professor. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at  
 149 the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in professional development,  
 150 *excellent* in teaching, and *very good* in service.

151 The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor are the same as those described above and  
 152 outlined in sections 4, 5, and 6 below for promotion to Professor.

## 153 **4. Evaluation of Professional Development**

### 154 155 **a. General Comments on Professional Development**

156 The evaluation of a candidate's Professional Development is based primarily on the candidate's  
 157 consistent publication of important original scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, books)  
 158 along with additional scholarly work significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations,  
 159 book reviews, editing and refereeing work). The Department sees the peer-review process as a  
 160 principal determiner of the type of scholarship a candidate has produced. Scholarship and  
 161 scholarly activities that have not undergone a peer-review process may be considered  
 162 "significant to the profession," but they will not weigh as heavily as peer-reviewed projects and  
 163 publications. The candidate must submit evidence of professional development organized  
 164 according to the categories of professional development listed in the College manual (section  
 165 V.E.).

166 The Department of Religious Studies recognizes that professional development can take many  
 167 forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as  
 168 scholars in the profession. For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles  
 169 for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his or her  
 170 work in books that undergo comparable peer-review scrutiny. Other candidates will pursue a  
 171 mixture of publications (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books). While  
 172 there is no one path, the Department recognizes that some external reviewers from our field have

173 increasingly expected candidates for promotion and tenure to publish books. The Department  
 174 recognizes that the nature of publishing is changing and will consider those realities in the  
 175 context of candidates' subfields.

176 While the Department of Religious Studies recognizes the central importance of refereed journal  
 177 articles to the profession, it also acknowledges the significant accomplishment represented by  
 178 having leading scholars in one's field invite one to contribute substantive articles and chapters to  
 179 anthologies, encyclopedias, and other scholarly works. The particular significance of an  
 180 individual instance of such scholarship can be weighed, in part, by the presence/absence of a  
 181 peer-review process, the reputation of the editor(s) of the volume, and the quality of the journal  
 182 or press in which it is published.

183 The Department of Religious Studies appreciates the increasingly prominent role that on-line  
 184 publication and other electronic resources play in the production and dissemination of  
 185 knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are sometimes difficult  
 186 to apply to emerging forms of scholarship relying on electronic media. Therefore, if including  
 187 such materials in their dossiers, candidates should make a case for the quality of the project by  
 188 briefly outlining its distinctive contribution to disciplinary knowledge and to the candidate's  
 189 professional development, providing evidence of peer review, when applicable, and/or by noting  
 190 citations of the project in other venues when applicable.

191 Obtaining external funding for one's research or creative works is a valued professional  
 192 development activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources,  
 193 will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in one's disciplines. At the same time, the  
 194 Department of Religious Studies recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in  
 195 some departmental sub-fields and, furthermore, that grant support is a means to the end of  
 196 producing scholarship, not an end in itself. The candidate should explain how grants she or he  
 197 has received have contributed or will contribute to the publication of peer-reviewed materials or  
 198 other significant scholarly accomplishments.

199 Other scholarly activities, such as making presentations at professional meetings and reviewing,  
 200 refereeing, and editing the scholarly work of others also are valued and expected activities for  
 201 any scholar. Although no one type of activity is mandated for promotion and tenure, successful  
 202 candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in some roles.

203 The Department of Religious Studies resists the idea that meeting the professional development  
 204 standard is solely a matter of the quantity of a candidate's publications or other scholarly  
 205 activities. We expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both  
 206 the quality and quantity of their professional record. Evaluation of an individual faculty  
 207 member's professional development will focus on the entire profile of that individual's  
 208 contribution.

#### 209 b. Procedures for the Evaluation of Professional Development

210  
 211 The Committee will first divide the candidate's professional development materials into two  
 212 categories, Category A and Category B. Category A items include important original

213 publications of scholarly research that have been subjected to the peer-review process (e.g.,  
 214 articles, chapters, and books). At the discretion of the candidate and/or Department Committee,  
 215 Category A may also include grants received in support of these publications. Category B items  
 216 are other scholarly works significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, reviews,  
 217 editing and refereeing others' work). While the departmental committee typically will have  
 218 comments from the outside reviewers on the nature and quality of most of the items found in  
 219 Category A, this will be less typical of the items placed in Category B.

220

#### 221 Examples of Category A Items

222 Articles

223 Books

224 Book Chapters

225 Book Review Essays

226 Critical Encyclopedia Articles

227 Critical Introductions to Anthologies

228 Critical Translations of Books and Articles

229 Edited volumes

230 Essays in Anthologies

231 Fellowships and Grants Received

232 Scholarly Monographs

233

#### 234 Examples of Category B Items

235 Bibliographical Monographs

236 Book Notes

237 Book Reviews

238 Commentaries on Papers Read at Professional Meetings

239 Editorial Service to Journal and Book Publishers

240 Expository Encyclopedia Articles

241 Honors and Awards

242 Professional papers presented

243 Review of Programs and Candidates at Other Institutions

244

245 Note 1: Book review essays are article-length works that contain sustained critical  
 246 discussion. Book reviews are standard-length reviews of the work of others. Book notes  
 247 are short reviews of the work of others.

248

249 Note 2: In cases of collaborative efforts (e.g., coauthored articles), the candidate must  
 250 submit a statement indicating the specific share he/she contributed to the item.

251

252

#### 253 c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development

254

255 In the manner described below, the Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate each item  
 256 placed in Category A individually.

257



258 The Committee will consider what the letters of the outside reviewers say, if anything, about the  
 259 item in question. The departmental evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and  
 260 contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly. After a discussion of the outside  
 261 reviewers' comments, each member of the Departmental Committee will determine whether, in  
 262 his or her view, the reviewers, taken as a group, judge the item under consideration as meeting  
 263 the standard for professional development.

264  
 265 The Committee will consult the Departmental List of Presses and Journals—compiled over  
 266 several years based on input from leading scholars from outside Georgia State University (see  
 267 Appendix) – to help determine the press/journal's generally perceived quality in the field, and  
 268 this will contribute to the Committee's consideration of whether the publication meets the  
 269 professional development standard. The fact that a scholarly work appears in a press/journal not  
 270 on the Departmental List should not be taken to imply anything about its quality.

271 The Committee will read the published materials included in the Candidate's dossier and  
 272 evaluate the relative quality of each item according to the evidence it provides of sound research  
 273 methods, creative engagement with the requisite fields or sub-fields, clarity and rigor of  
 274 expression and, where relevant, its impact on contemporary scholarly discussion. This aspect of  
 275 the assessment relies on the Committee's professional judgment of the Candidate's scholarship.

276  
 277 Finally, the Committee will establish the Final Assessment of the item. The Final Assessment  
 278 will take into account the external reviewer's recommendations, the quality of the presses and  
 279 journals in which the candidate has published (as determined by a departmental process laid out  
 280 in the Appendix), the variety of the candidate's distinct contributions to his/her field, and the  
 281 professional judgment of the Committee members.

#### 282 283 d. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development

284  
 285 The Committee next shall consider all Category B Professional Development accomplishments  
 286 in the candidate's dossier. The Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate the items in  
 287 Category B. While supporting evidence will be sparser here (outside evaluation letters may  
 288 contain no mention of these items and copies of presented papers are not included in the dossier),  
 289 the Committee Chair will solicit comments from the Committee about the scholarly significance  
 290 of the various Category B accomplishments. Final assessments may not be assigned to every  
 291 item in Category B, but the candidate's accomplishments in this area will become part of his or  
 292 her Professional Development Profile (see section 4.f, below).

#### 293 294 e. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Professional Development

295  
 296 To arrive at an assessment in Professional Development, the Professional Development Profile  
 297 will be examined and applied in light of the criteria set forth below.

298  
 299 The Department Committee will develop an overall assessment of the Candidate's dossier as it  
 300 relates to Professional Development. In all cases, the number of publications required to earn a  
 301 particular assessment decreases as the quality of the candidate's publications and the number and  
 302 quality of the candidate's Category B professional development activities increase.

303

304 The final assessment of the Departmental Committee for Professional Development shall be the  
 305 highest assessment to which the majority of the Committee can agree. As noted in the College  
 306 Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final evaluation will write a Minority  
 307 Report. Such a Minority Report must include substantive justification for the Minority's  
 308 disagreement with the final assessment of the majority of the Committee.  
 309

#### 310 *Rankings for Associate Professor (Professional Development)*

311 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is  
 312 available only to those candidates who are judged as *excellent* in professional development,  
 313 *excellent* in teaching, and at least *good* in service.

314 A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor will be judged as  
 315 *excellent* in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's  
 316 scholarly work is highly accomplished. There are obviously many ways for a candidate to  
 317 provide justification for such a conclusion. For example, a candidate may have published a book  
 318 and one or two articles in top tier journals or presses. Alternatively, a candidate's portfolio may  
 319 include a combination of articles or book chapters in top tier or highly regarded journals or  
 320 presses, production of an edited volume, published book review essays, critical translations, and  
 321 had his or her work recognized with a fellowship or grant. While the exact number and type of  
 322 materials in this combination may vary, the candidate will be assessed based on the candidate's  
 323 distinct contributions to his/her field. To receive an overall ranking of *excellent*, a candidate may  
 324 also have been active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher, conference session  
 325 organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, external grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

#### 326 *Rankings for Professor (Professional Development)*

327 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available  
 328 only to those candidates whose professional development is judged as *excellent*.

329 The candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Professional Development if the Committee's  
 330 judgment is that the candidate's scholarship is widely recognized as highly accomplished. Such a  
 331 candidate will typically have published a second book. In addition, the candidate may have also  
 332 published two or three articles in top tier journals or presses or alternatively published a  
 333 combination of articles or book chapters in top tier or highly regarded journals or presses,  
 334 produced an edited volume, published book review essays, critical translations, and had his or  
 335 her work recognized with a fellowship or grant. While the exact number and type of materials in  
 336 this combination may vary, the candidate will be assessed based on the candidate's distinct  
 337 contributions to his/her field. To be recommended for such promotion, a candidate also should  
 338 have been very active in other research roles, such as invited lecturer and panelist in national and  
 339 international venues, intramural researcher, conference session organizer or presenter, journal  
 340 editor or referee, book series editor, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

### 341 **5. Evaluation of Teaching**

342 a. General Comments on Teaching

343 The Department of Religious Studies regards high quality teaching and student learning to be of  
 344 foremost importance to its mission. Teaching is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such,  
 345 the Department recognizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement as central in the  
 346 evaluation of its faculty members. The Department expects its faculty members to be engaged in  
 347 instructional efforts, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, not only in the classroom  
 348 setting but also in directing individual student work.

349 The evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate's submission of documentation  
 350 organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the College manual (section V.F.).  
 351 Types of evidence include:

352 1. Courses Taught During the Last Four Academic Years

353 2. Perceptions of Students

354 3. Honors or Special Recognitions for Teaching

355 4. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, and Dissertations

356 5. Published Materials (as related to teaching)

357 6. Teaching Portfolio

358 By Departmental policy, this portfolio must include: (a) the latest version of  
 359 syllabi for all courses taught; (b) all materials given to the students in all such  
 360 courses (e.g., tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments); and (c)  
 361 the numerical and written student evaluations for all courses. College Policy bases  
 362 the evaluation of teaching only on the last four academic years in which the  
 363 candidate has taught. These, in turn, are the courses that should be documented in  
 364 the Teaching Portfolio.

365 7. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, such as:

366 (a) the development of effective evaluation and assessment methods  
 367 relative to student performance and the acquisition of knowledge and  
 368 skills (to be reflected in examinations, teaching methods and pedagogical  
 369 philosophy);

370 (b) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the  
 371 appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of  
 372 established courses (to be reflected in course syllabi and other curricular  
 373 materials);

374 (c) the maintenance of high standards for the material taught and  
 375 expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions,  
 376 syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other  
 377 examples);

378 (d) the advisement of students on various levels and in various degree  
 379 programs;

380 (e) guest lectures in classes; and

381 (f) a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching methodology.

### 382 b. Evaluation Process for Teaching

383 Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate's  
 384 teaching according to the College Manual's standard of *excellent*. The materials will be used to  
 385 evaluate the candidate's instructional contribution in four general areas (described further  
 386 below): 1) Course Content, 2) Course development, 3) Student Evaluations, and 4) Instructional  
 387 and Mentoring Activity Beyond the Classroom.

- 388 1) Course Content. Effective course content is evidenced by demonstrating coherence  
 389 between reading assignments, lecture materials, and graded assignments. Clear  
 390 organization of the syllabus and effective communication to students regarding their  
 391 responsibilities and expectations are also indications of thoughtful course content  
 392 development. In addition to these elements, the category of course content also takes into  
 393 consideration the level of rigor incorporated into the course through such things as the  
 394 nature and amount of reading required of students, types of assignment and tests.  
 395 Pedagogical innovation also belongs to the category of course content.
- 396 2) Course Development: Effective course development is evidenced by the candidate's  
 397 instructional contribution to the range and scope of courses offered by the department and  
 398 the way in which those courses fulfill the mission of the Department and serve to address  
 399 its curricular needs. Effective course development should enhance the Department's  
 400 offerings and, when possible, align with University Teaching Initiatives such as CTW or  
 401 WAC courses and/or provide signature experience activities such as field work or study  
 402 abroad programming. Evidence of course development that aligns with the University's  
 403 Strategic Plan will also be considered in high regard.
- 404 3) Perception of Students. The Department understands the category of student evaluations  
 405 to be inclusive of the totality of student perceptions of the instructor's contribution to the  
 406 learning environment. Therefore, standardized student evaluations are considered only as  
 407 one element among many that can be used to evaluate a candidate's performance within  
 408 this category. In addition to considering the written comments on the standardized  
 409 student evaluation, candidates may also submit feedback gained from students through  
 410 other channels, where applicable. Thereafter, the Department Committee will calculate an  
 411 average score for Question # 17 and a separate average for Questions ## 1-16 of the  
 412 standardized online student evaluations for each course. These averages should typically  
 413 be within the mid-4 range in order to demonstrate teaching excellence. The Department

414 Committee will qualitatively assess these numerical scores by taking into account the  
 415 level and type of course taught, the number of years in which it was taught, and the  
 416 nature of the fluctuations in the evaluation scores. Thus, the Department Committee will  
 417 not focus on Question #17 exclusively in its assessments, but rather will evaluate the  
 418 students' perceptions in line with criteria such as: student response rate, whether the  
 419 course was required or elective, the class size, and so on. The Department Committee  
 420 will attempt to discern a pattern in student perceptions of the overall pedagogical  
 421 environment created by the candidate, attending to the scores on all questions as well as  
 422 further evidence provided by students' written remarks.

423 4) Instructional and Mentoring Activity Beyond the Classroom. The Department considers  
 424 instructional and mentoring activity outside the traditional classroom setting as an  
 425 important supplement central to its educational mission. Thus, the Department  
 426 Committee will also consider the candidate's effective supervision of independent  
 427 studies, practica, undergraduate and graduate thesis development and writing, research  
 428 mentoring, supervision of internships, and the development of service-learning  
 429 opportunities. In making its assessment, the Department Committee will also take into  
 430 account the traditional enrollment numbers within the Department, the multiple non-  
 431 thesis tracks available at the undergraduate and graduate level, and the overall ratio of  
 432 faculty to students in the Department. Advising students on their post-graduate activities  
 433 and writing letters of recommendation on their behalf will also be considered in this  
 434 category.

#### 435 c. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Teaching

436 After the completion of discussion, the Departmental Committee shall vote on one cumulative  
 437 final ranking for the candidate in the area of teaching based on the four categories outlined above  
 438 and come to a final decision on the candidate's standing in the area of teaching. In line with the  
 439 College manual, the final ranking of the Departmental Committee for teaching shall be rendered  
 440 relative to the standard of *excellent*. As specified in the College Manual, members of the  
 441 Committee who disagree with the final ranking of the committee will write a Minority Report.  
 442 Any such Report must include the justification for disagreeing with the final ranking. The  
 443 following comments are intended to offer guidelines rather than absolute criteria.

#### 444 *Rankings for Associate Professor (Teaching)*

445 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is  
 446 available only to those candidates whose Teaching is judged as *excellent*. The candidate will  
 447 have demonstrated *excellence* if his or her dossier indicates that that he or she has been effective  
 448 across all four instructional categories, namely course content, course development, student  
 449 evaluations, and mentoring activity beyond the classroom. For instance, the course material  
 450 presented must show diligent preparation and be current in the field; the student evaluation  
 451 scores must suggest effective performance in the classroom; and the candidate must demonstrate  
 452 involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates may have developed new courses or  
 453 revised existing courses, taught courses that involve university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC,  
 454 study abroad, or service learning), used technology in innovative ways, published a textbook,  
 455 published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching awards.

456 *Rankings for Professor (Teaching)*

457 As stated in the College manual, promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available  
 458 only to those candidates whose Teaching is judged as *excellent*. The candidate will have  
 459 demonstrated *excellence* if his or her dossier indicates that that he or she has been highly  
 460 effective across all four instructional categories, namely course content, course development,  
 461 student evaluations, and mentoring activity beyond the classroom. For instance, the course  
 462 material presented must show diligent preparation and be current in the field; the student  
 463 evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; and the candidate  
 464 must demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates will  
 465 have developed new courses or significantly revised existing courses, taught courses that involve  
 466 university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC, study abroad, or service learning), used technology in  
 467 innovative ways, published a textbook, published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching  
 468 awards.

469 **6. Evaluation of Service**

470 a. General Comments on Service

471 The Department of Religious Studies is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the  
 472 university, local, and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and international  
 473 professional organizations. Only those service activities that are related to the candidate's areas  
 474 of professional expertise will be included in an evaluation of his or her service. While the  
 475 expectations for the amount and quality of service work will be higher for those seeking  
 476 promotion to Professor than for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor, collegiality, in  
 477 the broadest sense, is a necessary and highly valued quality sought in all candidates seeking  
 478 promotion and tenure in the Department of Religious Studies.

479 The candidate must submit documentation of service organized according to the categories of  
 480 service listed in the College manual (section V.G.). Complete descriptions for any service  
 481 category must be provided by the candidate along with explanatory documentation, when  
 482 appropriate. Possible examples of each category of service are provided below.

483 1. Contributions to the Department: Chairing departmental committees, memberships on  
 484 committees, development of programs and activities, participation in major department  
 485 sponsored activities, holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload  
 486 assessment.

487 2. Contributions to the College, University, or University System: Committees served on or  
 488 chaired at the College or University level, serving on the University Senate, holding positions of  
 489 significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment.

490 3. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: Consultations, memberships  
 491 on advisory boards, offices held.

492 4. Assistance to colleagues: Consultations concerning student issues, collaborations with other  
493 University departments and programs.

494 5. Significant Discipline-Related Community Service: Community lectures, speeches,  
495 presentations, short courses, hosting conferences.

496 6. Meritorious Public Service: Assistance to governmental agencies; major service awards that  
497 are discipline related. The service category “Support of Local, State, National, or International  
498 Organizations” refers to services to professional organizations (e.g., treasurer of a learned  
499 society, coordinating logistics of conferences) that do not rely predominantly on the scholarly  
500 expertise of the candidate. Professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing the  
501 promotion materials of faculty at other institutions, etc.), on the other hand, would be counted in  
502 Category B of Professional Development. A research based, largely expository, introductory  
503 lecture to a non-academic audience would be counted under Service. A lecture on substantive  
504 and novel scholarly ideas presented in an academic setting would be counted in Category B of  
505 Professional Development. Should there be disagreement about the classification of an item, the  
506 view of the Committee will be decided by majority vote. No item may count in more than one  
507 category.

#### 508 b. Evaluation Process for Service

509 Within the Department, the evaluation of service is based on two factors: *quality* of service work  
510 performed and *quantity* of the service work performed.

511 After a thorough discussion of the items listed in the candidate’s dossier under service and using  
512 the guidelines set forth below, every member of the Committee will rank the candidate as to  
513 whether he or she has provided *good* service. The Committee’s assessment of a candidate in each  
514 of the individual areas outlined below will be the highest ranking at which a majority of the  
515 Committee ranks the candidate.

516 *1. Quality of Service Work Performed:* Can the candidate be relied upon to perform assigned  
517 tasks in a timely and competent fashion? Does he or she attend scheduled meetings? Does he or  
518 she provide good leadership and results when chairing a committee? Has he or she made  
519 substantive service contributions? Does the candidate work well with colleagues? Does he or she  
520 avoid unnecessary conflict?

521 A candidate judged to have provided *good* quality service will receive a majority of positive  
522 answers to each of these questions. A candidate judged to have provided *very good* quality  
523 service will receive positive answers to almost all of these six questions.

524 *2. Quantity of Service Work Performed:* Does the candidate accept an amount of service  
525 responsibility commensurate with rank? Does the candidate accept an amount of service  
526 responsibility commensurate with the fair distribution of responsibilities in the Department?  
527 Does he or she consistently accept reasonable service requirements when asked? If being  
528 considered for promotion to Professor, has the candidate assumed major service roles at the  
529 College and/or University levels? Does the candidate recognize a range of service

530 responsibilities—not merely to the Department but to colleagues and the profession? Does the  
531 candidate show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

532 A candidate judged to have provided *good* quality service will receive a majority of positive  
533 answers to each of these questions. A candidate judged to have provided *very good* quality  
534 service will receive positive answers to almost all of these six questions.

535 c. Arriving at a Final Evaluation in Service

536 Based on the evidence submitted and the evaluations with regard to the quality and quantity of  
537 the candidate's service work (see section 6.b, above), the departmental committee will judge the  
538 candidate as at least good or very good in service relative to the rank for which the candidate is  
539 being considered and whether or not the candidate is being considered for tenure at his or her  
540 present rank. The evaluative terms to be used in the evaluation letters that represent the standards  
541 in the category of service are described in the subsections below on rankings. As noted in the  
542 College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final assessment will write a  
543 separate letter indicating their recommendations with their justification for disagreeing with the  
544 final assessment. Any dissenting letters must include the committee member's justification for  
545 disagreeing with the Final Ranking. The following comments are intended to offer guidelines  
546 rather than absolute criteria.

547 *Ranking for Associate Professor (Service)*

548 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be  
549 evaluated as at least *good* in service. Candidates will be judged *good* if they have been effective  
550 in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed several department  
551 service tasks. In addition, candidates may be active in department, college, or university service  
552 tasks or have provided service to community, governmental, or professional organizations.  
553 Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible. The  
554 department considers both quality and quantity of service.

555 In cases in which the evaluation of quality and quantity of Service do not coincide, the overall  
556 final assessment shall come from the committee selecting the higher of the two ratings.

557 *Ranking for Professor (Service)*

558 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available only to those candidates who  
559 have been evaluated as at least *very good* in service. Candidates will be judged *very good* if they  
560 have been consistently effective in providing assistance to colleagues, sometimes in a leadership  
561 capacity, and if they have consistently, willingly and responsibly performed several department  
562 service tasks. Candidates are expected to have contributed service at the college or university  
563 levels in addition to supporting department programs. They should have provided significant  
564 service to community, governmental, or professional organizations, including some leadership  
565 service. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.  
566 The department considers both quality and quantity of service.



567 In cases in which the evaluation of quality and quantity of Service do not coincide, the overall  
 568 final assessment shall come from the committee selecting the higher of the two ratings.

569

## 570 **8. Post-Evaluation Procedures**

571

572 By the date given in the College manual, the Chair of the Departmental Committee will write a  
 573 letter to the Department Chair expressing the Committee's recommendation and providing a  
 574 detailed justification of the recommendation. Every member of the Committee will sign this  
 575 letter or write and sign a dissenting letter. These letters must be in the format specified in the  
 576 College Manual (see section III.A.) and must protect the anonymity of the outside evaluators.

577

578 The Department Chair will review the Committee's letter and conduct an independent review of  
 579 the candidate's qualifications in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service. In  
 580 conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria specified in this document.  
 581 The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee  
 582 expressing his or her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the  
 583 recommendation. The Committee's letter(s), the Department Chair's letter, and the candidate's  
 584 external letters and dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date  
 585 specified by the College. Candidates for promotion and tenure will receive from the  
 586 Departmental Chair, in a timely fashion, copies of the recommendations of the Departmental  
 587 Committee and Department Chair. The candidate can respond in writing to any of these  
 588 recommendations by writing to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than the  
 589 date specified in the College Manual.

590

591 The remainder of the promotion and tenure process is described in the College and University  
 592 manuals.

593

### 594 Process

595

596 For details on the timing of the third-year review, the preparation of the dossier, and the  
 597 submission of materials, please see the College manual (section VII.).

598

599 The departmental Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor will review the dossier. After  
 600 due deliberation, Committee members will jointly prepare a summary report on the dossier that  
 601 includes an evaluation of how well the candidate is progressing towards promotion and tenure.

602

603 The Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor will  
 604 hold a conference to inform the faculty member of how well he or she is progressing towards  
 605 promotion and tenure. The Department Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of the  
 606 Committee's written evaluation and a copy of the Department Chair's own independent report.

607

608 The Chair will forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and a member of the  
 609 Dean's Office will meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.

610

611

## 612 APPENDIX I. The Assessment of Journals and Presses

613

614 While loose hierarchies of scholarly journals, publishers, granting agencies, and more  
 615 experimental venues may exist in each field or subfield, there is generally disagreement about  
 616 such rankings, both as to the merit of such ranking as well as to the specific assessment of  
 617 specific scholarly venues. Moreover, valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new  
 618 ideas, or evidence and perspectives that challenge existing knowledge may not be found in or  
 619 supported by the allegedly best of these. In fact, as the history of a great deal of scholarship in  
 620 the Humanities and Social Sciences attests, sometimes cutting-edge work can only be made  
 621 available outside of and independently of the most prestigious venues. In addition, given the  
 622 interdisciplinary nature of academic work in the comparative study of religion, some of a  
 623 candidate's work may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines and areas of study and  
 624 have little recognizable Religious Studies content. Given the shifting disciplinary landscape in  
 625 the Humanities and Social Sciences, we also recognize that some candidates may work in  
 626 cognate fields or sub-fields, and we do not wish to disadvantage such work. Likewise, a  
 627 candidate's more creative collaborations may require moving outside the field as traditionally  
 628 construed and should be assessed with all due consideration.

629

630 With that recognition, a candidate's work should nonetheless demonstrate overall advancement  
 631 of scholarly inquiry within the field of Religious Studies as it is broadly defined. To that end, and  
 632 in order to assist candidates who are preparing to come up for promotion and/or tenure (and who  
 633 are deciding where they might seek to publish their work), the Department will create, maintain,  
 634 and regularly update a list of journals and presses in which faculty might publish, along with  
 635 assessments of the quality of these journals/presses provided by outside scholars with  
 636 distinguished scholarly records in relevant subfields.

637

638 The Department Chair will circulate this list each year at the last official Department faculty  
 639 meeting of the academic year (usually in April). At this time, faculty may request that a new  
 640 journal/press be assessed or that a journal/press already on the list be assessed again. Potential  
 641 candidates for promotion and/or tenure are particularly encouraged to request ranking for all  
 642 journals and presses in which they might reasonably anticipate publishing their work.

643

644 The Department Chair will then solicit judgments about the quality of the journals and presses  
 645 from leading scholars suggested by the faculty member(s) requesting the review. Faculty  
 646 members will be asked to submit three to five names of scholars in the appropriate field or  
 647 subfield. These scholars must not be affiliated with Georgia State University. All tenured and  
 648 tenure-track members of the Department may nominate scholars to rank the journals and presses.  
 649 Scholars will be asked to rank listed journals and presses on the following scale:

650

651 *Top Tier:* the journal or press published is considered one of the top 1-3 in a given  
 652 (sub) field

653 *Highly Regarded:* the journal or press publishes highly regarded work in a given  
 654 (sub) field

655 *Not Highly Regarded:* the journal or press publishes work that is below the  
 656 professional standard normal to the (sub) field.

657 *Unable to Rank:* the scholar may decline to rank a journal/press

658 The Department will assemble the solicited assessments by external reviewers at the next  
659 Department faculty meeting (normally in August). In cases of disagreement among external  
660 reviewers, the Department will vote on how to translate the external assessment into  
661 departmental criteria. The judgment of the majority will determine the provisional final  
662 assessment. "Unable to Rank" is not a departmental criterion, but is reserved for the use of  
663 external reviewers who feel unqualified to assess the quality of a press or journal.

## **APPENDIX II. Third-Year Pre-Tenure Review**

The Department of Religious Studies reviews all tenure-track faculty members during their third year of employment. Faculty members who come to Georgia State University with one year of credit from a previous institution go through a third-year review in their second year at Georgia State University. Faculty members who come to Georgia State University with two years of credit go through a third-year review in their first year at Georgia State. Faculty members who come to Georgia State University with three years of credit do not go through a third-year review.

The purpose of this review, which considers the faculty member's effectiveness in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service, is to ensure that faculty members have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and tenure decision.

While the faculty member under third-year review should be familiar with the Department guidelines and use the document as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion and tenure process. While extremely important, the third-year review is more informal; it is meant to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, the faculty member's achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Department Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion and tenure decision, the Department Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, he or she will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion and tenure.

### **APPENDIX III. Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

#### **A. Professional Development**

The Department of Religious Studies recognizes that professional development can take many forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in the profession. The following ratings provide an assessment of the candidate's progress toward meeting the professional development standards for tenure and promotion in a timely fashion. The standards for tenure and promotion in professional development are articulated more fully in the body of this manual.

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

**Fair:** The faculty member maintains a minimal program of professional development, but has no evidence that he or she is producing scholarly work that is recognized as accomplished. For example, he or she has presented work at scholarly conferences, written book reviews, and/or has published one article in an unranked or non-peer-reviewed journal. Overall, the quantity and quality of the faculty member's work does not indicate he or she is an active scholar, and there is no substantial plan for increasing his or her activity.

**Good:** The faculty member maintains a program of professional development, but the reviewers are not confident that he or she is producing scholarly work that is accomplished or is establishing a reputation within his or her field. For example, the faculty member may have presented work at scholarly conferences and published one or two articles, but they appear in unranked or poorly ranked journals. Alternatively, the faculty member is working on a book, but has not completed a manuscript and there is no evidence of interest from a publisher. Overall, the quantity and quality of the faculty member's work suggest that he or she will not have established a body of scholarly work that will be viewed as highly accomplished by the time of tenure review, and/or that the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

**Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, does not yet demonstrate that he or she is producing scholarly work that is highly accomplished. The faculty member has published in journals or in edited volumes, but has not yet published work in sufficient quantity or with enough highly ranked journals to indicate that he or she is on track to developing a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field. Similarly, the faculty member may have begun a book project, but has not yet made sufficient progress in writing and/or eliciting publisher interest to indicate that he or she is on track to having the book published in a timely fashion. Overall, it is not clear whether the projects that he or she has underway are likely to result in a sufficiently prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

**Excellent:** The faculty member is moving toward establishing the reputation of a highly accomplished scholar, as indicated by a contract with an academic press; two or more articles in highly ranked journals or presses; several articles, book chapters, and critical essays in

recognized journals or presses; production of an edited volume (in some stage of production or under contract), and/or recognition of the faculty member's work by a national or international fellowship or grant. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty member's current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member's upward trajectory continue.

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

## **B. Teaching**

The Department expects its faculty members to be engaged in instructional efforts, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, not only in the classroom setting but also in directing individual student work. The following ratings provide an assessment of the candidate's progress toward meeting the teaching standards for tenure and promotion, standards which are articulated more fully in the body of this manual.

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

***Fair:*** The faculty member displays a marginal record of teaching, as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic efforts, ineffective course development or pedagogical techniques, and so forth.

***Good:*** The faculty member's instructional performance displays some evidence of conscientious preparation and appropriate class content, but fails to demonstrate either effective pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

***Very Good:*** The faculty member is a capable teacher who displays evidence of diligent classroom preparation and instruction, effective pedagogy, student mentoring, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the department, but requires some improvement on course content and development, instructional activity beyond the classroom, and/or student course evaluations.

***Excellent:*** The faculty member's teaching record shows consistently strong classroom preparation and instruction and demonstrates instructional effectiveness and student achievement. The faculty member is engaged in instructional and mentoring activities beyond the classroom that include direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, as

well as honors and/or master's theses. The faculty member's student evaluation scores are often in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has demonstrated unusually effective student teaching and mentoring; for example, he or she has won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet; he or she has co-authored published scholarly work with a student; he or she has developed new instructional or extra-curricular programming; and/or he or she has had significant demonstrable positive impact on a student's post-graduation opportunities or achievements..

### C. Service

The Department of Religious Studies is committed to providing professionally-oriented service to the university, local, and state communities, as well as to relevant local, national and international professional organizations. The following ratings provide an assessment of the candidate's progress toward meeting the service standards for tenure and promotion, standards which are articulated more fully in the body of this manual

**Poor:** The faculty member does not make any significant contribution to departmental meetings or committees.

**Fair:** The faculty member attends general faculty meetings and serves on departmental committees, but makes few significant contributions to the business of those meetings or committees.

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

**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department level, and has contributed to other college or university functions and/or professional associations.

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

**Outstanding:** The faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained significant service accomplishments at all levels of the college and university, as well as in national and/or international professional organizations.