

**INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN’S, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

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

Policy Title:	Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Version:	3
Department Approval:	02/06/2013
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.

1 I. Introduction
2

3 This document contains the specific guidelines that apply to and govern all
4 recommendations for promotion and tenure made by the Institute for Women's, Gender, and
5 Sexuality Studies (WGSS) to the Dean's Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. This
6 set of guidelines elaborates for the Institute the procedures and standards set forth in the College
7 of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, with the proviso that everything therein
8 affirmed about "department/school" is understood to include "institute." Should any conflict
9 arise, the College Manual will take precedence. All procedures hereinafter discussed must take
10 place according to the deadlines specified in that manual.
11

12 This document will apply to all Institute core faculty, understood as all those who are
13 hired as faculty in the Institute. *For any faculty housed in other departments but with a joint*
14 *appointment (see the Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies' Bylaws) in the*
15 *Institute, work for the Institute will be evaluated by the Director and the evaluation sent to the*
16 *department chair.* Such joint appointments will be made by the Dean of Arts and Sciences upon
17 the recommendation of the Director and relevant department chairs and deans. The
18 appointments will normally be made for one year and are renewable. These individuals and
19 others with affiliate or associate status (see the Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality
20 Studies' Bylaws) in the Institute may request an overall evaluation of their work in the Institute
21 for their P&T reviews. This request must be made in a letter to the Director indicating the
22 purpose of the evaluation and to whom it should be sent. WGSS affiliates are full-time faculty
23 selected by the Director in consultation with the Executive Committee and approved by the Dean
24 of Arts and Sciences, a status normally granted for three years and renewable. Affiliate faculty
25 normally serve on WGSS committees and teach WGSS courses that are cross-listed with WGSS
26 in accordance with College and University workload policies. WGSS associates are full-time
27 faculty housed in other departments or institutes who commit a portion of their work to WGSS, a
28 renewable status granted for 10-24 months. Associates are selected by the Director in
29 consultation with the Executive Committee and approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and
30 any other appropriate dean.
31

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

42 II. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

43

44 A. Candidacy and Outside Evaluations

45

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

49

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

63

64 The Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies recognizes that women's,
65 gender, and sexuality studies scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of
66 methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical
67 versus empirical work, scholarship of discovery versus scholarship of integration, qualitative
68 versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses as misguided struggles over
69 false choices. Each topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it
70 is appropriate and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore, that success in
71 professional development can be achieved in many ways, that contributions may affect study,
72 practice, or policy, and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

73

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

84 B. Promotion and Tenure Committees

85
86 To consider any Institute-housed faculty member's candidacy for tenure and/or for
87 promotion to assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, a promotion and tenure
88 committee shall be formed consisting of all faculty with formal appointment in the Institute at or
89 above the level to which the candidate aspires (or, in the case of a tenure-only candidate, of all
90 those at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered for tenure). Others may
91 be drawn, after consultation between the director and the candidate and with the approval of the
92 Dean's office, as needed from the affiliated faculty (see definition thereof in the Bylaws) of the
93 proper rank. If there are fewer than three Institute faculty and appropriate affiliated faculty at the
94 specified rank are deemed not sufficient to constitute a committee, the Dean, in consultation with
95 the Director, will augment the faculty review committee with members at the appropriate rank
96 from other departments.

97
98 In advance of meeting to consider the candidate, the committee shall select a chair, who
99 will then ensure that each member of the committee has access to all the material submitted by
100 the candidate as well as to any letters solicited by the Dean's office from outside evaluators. The
101 committee shall then discuss the material submitted and vote on the candidate in each of the
102 three areas to be evaluated: professional development, teaching, and service. Candidates will be
103 evaluated as either having met or having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in
104 each of the following three areas: professional development, teaching, and service. This
105 determination will be made by majority vote and will take into consideration the standards
106 appropriate for the rank to which the candidate desires promotion or the rank at which tenure is
107 to be awarded.

108
109 The chair or a designated member of the committee in consultation with those voting
110 with the majority of the committee will draft a letter reflecting the committee's judgment in each
111 of the three areas together with as much supporting argument as needed. Each member of the
112 committee must either sign this letter or write and sign a minority report. The committee's letter
113 together with any minority reports will be sent to the Director of the Institute and then shall be
114 forwarded with the Director's own letter of evaluation to the appropriate area committee on
115 promotion and tenure of the College. If there is no majority, reports reflecting the split shall be
116 written, signed by those in agreement, and forwarded. Minority opinions may still be written.

117
118 C. Requisite Levels of Evaluation

119
120 Following Board of Regents, University, and College requirements, standards of
121 evaluation differ, depending on the level for which an individual is being considered. The levels
122 and their standards are indicated as follows:

123
124 **Associate Professor:** To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of
125 associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least *excellent* in professional
126 development and teaching. In keeping with university standards, the recommended
127 candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has already

128 contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers within and
 129 outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in his/her field. As part
 130 of the college and departmental reviews, the candidate will be evaluated on evidence that
 131 his/her current trajectory in both professional development and teaching will support
 132 successful progress toward the rank of professor after promotion to associate professor
 133 with tenure. The candidate must also be evaluated as having provided at least *good*
 134 service to merit promotion to and/or tenure at this level.

135
 136 **Professor:** To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a
 137 candidate must be evaluated as at least *excellent* in both professional development and
 138 teaching and at least *very good* in service, with the proviso that the quality and the
 139 number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor
 140 substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. In
 141 keeping with university standards as described in the GSU and College of Arts and
 142 Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manuals, the recommended candidate must be deemed to
 143 have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high
 144 probability of continued high quality and productive research, scholarship, and creative
 145 activities.

146
 147 D. Areas of Evaluation

148
 149 The Institute will evaluate all candidates in the three areas of professional development,
 150 teaching, and service. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the Institute should specify
 151 what is distinct, unique and individual about her/his area of specialization within her/his field
 152 and instructional area. Distinctive aspects and features of specialization within each field and
 153 within areas of professional development, teaching, and service need to be clarified and
 154 documented for the departmental and college promotion and tenure committees. The burden for
 155 designating and elaborating such area distinctions lies with the candidate seeking tenure and/or
 156 promotion.

157 **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

158

159 **General Remarks**

160

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

167

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

183

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

189

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

198

199 While loose hierarchies of scholarly journals, publishers, granting agencies, and venues
 200 for performance and showing creative work may exist in each field, there is generally

201 disagreement about such rankings. Moreover, valuable work that offers innovative approaches,
202 new ideas, or evidence and perspectives that challenge existing knowledge may not be found in
203 or supported by the allegedly best of these. In fact, as the history of women's, gender, and
204 sexuality studies shows, sometimes cutting-edge work can only be made available outside and
205 independently of the most prestigious venues. In addition, given the interdisciplinary nature of
206 women's, gender, and sexuality studies, some of a candidate's work may appear in the scholarly
207 outlets of other disciplines and areas of study and have little recognizable women's, gender, and
208 sexuality studies content. We recognize that those in women's, gender, and sexuality studies
209 often work in other fields as well, and we will not disadvantage such work. Likewise, a
210 candidate's creative collaborations with other artists outside as well as within women's, gender,
211 and sexuality studies will be given consideration. However, a candidate's work should
212 demonstrate advancement of scholarly inquiry within the field of women's, gender, and sexuality
213 studies, as it is broadly defined.

214
215 Though both individual and cooperative scholarship and creative works have value, the
216 Institute recognizes the occasional difficulty of determining the relative contributions of co-
217 authors or co-creators. Order of authorship does not necessarily convey accurate information
218 about relative contributions to a multiply-authored work. For fair assessment, each candidate
219 must define their contribution to co-authored or collaborative scholarship and explain its
220 significance in their promotion and tenure dossiers. Contributions to professional associations of
221 an administrative nature shall be counted in the category of service rather than professional
222 development. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations count in the professional
223 development category.

224
225 Many of the most innovative projects in the field of women's, gender, and sexuality
226 studies combine theory and practice. The Institute encourages such work and recognizes that
227 there may be overlaps in the categories of scholarly works and creative projects. Those
228 achievements which fall into the two categories will be evaluated using criteria drawn from both.

229
230 Criteria for evaluating creative projects will include consideration of the length and
231 complexity of the project, the means of disseminating the work to an audience, and the
232 evaluation of the completed work by outside peer review. For creative projects, a loose analogy
233 might be drawn between a produced short play, short film, or short performance and a journal
234 article or book chapter. Similarly, a loose analogy might be drawn between the production of a
235 full-length film or full-length play and a book. Dissemination venues may be to an on-campus,
236 local, regional, national and/or international audience, generally in a hierarchy of rising
237 valuation. In some cases, there may be special value to on-campus productions, but that value
238 must be demonstrated and judged by the above criteria and outside peer review. For those
239 projects that fall outside traditional creative categories, such as multimedia and digital projects, it
240 will be necessary for candidates to establish the status of their work in relation to generally
241 understood standards of their field.

242
243 Evaluations will be based on the reputation of the producer or distributor of the work and
244 their standards of selection. Supporting materials for creative projects might include reports

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

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

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

267 **Categories of Professional Development**

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

273 **Evaluation of Professional Development**

275 Based on the evidence submitted, the Institute committee will evaluate the candidate's
 276 professional development.

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

280 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor is available only to those
 281 candidates who are judged to be at least *excellent* in both professional development and teaching
 282 and at least *good* in service. Candidates already at the rank of associate professor applying for
 283 tenure must also be evaluated as having provided *very good* service in order to be recommended
 284 for tenure at this level. Following university standards, the recommended candidate for
 285 promotion to associate professor will have developed a substantial body of work that has already
 286 contributed to the advancement of the field as determined by peers within and outside of the
 287 university, while establishing a national reputation in the field.

288 A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be
 289 judged as *excellent* in professional development only if the committee's assessment is that the
 290 candidate's scholarly and/or creative work is highly accomplished. A candidate should have
 291 been very active in other research and/or creative roles. There are obviously many ways for a
 292 candidate to provide justification for such a conclusion. A candidate, for example, might have
 293 published a book and several articles or chapters, all of very good quality; a significant number
 294 of refereed articles and/or book chapters of distinguished quality; or a larger number of articles
 295 and/or chapters of very good quality and comparable to more than a book. A candidate may also
 296 have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as intramural research,
 297 conference session organization or participation, creative event production, editing or refereeing
 298 for a journal, or reviewing grants or books. For a candidate whose field is creative, published
 299 and produced creative works will be evaluated as described in the preceding General Remarks.

300

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

302

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

309

310 The candidate will be judged *excellent* in professional development only if the
 311 committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship or creative activities are highly
 312 accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a large number of
 313 influential refereed articles or chapters of excellent quality; or a larger number of articles or
 314 chapters of very good quality and comparable to more than a book; or a book and a significant
 315 number of articles or chapters, all of very good quality. To qualify as *excellent*, a candidate
 316 could also have secured extramural funding to support his/her research and should have been
 317 highly active in additional research roles, such as reviewing grants and books, serving on
 318 editorial boards, or presenting research in professional and academic venues. For a candidate
 319 whose field is creative, published and produced creative works will be evaluated as described in
 320 the preceding General Remarks.

321 **TEACHING**

322

323 **Categories of Teaching**

324

325 The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Institute
326 and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. Candidates for promotion and tenure
327 must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the categories of
328 teaching listed in the college manual (section V.F.).

329

330 **Evaluation of Teaching**

331

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

335

336 A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor will be
337 judged to be *excellent* in teaching if the judgment of the committee on the basis of the evidence
338 submitted is that the candidate's performance is effective. For instance, the student evaluation
339 scores must suggest effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must
340 show diligent preparation and be current in the field; and the candidate must demonstrate
341 involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates may have developed new courses or
342 revised existing courses, taught courses that involve university initiatives (such as CTW, WAC,
343 study abroad, or service learning), used technology in innovative ways, published a textbook,
344 published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching awards.

345

346 A candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor will be judged to be
347 *excellent* in teaching if the judgment of the committee on the basis of the evidence submitted is
348 that the candidate's performance is superb. For instance, the student evaluation scores must
349 suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show
350 impressive preparation and be current in the field; and the candidate must demonstrate a high
351 level of involvement in mentoring students. In addition, candidates will either have developed
352 new courses (or significantly revised existing courses), taught courses that involve university
353 initiatives (such as CTW, WAC, study abroad, or service learning), used technology in
354 innovative ways, published a textbook, published about pedagogy, or won one or more teaching
355 awards.

356 **SERVICE**

357
 358 Service to one's colleagues, to the Institute, to the College, and to the University is a very
 359 important element in judging faculty's contributions and performance. Faculty also owe service
 360 to their academic discipline or area(s) of study, usually by participating in the operation of
 361 professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition, women's,
 362 gender, and sexuality studies, as a field of study concerned with the workings of gender and
 363 sexuality in society, is quite conducive to practical forms of community service, so efforts at
 364 applying the field's knowledge and methods to address community concerns are highly valued
 365 in our Institute.

366
 367 Neither the College nor the Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies asks
 368 the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks.
 369 The information given below indicates what we in the Institute consider important forms of
 370 service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of
 371 quality when evaluating candidates' work in the area of service.

372 **Categories of Service**

373
 374
 375 The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to their areas of
 376 professional expertise according to the categories of service in the college manual (section V.G.).

377 **Evaluation of Service**

378
 379 Based on the evidence submitted, the institute committee will evaluate the candidate's
 380 service.

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

382
 383
 384 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of **Associate Professor** the candidate must be
 385 evaluated as at least *good* in service. Candidates will be judged *good* if they have either been
 386 very effective in assistance to colleagues and have willingly and responsibly performed several
 387 institute service tasks, are active in institute service tasks and serve on a college, university, or
 388 system committee, or are active in institute service tasks and have had significant service to
 389 community, governmental, or professional organizations or significant public contact (e.g., talks,
 390 workshops, interviews). Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service
 391 wherever possible.

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

393
 394
 395 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of **Professor** the candidate must be evaluated
 396 as at least *very good* in service.

397
 398 Candidates will be judged *very good* if they have effectively taken a major role in
 399 department or institute service or have significant service on college or university committees.
 400 Candidates may have served as an officer or board or committee member of a regional or

401 national professional association. They may also show significant service to community,
402 governmental, or professional organizations or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops,
403 interviews). Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their service wherever possible.

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

A1. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; however there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research. This body of scholarship, which may include a book or comparable body of articles and book chapters, has contributed to the advancement of her/his field. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications in sub-fields in which scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes documentation directly demonstrating one's emerging national reputation and/or the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies; these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and significance of the candidate's research. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty member's current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member's upward trajectory continue.

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

443 **A2. Professional Development in the Creative Arts**

444

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

446

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

448

449 **Good:** The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional
450 development and/or the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited in
451 scope and impact.

452

453 **Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional
454 development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field;
455 however, there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a
456 more prominent creative profile in the near future.

457

458 **Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a body of work that shows national recognition and
459 strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the
460 long term as well as the near future. A significant body of creative work may include a full-
461 length book, play, or film, or a number of short pieces in the genre within which the faculty
462 member works. This work or collection of works will directly demonstrate her/his emerging
463 national reputation. Peer-reviewed digital and other new media forms of publication are also
464 valid venues. Securing external support, an extremely competitive undertaking, is valued highly
465 as acknowledgment of success and prominence. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the
466 faculty member's current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an
467 assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member's upward
468 trajectory continue.

469

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

474 **B. Teaching**

475

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

480

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

485

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

492

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

501

502 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent
 503 involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate
 504 student research papers, as well as honors and master's theses. The faculty member's student
 505 evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as
 506 appropriate to the course size and level. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with
 507 teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. For example, the faculty member may have
 508 created new courses, significantly revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into
 509 course syllabi and instruction, implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and
 510 exercises into course syllabi and instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the
 511 unit's overall instruction and curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to
 512 lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading
 513 workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of
 514 research or pedagogical expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to
 515 her/his research. Through these activities, the faculty member shows creative reflection and
 516 action in teaching.

517 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent* at either level, the faculty
 518 member's student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has
 519 won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for
 520 superior instruction.

521 C. Service

522
 523 **Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other
 524 significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental
 525 committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

526
 527 **Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other
 528 significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental
 529 committees, but with few effective contributions to the work of those committees.

530
 531 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
 532 and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

533
 534 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service
 535 and leadership at the department level as well as on the college or university levels. The faculty
 536 member engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in
 537 professional associations, serving on editorial review boards, and/or a significant amount of
 538 review work (e.g., for presses in the form of unpublished manuscripts).

539
 540 **Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that
 541 has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions.
 542 Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as *very good*.

543
 544 **Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
 545 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department
 546 and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and/or international professional
 547 organizations.

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

548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581

A1. Professional Development

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

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

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

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

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The faculty member's books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member's work attest to this reputation. The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research since her or his last promotion, which may include a book-length project, a number of book chapters or peer-reviewed articles, co-authored or co-edited projects, or some combination of these. Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

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

582 **A2. Professional Development in the Creative Arts**

583

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

585

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

587

588 **Good:** The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional
589 development and/or the faculty member's professional development contributions are limited in
590 scope and impact.

591

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

596

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

606

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

611 **B. Teaching**

612

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

617

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

622

623 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty
624 member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid

625 content, but fail to demonstrate either competent pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the
 626 wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The
 627 learning environment in this faculty member's classroom, as reflected in student evaluations,
 628 achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

629
 630 **Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes
 631 evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students,
 632 effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are
 633 creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient
 634 student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may
 635 lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is
 636 typically expected for a rating of *excellent*, as described below, and/or the faculty member's
 637 student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores that fall regularly below the 4-out-of-5 range.

638
 639 **Excellent:** The faculty member's teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive
 640 involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful
 641 direction of honors and master's theses to completion. The faculty member's student evaluation
 642 scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the
 643 course size and level. The faculty member evaluated as *excellent* also will have demonstrated a
 644 creative and reflective pedagogy that may include a substantial variety of activities related to
 645 instruction. For example, the faculty member may have created new courses, significantly
 646 revised existing courses, incorporated digital literacies into course syllabi and instruction,
 647 implemented critical-thinking-through-writing core tenets and exercises into course syllabi and
 648 instruction, or incorporated other activities that strengthen the unit's overall instruction and
 649 curriculum. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or
 650 her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or
 651 producing pedagogical publications based upon her or his area of research or pedagogical
 652 expertise, thereby demonstrating a commitment to teaching as related to her/his research. Such a
 653 faculty member will also have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs
 654 in a timely fashion; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; presenting or
 655 publishing their work, completing their programs, and advancing into subsequent programs or
 656 into the profession. Such a faculty member advises and guides students diligently, and these
 657 students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

658
 659 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's student
 660 evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a
 661 significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical
 662 studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

663 C. Service

664
 665 **Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other
 666 significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental
 667 committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

668 **Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other
669 significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental
670 committees, but with few effective documented contributions to the work of those committees.
671

672 **Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
673 and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.
674

675 **Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service
676 and leadership at the department level as well as on the college or university levels. The faculty
677 member engages in service to her or his field, which may include holding positions in
678 professional associations, serving on editorial review boards, a significant amount of review
679 work (either for presses in the form of unpublished manuscripts or for universities by serving as
680 an external reviewer), or significant public contact (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews).
681

682 **Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has
683 involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such
684 leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as *very good*.
685

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