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1. Introduction

a. General Comments

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring the quality of scholarship, instruction, 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 Policy on Promotion, and the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. The policies, procedures, and standards of the Regents, College and University take precedence over and govern the material in this manual.

The departmental guidelines contained in this manual are designed to provide information concerning expectations for performance and achievement for promotion and tenure to candidates from the Department of Religious Studies and to guide the deliberation 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 manual 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 Review Board.

b. Tenure

Tenure is established and governed by the policies and regulations of the Board of Regents. Only Associate Professors and Professors employed full-time may hold tenure.

Tenure may be awarded upon completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. The five-year period should be continuous, although a limited interruption because of leave of absence or part-time service may be permitted. This interruption may not exceed two years. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of Instructor at Georgia State University. Such credit shall be specified in writing and approved by the Dean.

Candidates for tenure who are granted probationary credit and apply this credit toward tenure must submit all work done (in professional development, instruction, and service) during the period for which probationary credit is given, as well as work done since arriving at Georgia State University. However, for some aspects of the evaluation of teaching (as outlined in the section of this manual on the Evaluation of Teaching), only courses taught by the candidate for the last four years at Georgia State University are considered.

c. Promotion

An Assistant Professor is normally considered for promotion and tenure in the sixth year of service at that rank. In cases of highly exceptional achievement, an Assistant Professor may apply for promotion and
tenure in the fifth year of service. An Assistant Professor must be considered for promotion and tenure no later than the seventh year. Credit received for service at other institutions or in the rank of Instructor may be applied (at the candidate’s discretion) towards a candidate’s tenure. Assistant Professors must simultaneously apply for promotion and tenure, though tenure in the College will not be granted without promotion to Associate Professor.

An Associate Professor seeking promotion to Professor normally is not considered for promotion before the fifth year of service as Associate Professor at Georgia State University. However, a candidate may seek early promotion, if exceptionally strong justification exists for doing so, in the fourth year of service, but no sooner. A faculty member hired at the Associate Professor or Professor level may be considered for tenure no earlier than the fifth year of service and must be considered for tenure no later than the seventh year of service at Georgia State University. Credit for service at other institutions may be applied (at the candidate’s discretion) towards tenure. Thus, for example, a person with two years of credit may be considered for tenure in the third year of residence at Georgia State University. Non-tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion and tenure may not seek promotion prior to tenure; a candidate may seek tenure prior to promotion.

A faculty member may receive a maximum of three years of credit for service at other institutions.

Candidates for promotion must submit all work done since their initial appointments or since the completion of the dossier used in the review that led to promotion to his or her current rank at Georgia State University, whichever is relevant. Candidates with probationary credit must submit work done during the period for which such credit is given. For some aspects of the evaluation of teaching (as outlined in the section of this manual on the Evaluation of Instruction), only courses taught by the candidate during the last four years at Georgia State University are considered.

For a fuller explanation of these rules, please see the College Manual.
2. The Promotion and Tenure Process

a. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process

Recommendations with regard to promotion and tenure begin at the departmental level. Both the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair provide independent evaluations and make independent recommendations about a candidate to the College Promotion and Tenure 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. The President makes a recommendation to the Board of Regents, and the Board makes the final decision.

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

No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the Department Chair will remind all faculty in the Department who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure that they may so apply. All eligible faculty members who wish to apply must provide the Department Chair with a list of six possible outside reviewers. For each reviewer the candidate must provide the following: institution affiliation and title(s), addresses (both postal and e-mail), indication of her or his rank, areas of concentration, major achievements, standing in the discipline, and the nature and extent of any personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate. Candidates must not contact any of the individuals on their lists of outside reviewers concerning a possible request for an evaluation. The Committee and the Department Chair will also compose a list of six possible outside reviewers. The reviews should not be from institutions in Georgia, should not have taught at the institution from which the candidate received his or her Ph.D. during the time the candidate was at that institution, and should be from national research universities and national liberal arts colleges. In cases involving promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers may be either associate or full professors; in case of promotion to Professor, reviewers must be full professors. The Office of the Dean will select at least four reviewers, with at least two being from the candidate’s list and with at least two being from the Committee’s list.

No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must provide the Chair of the Department with six copies of his or her professional development materials (i.e., his or her publications, professional development statement, and any other materials specified in the College Manual). These materials will be forwarded to the outside reviewers. The professional development materials are part of the dossier discussed in the next paragraph but the dossier also includes the instruction and service materials.

No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must submit his or her dossier to the Department Chair. The material must be in the format required by the College Manual. Candidates should be aware that the format required by the College Manual is complex. The dossier includes three statements of interests and goals: one for professional development, one for instruction, and one for service. Very specific formats for the dossier are required. Candidates should be sure to allow sufficient time to compose these statements and compile the dossier before the deadline for its submission.

Candidates must also submit their Teaching Portfolio as a component of the promotion and tenure process. By Departmental policy, this portfolio must include: (a) the syllabi for all courses taught, (b) all materials given to the students in all courses (e.g., tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments), and (c) the numerical and written student evaluations for all courses. By College Policy, the evaluation of instruction for the purposes of promotion and tenure is based only on the courses taught during the last four years that the candidate has taught courses at Georgia State. These courses, in turn, should be the ones covered in the Teaching Portfolio submitted for purposes of promotion and tenure.

The Department Chair will add the letters from the outside reviewers to the dossier before the dossier is given to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate will not be informed of the identities of the outside reviewers and will not see the letters themselves. Portions of the outside reviewers’
letters may be quoted in the evaluation letters written by the Departmental Committee and the Departmental Chair as part of the evaluation process, but the identities of the outside evaluators must not be explicitly or implicitly revealed.

c. Committee Membership

The Departmental Committee on Promotion to Associate Professor consists of those and only those members of the Department who have tenure and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, except the Chair of the Department and any members of the Department serving in a position that will require them to review the candidate’s promotion and tenure decision at the College or University level. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will be elected by its members and will have full voting rights.

The Departmental Committee on Promotion to Professor shall consist of those and only those members of the Department who have tenure and who hold the rank of Professor, except the Chair of the Department and any members of the Department serving in a position that will require them to review the candidate’s promotion and tenure decision at the College or University level. The Chair of this Committee will be elected by its members and will have full voting rights.

In the event that there are not enough eligible departmental faculty members to constitute a committee on promotion and/or tenure, the Departmental Chair and the College Area Committee shall make the promotion and/or tenure recommendation to the Dean of the College. If there is a single eligible faculty member for the departmental promotion and/or tenure committee, he or she shall write a letter assessing the candidate which will be included with materials sent to the College Area Committee.
3. The Evaluation of Candidates

a. Terms Used in Evaluation

Candidates for promotion are evaluated in three areas: professional development, instruction, and service (to the department, university, community, and profession). In each of these three areas, candidates are evaluated on a scale established by the university and referred to subsequently in this manual: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding.

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

b. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Associate Professor

In order to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must present evidence that he or she is recognized by professionals in his or her field outside of the University as contributing to the advancement and development of his or her discipline. The rank of Associate Professor also presumes a demonstrated ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and graduate students and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The candidate must also be judged as contributing significantly and positively to the instructional and service activities of the department.

For a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least excellent in professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other. The candidate must also be rated as at least good in service.

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing at Georgia State University and in their professions nationally. The quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor surpass those required for a recommendation to Associate Professor.

In order to be recommended for promotion to Professor, a candidate must be judged as excellent in both professional development and instruction, and at least very good in service.

To receive tenure at the rank of Professor, the candidate must meet the requirements for promotion to Professor stated above.

c. Departmental Evaluation Procedures

The Departmental Committee will meet to discuss and deliberate about each candidate being considered for promotion and tenure.
The Chair of the Departmental Committee will call the meeting to evaluate the candidate. Prior to meeting, the members of the Committee will familiarize themselves with the College and Departmental manuals and read all of the candidate's materials.

Unless otherwise noted in this Manual, the College Manual, or the University Manual, Robert's Rules of Order Revised will be followed throughout the deliberations. In this manual, the word “majority” has the meaning used in Robert’s Rules and in standard usage, i.e., “more than half of the total votes cast.”

Confidentiality: As indicated in the College Manual, the deliberations of the Committee are strictly confidential. The only information the candidate should receive about the deliberations are the letters sent forward to the Department Chair. No discussion of substantive aspects of the deliberations should be held with any individual who is not part of the formal decision-making process. Because the privacy of e-mail cannot be guaranteed, e-mail correspondences, even between parties who are involved in the process, should not include substantive statements and judgments about individual cases.

d. Specific Evaluation Criteria for Professional Development, Instruction, and Service

The detailed criteria for the evaluation of each of these three areas are explained in sections 4, 5, and 6.
4. Evaluation of Professional Development

a. General Comments on Professional Development

The evaluation of a candidate’s professional development is based primarily on the candidate’s consistent publication of important original scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, books) and secondarily on other scholarly work significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, book reviews, editing and refereeing work). This section describes the criteria for assigning evaluation terms (i.e., poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding) for a candidate’s 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. For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his or her work in books which undergo comparable peer-review scrutiny. Other candidates will pursue a mixture of publications (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books). The Department judges no one path to be superior to others.

The Department also recognizes that a loose hierarchy of scholarly journals and presses exists within the discipline. As a result, it will seek the opinions of leading scholars in the field of religious studies from outside the University and ask them to rank the quality of journals and presses in the field (including strengths and weaknesses in individual subfields and series, when appropriate). These rankings will contribute to departmental deliberations about the impact and quality of a candidate’s published work, as outlined in section 4.c (below), though such considerations will not replace substantive consideration of the work itself. For a description of the process by which these journals and presses are ranked, see section 10 of this manual.

While the Department of Religious Studies recognizes the central importance of refereed journal articles to the profession, it also acknowledges the significant accomplishment represented by having leading scholars in one’s field invite one to contribute substantive articles and chapters to anthologies, encyclopedias, and other scholarly works. The particular significance of an individual instance of such scholarship can be weighed, in part, by gauging the reputation of the editor(s) of the volume and the quality of the journal or press in which it is published.

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

Obtaining external funding for one's research or creative works is a valued professional development activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in one’s disciplines. At the same time, the Department of Religious Studies recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in some departmental sub-fields and, furthermore, that grant support is a means to the end of producing scholarship, not an end in itself.

Other scholarly activities, such as making presentations at professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the scholarly work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no one type of activity is mandated for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.
The Department of Religious Studies resists the idea that qualitative evaluations, such as excellent and very good, can be defined solely by the number of publications or other scholarly activities. We expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quantity and quality of their professional record. Evaluation of an individual faculty member’s professional development will focus on the entire profile of that individual’s contribution.

b. Procedures for the Evaluation of Professional Development

The Committee will first consider whether any publications or professional development activities presented by the candidate as distinct items are in fact multiple instances of the same item (e.g., the same talk given in two different places). Should this issue be raised by any Committee member, the Committee, after discussion, will vote to determine whether the specific items in question shall be regarded as a single accomplishment or multiple accomplishments. If the vote is tied, the items in question will be treated as multiple accomplishments.

The Committee will then divide the candidate’s professional development materials into two categories, Category A and Category B. Category A items are important original publications of scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, and books). Category B items are other scholarly works significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, reviews, editing and refereeing work). While the departmental committee typically will have comments from the outside reviewers on the nature and quality of all of the items found in Category A, this will be less typical of the items placed in Category B.

Examples of Category A Items
Articles
Book Chapters
Essays in Anthologies
Book Review Essays
Critical Encyclopedia Articles
Critical Introductions to Anthologies
Books
Scholarly Monographs

Examples of Category B Items
Anthologies Edited
Bibliographical Monographs
Book Notes
Book Reviews
Professional papers presented
Commentaries on Papers Read at Professional Meetings
Expository Encyclopedia Articles
Fellowships, Grants, Honors, and Awards
Editorial Service to Journal and Book Publishers
Review of Programs and Candidates at Other Institutions
Translations of Books and Articles

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

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

Note 3: The above divisions between Category A and Category B accomplishments are intended as a guideline for the Committee and as a starting-point for the discussion. These divisions should not replace the careful consideration of the actual work. For example, certain translations may be of such creative and scholarly significance as to qualify in Category A, while certain critical
introductions may by substance and brevity qualify for Category B. If there is any disagreement about whether an item belongs in Category A or Category B, the view of the Committee will be decided, after discussion, by majority vote. If a vote regarding the classification of a work in Category A or Category B is tied, the item will be assigned to Category A.

c. Evaluating Items in Category A of Professional Development

The Departmental Committee will discuss and evaluate each item placed in Category A individually.

First, the Committee will consider what the letters of the outside reviewers say, if anything, about the item in question. The Departmental Committee should consider that the letters from outside reviewers may be, at times, both more and less reliable than other appraisals of a candidate's work: more reliable because the reviewer may be a more objective judge and may share an area of specialization with the candidate, but less reliable because the reviewer may lack an understanding of the specific context and conditions in which and for which the material was produced. Therefore, the departmental evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly. After a discussion of the outside reviewers' comments on each item, each member of the Departmental Committee will announce whether, in his or her view, the reviewers, taken as a group, judge the item under consideration to be poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, outstanding, or none of the above. (“None of the above” will be selected when the outside reviewers do not address the quality of an item or do so in such a way that an overall assessment of their opinions cannot be made.) The highest ranking such that a majority of the Committee believes that the outside reviewers rank the item at that rank or higher will determine the Outside Reviewers' Ranking of the item.

Second, the Committee will consult the Departmental List of Presses and Journals—compiled over several years based on input from leading scholars from outside Georgia State University (see section 10)—to determine whether the press/journal in which the item appears is less than good, good, very good, excellent or unable to rank. This will determine the Press/Journal Ranking of the item. The fact that a scholarly work appears in a press/journal not on the Departmental List should not be taken to imply anything about its quality. It means nothing more than that the item has no Press/Journal Ranking.

Third, the Committee will establish the Initial Ranking of the item. The Initial Ranking is the higher of the Outside Reviewers' Ranking and the Press/Journal Ranking. If an item is published in a press or journal not on the departmental list, then the Initial Ranking is the Outside Reviewers’ Ranking. If an item has no Outside Reviewer Ranking but is in a press or journal ranked on the departmental list, then the Initial Ranking is the Press/Journal Ranking. If an item is neither published in a press or journal on the departmental list nor is it discussed by the outside reviewers, then it has no Initial Ranking.

d. Assignment of Final Evaluation Term to an Item in Category A of Professional Development

The Committee shall then consider whether this initial evaluation should be made final. The Chair of the Committee should ask if all members are in agreement that the initial term assigned to the item represents a fair assessment of the accomplishment. If so, the initial evaluation term becomes the final evaluation of the Committee. If not, the Committee will discuss any and all arguments put forth by members of the Committee for lowering or raising the item’s ranking. A motion or motions to change the initial ranking of the item will then be entertained. If such a motion receives the majority support of the Committee members, the final ranking of the item thereby becomes the evaluation term specified in the motion. In the case of a tie, the initial ranking shall stand. All deviations from the initial rankings of an item by the Committee must be clearly explained and justified.

e. Evaluation of Items in Category B of Professional Development

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

f. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Professional Development

With these discussions and votes complete, the Committee will arrive at a Professional Development
Profile of the candidate. Such a profile might look something like the following:

Category A: 1 Very Good book, 2 Excellent articles, 1 Very Good article, 1 Good book review essay
Category B: 4 papers delivered at national conferences, 1 paper delivered at a regional conference, 4 book
reviews, 2 book notes, 1 editorial board appointment to a Good journal.

To arrive at a final ranking in Professional Development, the Professional Development Profile will be
examined and applied in light of the criteria set forth in the following paragraphs. The words and numbers
set forth below are intended as guidelines and are not intended to replace the careful discussion of and
deliberation about the individual and collective accomplishments of the candidate.

The phrase “on average” with regard to the quality of scholarly works refers to an averaging of the
qualitative rankings for publications established in section 4.d, above. For instance, 3 articles of which one
is ranked excellent, one very good, and one good would be “on average” very good. In arriving at such
averages, a book will typically weigh three to four times that of any article, but the length and substance of
the individual works may impact this ratio, as well as impacting the total number of publications required
to earn a specific ranking. In all cases, the number of publications required to earn a particular qualitative
ranking decrease as the quality of the candidate’s publications and the number and quality of the
candidate’s Category B professional development activities increase.

The final ranking of the Departmental Committee for professional development shall be the highest
evaluative term from among outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor such that a majority of
the Committee members believes that the candidate deserves that rank or higher. As noted in the College
Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the final ranking will write a dissenting letter. Any
dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for disagreeing with the final ranking.

All numbers listed below are intended as guidelines, not as minimum or maximum requirements. The
scenarios outlined are offered as examples and are not intended to exhaust all possibilities.

Rankings for Associate Professor (Professional Development)

As stated in the College manual, promotion to Associate Professor is available only to those candidates
who are judged to be at least excellent in either professional development or instruction and at least very
good in the other area.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will be judged outstanding in professional development
if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarly work is of an extremely rare quality and
unquestioned importance. There are many ways for a candidate to provide justification for such a
conclusion. A candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (7-8) of articles and/or
book chapters of on average excellent quality; or a smaller number (5-6) of articles and/or book chapters of
on average outstanding quality; or a larger number (over 8) of articles and/or chapters of a mix of excellent
and very good quality, or a book and a small number (3-4) of articles and chapters of on average excellent
quality; or two or more books of excellent/very good quality. To qualify as outstanding, a candidate also
should have been highly active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarly work is highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (5-6) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality; or a larger number (6-7) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or a smaller number (4 or so) of articles and/or book chapters of on average outstanding quality; or a book and a small number (1-2) articles and/or chapters of on average excellent quality; or a book and a few (3-4) articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also should have been very active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged very good in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarly work is highly competent. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (5-6) articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality; or a larger number (7-8) of articles and/or chapters of on average good quality; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of an excellent quality; or a book and a small number (1-2) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or a book and a few (3-4) articles and/or chapters of on average good quality. To qualify as very good, a candidate also should have performed several additional research roles, such as conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged good in professional development if the committee's general impression is that the candidate's scholarly work is competent. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a small number (2-4) of articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality, or a significant number (5-6) of articles and/or chapters of on average good quality, or a larger number of articles (more than 6) and/or chapters of on average fair quality; or a book and small number (1-2) of articles of on average good quality. To qualify as good, a candidate also should have performed at least some additional research activities, such as conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

The evaluation categories, fair and poor, are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good professional development.

**Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor (Professional Development)**

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the area of Professional Development are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.

**Rankings for Professor (Professional Development)**

As stated in the College manual, promotion to professor is available only to those candidates whose professional development is judged as excellent.

A candidate for promotion to Professor will be judged outstanding in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship is of rare quality and truly exceptional importance. There are a number of ways for a candidate's work to meet these criteria. A candidate, for example, might have published a significant number of articles and/or chapters (more than 8) of on average excellent quality since the candidate's last promotion; or a smaller number of articles (6-7) of on average outstanding quality; or a book and a significant number (4-5) of articles and chapters of on average excellent quality; or two books of on average excellent quality. To qualify as outstanding, a candidate also will likely have secured extramural funding to support his or her research and should have been highly
active in additional research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or presenter, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged **excellent** in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship is highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-7) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality since his or her last promotion; or a larger number (7-8) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average outstanding quality; or a book and a small number (2-3) of articles and/or chapters of on average excellent quality; or a book and a larger number (4-5) of articles and/or chapters of on average very good quality; or two books of on average very good quality. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also should have been very active in other research roles, such as intramural researcher or grant recipient, conference session organizer or presenter, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged **very good** in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship is accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-7) of articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality since his or her last promotion; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average excellent quality; or a larger number (7-8) of articles and/or book chapters of on average good quality; or a book and a small number (2-3) of articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality; or a book and a larger number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average good quality. To qualify as very good, a candidate also should have performed several additional research roles, such as conference session organizer or presenter, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged **good** in professional development if the committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship is competent. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-7) of articles and/or book chapters of on average good quality; or a smaller number (4-5) of articles and/or book chapters of on average very good quality; or a book and a small number (2-3) of articles and/or book chapters of on average good quality. To qualify as good, a candidate also should have performed at least one or two additional research activities, such as conference session organizer or presenter, journal referee, or book reviewer.

The evaluation categories **fair** and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good professional development.

**Tenure at the Rank of Professor (Professional Development)**

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor in the area of Professional Development are the same as those for promotion to Professor
5. Evaluation of Instruction

a. General Comments on Instruction

The Department of Religious Studies regards quality instruction and student learning to be of foremost importance to its mission. Instruction is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such, the Department recognizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement as central in the evaluation of its faculty members. 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.

Included in the evaluation of Instruction will be written documentation of the following:

1. All courses taught during the last eight semesters of the candidate’s teaching

2. Perceptions of students: including official student evaluation instruments for the last four years taught at Georgia State University

3. Honors or special recognitions for instruction

4. Evidence of instructional service beyond the classroom (e.g., independent studies, practica, honors theses, masters theses, service on dissertation committees, instructional service to other universities)

5. Published materials (e.g., textbooks, published articles, manuals and/or monographs on pedagogy)

6. Evidence of student mastery of material, including student publications, awards, and graduate school admissions

7. Teaching Portfolio. By Departmental policy, this portfolio must include: (a) the syllabi for all courses taught, (b) all materials given to the students in all courses (e.g., tests, quizzes, handouts, web postings, paper assignments), and (c) the numerical and written student evaluations for all courses. By College Policy, the evaluation of instruction is based only on the last eight semesters in which the candidate has taught. These, in turn, are the courses that should be covered in the Teaching Portfolio.

8. Other Materials (some of which might be located in the Teaching Portfolio). This category might include: (a) the development of effective evaluation and assessment methods relative to student performance and the acquisition of knowledge and skills (to be reflected in examinations, teaching methods and pedagogical philosophy); (b) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of established courses (to be reflected in course syllabi and other curricular materials); (c) the maintenance of high standards for the material taught and expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions, syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other examples); (d) the advisement of students on various levels and in various degree programs; (e) guest lectures in classes; and (f) a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching methodology.

b. Evaluation Process for Instruction
Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate's instruction according to the College Manual’s evaluative categories: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor.

The evaluation of instruction is based on five factors: rigor, quality of course content and organization, non-course instruction, evidence of student learning, and student perceptions. For each of these five factors, every member of the Committee will rank the candidate on the following scale: poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent. The Committee’s ranking of a candidate in each of these five areas will be the highest ranking such that a majority of the Committee rank the candidate at that rank or higher.

Rigor: Do the candidate’s courses require an appropriate amount of effort of the students? Features of the candidate’s courses such as the nature and amount of reading required of the students and the type of assignments are relevant to this factor. Examples: A course which has only one multiple choice exam would show evidence of poor rigor; an introductory course which required 10 substantive papers might be judged to be too rigorous.

Quality of Course Content and Organization: Does the candidate assign appropriate, interesting and high-quality reading materials in his or her courses? How well organized are the courses? Both the organization of the course as a whole and the organization of individual class meetings may be considered. Good course content is demonstrated by features such as syllabi that present materials and assignments in a clear and coherent fashion.

Non-Course Instruction: How good is the quality and quantity of the candidate’s non-course instructional efforts? Has the candidate been active and effective in directing honors and masters theses? Has he or she been creative in non-classroom instructional efforts? Teaching publications would be weighed here.

Evidence of Student Learning: Is there evidence that students are actually learning from the candidate? Student publications, awards, fellowships, and graduate school admissions for which the candidate played a significant role would be weighed here, as would other measures of student learning.

Student Perceptions: What is indicated by the course evaluations completed by students? Numerical and written student evaluations will be important here. The committee should be mindful that the student evaluation averages mentioned in section 5.c (below) are given as approximate, general guidelines rather than to reify any particular number. The evaluation of student perceptions begins with the calculation of an average or base number. In calculating the base number one considers only the courses that were taught by the candidate over his or her last four years of teaching at Georgia State University. (For candidates with probationary credit from other institutions, student scores from other institutions will not be included.) To calculate the base number, the Committee will take the average of: (i) a candidate's average score on Question 17 of the student evaluation form for all applicable courses, and (ii) a candidate's average score on Questions 1-16 of the student evaluation form for all applicable courses. Cross-listed courses are to be treated as if they were one course. The base number will then be discussed by the Committee and adjusted, as deemed appropriate by Committee majority vote, based on the written comments of students, the level and type of courses taught by the candidate during the eight-semester period, trends such as marked increases or decreases in scores over the eight-semester period, and any other evidence of student perceptions.

c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Instruction

After the completion of discussion, the Departmental Committee shall vote on a final ranking for the candidate in the area of instruction using the guidelines set forth in the following paragraphs. The final ranking of the Departmental Committee for instruction shall be the highest evaluative term from among outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor such that a majority of the Committee members
believes that the candidate deserves that rank or higher. As specified in the College Manual, members of
the Committee who disagree with the final ranking of the committee will write a dissenting letter. Any
dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for disagreeing with the final ranking.
The following comments are intended to offer guidelines rather than absolute criteria.

Rankings for Associate Professor (Instruction)

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will be judged to be outstanding in instruction if the
overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is, on
balance, truly exceptional—of the sort evidenced in only a few instances in the College. The candidate
typically will be ranked as excellent in all five categories outlined above. The student evaluation scores
might suggest extraordinary performance in the classroom (the base number is high-4 out of 5 range); the
course material presented will show exceptional preparation; a high degree of knowledge of the subject
matter will be indicated; the candidate will demonstrate a very high level of involvement in mentoring
students with accompanying impressive accomplishments by his or her advisees; and/or the candidate may
have published a textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or received one or more significant teaching
awards.

The candidate will be judged to be excellent in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from
the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly accomplished. The candidate should be
ranked as excellent in at least three of the five categories listed above and no less than very good in any
one. The student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the base number
is mid- to high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented will show impressive preparation; a
significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might
demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be very good in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from
the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly competent. The candidate should be
ranked as at least very good in three of the categories and no less than good in any one. For example, the
student evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom (the base number is mid-4
out of 5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation; a better-than-average degree
of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate
level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be good in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the
evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is competent. The candidate will be ranked as at
least good in most of the five categories outlined above. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest
effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the low-4 to high-3 out of 5 range); the
course material presented might show merely acceptable preparation; a competent degree of knowledge of
the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of
involvement in mentoring students.

The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the
standards listed above for good performance.

Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor (Instruction)

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the Instructional area are the same as those for
promotion to Associate Professor
Rankings for Professor (Instruction)

Candidates for the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and even exceed the sort of involvement and accomplishment required for an Associate Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in the Instructional area are expected to surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor.

A candidate for promotion to Professor will be judged to be **outstanding** in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is, on balance, truly exceptional—of the sort evidenced in only a few instances in the College. The candidate typically will be ranked as excellent in all five of the categories. The student evaluation scores suggest extraordinary performance in the classroom (the base number is in the high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show exceptional preparation and continued refinement and improvement of course content; a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated by exceptional efforts to improve the department's curriculum might be manifested; the candidate might demonstrate an especially high level of involvement in mentoring students (completion of advanced degrees, conference participation, publications, career development, etc.); the candidate might have developed innovative teaching instruments and/or methods (such as the use of new technologies or creative approaches in the classroom); and/or the candidate may have published an exceptional textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or received one or more significant teaching awards.

The candidate will be judged to be **excellent** in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is superb. The candidate should be ranked as excellent in at least four of the five categories described above, and no less than very good in the other. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the mid- to high-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show impressive preparation and a continuing devotion to improving and updating course content and syllabi, as well as overall curricular reform; the candidate might participate in college, university-wide, or national committees that focus on instructional improvements and issues; a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be **very good** in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly effective. The candidate should be ranked as very good or higher in at least four of the categories and no less than good in any one. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the low to mid-4 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation and ongoing improvement and refinement; a better-than-average breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

The candidate will be judged to be **good** in instruction if the overall assessment of the committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is competent. The candidate should be ranked as at least good in four of the five categories outlined above and no less than fair in any one. The student evaluation scores suggest effective performance in the classroom (the base number is in the low-4 to high-3 out of 5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation and updated syllabi; some level of participation in curricular reform might be manifested; a moderate breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

The evaluation categories of **fair** and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

Tenure at the Rank of Professor (Instruction)
The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor in the Instructional area are the same as those for promotion to Professor.
6. Evaluation of Service

a. General Comments on Service

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

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least good in service. For promotion to the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least very good in service.

Appropriate service activities are listed below. Complete descriptions for any service category must be provided by the candidate along with explanatory documentation, when appropriate. Possible examples of each category of service are provided below.

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

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

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

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

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

6. Meritorious Public Service: Assistance to governmental agencies; major service awards that are discipline related.

The service category “Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations” refers to services to professional organizations (e.g., treasurer of a learned society, coordinating logistics of conferences) which do not rely predominantly on the scholarly expertise of the candidate. Professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing the promotion materials of faculty at other institutions, etc.), on the other hand, would be counted in Category B of Professional Development. A largely expository, introductory lecture to a church group would be counted under Service. A lecture on substantive and novel scholarly ideas presented in an academic setting would be counted in Category B of Professional Development. Should there be disagreement about the classification of an item, the view of the Committee will be decided by majority vote. No item may count in more than one category.
b. Evaluation Process for Service

The evaluation of service is based on two factors: quality of service work performed and quantity of the service work performed.

After a thorough discussion of the items listed in the candidate’s dossier under service and using the guidelines set forth below, every member of the Committee will rank the candidate on the following scale: poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent. The Committee’s ranking of a candidate in each of the two areas outlined below will be the highest ranking such that a majority of the Committee ranks the candidate at that rank or higher.

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

A candidate ranked excellent for Quality of Service will merit unconditionally positive answers to each of these six questions. A candidate ranked very good for Quality of Service will receive strongly positive responses to most of the six questions. A candidate ranked good for Quality of Service will receive more positive responses than negative responses to these questions. A candidate ranked fair for Quality of Service will receive an equal number of positive and negative responses. A candidate ranked poor for Quality of Service will receive more negative than positive responses to these six questions.

2. Quantity of Service Work Performed: Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with rank? Does the candidate accept an amount of service responsibility commensurate with the fair distribution of responsibilities in the Department? Does he or she consistently accept reasonable service requirements when asked? If being considered for promotion to Professor, has the candidate assumed major service roles at the College and/or University levels? Does the candidate recognize a range of service responsibilities—not merely to the Department but to colleagues and the profession? Does the candidate show initiative in locating and seeking out service tasks?

A candidate ranked excellent for Quantity of Service will merit unconditionally positive answers to each of these six questions. A candidate ranked very good for Quantity of Service will receive strongly positive responses to most of the six questions. A candidate ranked good for Quantity of Service will receive more positive responses than negative responses to these questions. A candidate ranked fair for Quantity of Service will receive an equal number of positive and negative responses. A candidate ranked poor for Quantity of Service will receive more negative than positive responses to these six questions.

c. Arriving at a Final Ranking in Service

Based on the evidence submitted and the rankings with regard to the Quality and Quantity of the candidate’s service work (see section 6.b, above), the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate's service according to the College Manual’s evaluative categories: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, poor. As noted in the College Manual, members of the Committee who disagree with the Final Ranking will write a dissenting letter. Any dissenting letters must include the committee member’s justification for disagreeing with the Final Ranking. The following comments are intended to offer guidelines rather than absolute criteria.
Ranking for Associate Professor (Service)

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor who is judged as outstanding in service should be rated as excellent in both Quality and Quantity of service. Such a candidate will have performed major and time-consuming service responsibilities above and beyond those required to be judged excellent in service. The candidate may have served as an officer or board member of a state, regional, or national professional association, and will have served effectively on a significant number of departmental, college, university, community or governmental committees, boards, or agencies. Such a candidate will consistently make major, positive contributions in his or her service roles.

A candidate who is judged as excellent in service should be rated as excellent in either Quality or Quantity of Service and at least very good in the other. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues, will serve effectively on major departmental committees, may serve on college, university, or professional committees, may be active in offering public lectures, and will consistently make highly valued contributions in these various service areas.

A candidate who is judged as very good in service should be rated as at least very good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues, will perform assigned departmental service tasks effectively, may serve on a college, university, or university system committees or may show significant service to community governmental, or professional organizations, and may offer some public lectures. The value of his or her service contributions will consistently be strong.

A candidate who is judged as good in service should be rated as at least good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be active in assistance to colleagues and effectively perform departmental service tasks that have been assigned to him or her. The service contributions made by such a candidate will be positive.

The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

In cases in which the rankings assigned to the candidate in Quality and Quantity of service do not coincide, the overall ranking shall be the average of the two qualitative terms assigned (i.e., a candidate assigned an excellent in Quality and a good in Quantity would be ranked very good overall.) In cases in which the averaging results in the exact mid-point between two qualitative terms, a majority vote of the committee shall determine which of those two terms shall be the final ranking of the committee.

Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor (Service)

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the area of Service are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.

Ranking for Professor (Service)

A candidate for promotion to Professor who is judged as outstanding in service should be ranked as excellent in both Quality and Quantity of service. Such a candidate will have performed major and time-consuming service responsibilities above and beyond those required to be judged for excellent in service; regularly served as an officer or board member of a state, regional, or national professional association; and served effectively on a significant number of departmental, college, university, community or governmental committees, boards, or agencies. Such a candidate will consistently make major, positive contributions in his or her service roles.

A candidate who is judged as excellent in service should be rated as excellent in either Quality or Quantity of Service and at least very good in the other. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues, will serve effectively on major departmental committees, may serve on college, university, or professional committees, may be active in offering public lectures, and will consistently make highly valued contributions in these various service areas.

A candidate who is judged as very good in service should be rated as at least very good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues, will perform assigned departmental service tasks effectively, may serve on a college, university, or university system committees or may show significant service to community governmental, or professional organizations, and may offer some public lectures. The value of his or her service contributions will consistently be strong.

A candidate who is judged as good in service should be rated as at least good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be active in assistance to colleagues and effectively perform departmental service tasks that have been assigned to him or her. The service contributions made by such a candidate will be positive.

The evaluation categories of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

In cases in which the rankings assigned to the candidate in Quality and Quantity of service do not coincide, the overall ranking shall be the average of the two qualitative terms assigned (i.e., a candidate assigned an excellent in Quality and a good in Quantity would be ranked very good overall.) In cases in which the averaging results in the exact mid-point between two qualitative terms, a majority vote of the committee shall determine which of those two terms shall be the final ranking of the committee.
committees, boards, or agencies. Such candidate will consistently make major, positive contributions in his or her service roles.

A candidate who is judged as **excellent** in service should be rated as excellent in either Quality or Quantity of Service and at least very good in the other. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues; will serve effectively on major departmental committees, often assuming a leadership role; will serve on a number of college, university, or professional committees; will show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations; and will consistently make highly valued contributions in these various service areas.

A candidate who is judged as **very good** in service should be rated as at least very good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be very active in assistance to colleagues; will perform assigned departmental service tasks effectively, at times assuming a leadership role; will serve on a college, university, or university system committees; and will show significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations. The value of his or her service contributions will consistently be of high quality.

A candidate who is judged as **good** in service should be rated as at least good in both Quality and Quantity of Service. Such a candidate will be active in assistance to colleagues and effectively perform departmental service tasks that have been assigned to him or her. He or she may have served on some college, university, or professional committees. The service contributions made by such a candidate will be positive.

The evaluation categories of **fair** and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

In cases in which the rankings assigned to the candidate in Quality and Quantity of service do not coincide, the overall ranking shall be the average of the two qualitative terms assigned (i.e., a candidate assigned an excellent in Quality and a good in Quantity would be ranked very good overall.) In cases in which the averaging results in the exact mid-point between two qualitative terms, a majority vote of the committee shall determine which of those two terms shall be the final ranking of the committee.

**Tenure at the Rank of Professor (Service)**

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor in the area of Service are the same as those for promotion to Professor
7. The Overall Promotion and Tenure Recommendation

The Departmental Committee will determine the Committee’s recommendation regarding promotion and tenure based on the previously outlined procedures for determining rankings in the area of professional development, instruction, and service.

Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor who are ranked as at least excellent in professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other, and who are ranked as at least good in service will be recommended for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Otherwise, the Committee will recommend that the candidate not be promoted and not be tenured.

Candidates for the rank of Professor who are ranked as at least excellent in professional development, at least excellent in instruction, and at least very good in service will be recommended for promotion to professor. Otherwise, the Committee will recommend that the candidate not be promoted.
8. Post-Evaluation Procedures

The Chair of the Departmental Committee will write a letter to the Department Chair expressing the Committee’s recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. Every member of the Committee will sign this letter or write and sign a dissenting letter. These letters must be in the format specified in the College Manual and must protect the anonymity of the outside evaluators.

The letter or letters of the Committee members will be given to the candidate at least five business days before they are due to the Department Chair. At least three days before the letters are due to the Department Chair, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Committee is not obligated to make any changes. The final versions of the letter(s) of the Committee members will be given to the Department Chair no later than the date specified in the College Manual. At the same time, copies of the final versions of the letters will be given to the candidate.

The Department Chair will review the Committee’s letter and conduct an independent review of the candidate’s qualifications in professional development, instruction, and service. In conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria specified in this Manual. The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee expressing his or her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. The Department Chair’s letter will be given to the candidate at least five business days before it is due to the Office of the Dean. At least three days before the letters are due to the Office of the Dean, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Department Chair is not obligated to make any changes.

The Committee’s letter(s), the Department Chair’s letter, and the candidate’s dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date specified by the College. At that time, a copy of the Department Chair’s letter will be given to the candidate.

The remainder of the promotion and tenure process is described in the College and University manuals.
9. Third-Year Promotion and 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 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 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 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, instruction, 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 Manual and use the manual 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.

Process

By January 1 the Department Chair will ask third-year faculty in writing to prepare and submit, by March 1, a dossier for third-year promotion and tenure review. The faculty member under review should assemble a brief dossier (including such materials as annual reports, a curriculum vita, publications, and evidence of teaching effectiveness) and containing a two-page statement of goals and accomplishments in the areas of professional development, instruction, and service.

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

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

The Chair will forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and a member of the Dean’s Office will meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.
10. The Ranking of Journals and Presses

In order to assist both candidates who are preparing to come up for promotion and/or tenure (and who are deciding where they might seek to publish their work) and the Departmental Committee members who are evaluating the scholarly work of candidates, the Department of Religious Studies will maintain a list of rankings of the quality of major journals and presses in the field.

The Department Chair will circulate the list on a regular basis and solicit additions or deletions to the listed journals and presses from the departmental faculty. Any faculty member may request that an unranked journal or press be ranked, and this request will be honored. In order to allow adequate time for feedback from evaluators, such requests must be made at least 90 days before the beginning of the review cycle in which the journal/press ranking will be needed. Potential candidates for promotion and/or tenure are particularly encouraged to request ranking for all journals and presses in which they might plausibly publish.

The Department Chair will then solicit judgments about the quality of the journals and presses from leading scholars in the field who are not affiliated with Georgia State University. All tenured and tenure-track members of the department may nominate scholars to rank the journals and presses. Scholars will be asked to rank listed journals and presses on the following scale:

- **Excellent**: the journal or press publishes consistently exemplary work in the field
- **Very Good**: the journal or press publishes highly regarded work in the field
- **Good**: the journal or press publishes valuable work in the field
- **Less than Good**: the journal or press publishes work which is below the quality normal to the field
- **Unable to Rank**: the quality of the journal or press is unknown

The Chair will request that contacted scholars not rank journals or presses on which they have major editorial or professional roles.

Every five years the Department will consider whether it is necessary to re-rank all the journals and presses. This issue will be decided by majority vote.