1. Tenure

Below are criteria for tenure in the department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading (CFR). The Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook (section 209) lists the following areas of evaluation for tenure decisions:

- teaching;
- scholarship;
- service (institutional and/or professional);
- needs of the institution;
- ability to function within the Georgia Southern academic community; and
- length of service.

In addition to the above areas, the Faculty Handbook (section 205.01) states that faculty attributes (section 204) must also be considered for all types of evaluation.

1.1 Teaching

Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the university classroom or laboratory, and direction of research, mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials for both university and other students; chairing or serving on dissertation or other student-research committees; supervising and evaluating field experiences; and developing and/or delivering Internet web-based instruction. Judgment of the quality of teaching activities will be based on evidence from multiple indicators, which include the following:

- Syllabi that are well organized, clearly outline expectations and assignments, and demonstrate consistency with departmental course content outlines.
- Student assignments that are appropriate for the discipline, with an emphasis on quality work in demonstrating mastery of the course content.
- Evidence that students are intellectually challenged and courses are academically rigorous. For example, provide ratings from the Course Difficulty item from the student ratings evaluation form, provide a narrative explaining how one’s courses are challenging to students, or provide samples of students’ work.
- Evidence that the candidate has accepted responsibility for teaching courses as needed by the department. This may include willingness to teach less preferred courses within one’s area and engaging in teaching development activities.
- Evidence that student evaluations of instruction are generally rated as satisfactory or higher.
- Evidence that the candidate has mentored students individually, for example, by serving
on, or perhaps chairing, master’s and doctoral committees.
• Other evidence that the candidate wishes to provide such as course materials, peer
evaluations, teaching portfolios, and sample assessments with accompanying narratives.

1.2 Scholarship

Scholarship includes academic achievement and professional growth and development.
Scholarship is the integration, development, and extension of knowledge and is demonstrated by
publications, presentations, and other scholarly and creative activities. Scholarship is primarily
manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, edited books for which the candidate served as
editor, reports of research, creative works, scholarly presentations focusing on national and
international levels as well as state and/or regional levels; research grants, demonstration grants,
panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional
professional training or certification, degrees earned, postdoctoral work, work toward terminal
degrees, and academic honors and awards.

The department views educational scholarship broadly; therefore, both theoretical and applied
research activities are equally valued. Moreover, faculty members may engage in scholarly
activities of their interest as guaranteed by academic freedom and described in the Faculty
Handbook section 201 and the opening paragraph of section 209.

Candidates seeking tenure are expected to demonstrate evidence of productive scholarship by
documenting the quality and impact of their published work. Measures to assess scholarship
quality and impact may include the following forms of evidence:

• peer review of one’s work;
• publisher acceptance rate;
• publisher impact factor;
• publisher review process;
• number of citations to one’s work; and
• circulation, topic, length, and other characteristics deemed relevant to published work

Candidates should also demonstrate the ability to publish works as a sole or lead author. Given
the multidisciplinary nature of scholarly work present in CFR, it is incumbent upon candidates
seeking tenure to address scholarship quality and impact employing the criteria and evidence
noted above, or other relevant evidence that may be available to the candidate. Colleagues within
the candidates’ fields who serve on the committee will also assist in committee judgments in this
area, and submitted external letters of support or review will also be consulted.

Candidates for tenure, who are currently at the rank of assistant professor, are expected to obtain
about one publication per year in peer-reviewed journals, books, and/or chapters in books.
Furthermore, achievements other than publications (e.g., grants, creative works) may count
toward satisfactory productivity in scholarship if the candidate offers substantive rationale,
justification, and evidence that the scholarly work is equivalent or superior to a publication
within their field, and the work also has experienced a peer-review process. Thus, satisfactory
productivity in scholarship will be determined according to the following indicators:
• evidence that the candidate has published roughly one peer reviewed product per year;
• evidence of producing other peer reviewed scholarly achievements such as submitting grants or creative works; and
• adequate justification via evidence that the quality of one’s scholarly work is on par with the demands of publishing roughly one peer reviewed product per year.

1.3 Service

Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of the university and of professional organizations, and activities undertaken on behalf of the university or the profession that do not entail systematic instruction. Service includes the application of the individual’s expertise in his/her discipline for the benefit of an organization, the community, schools, or academic institutions. Examples of service that are valued in the department include, but are not limited to, the following:

• conducting workshops in the school,
• membership on institutional committees,
• participation in professional organizations,
• consultation with colleagues, and
• other relevant evidence of service to the institution or community.

Judgment of satisfactory productivity in the area of service will be based primarily on evidence of service to the institution at all levels (unit, department, college and university), and, if available, service outside the institution. Tenure candidates should differentiate those service activities that resulted, or will result, in monetary or tangible rewards.

1.4 Needs of the Institution

Tenure candidates should provide evidence of their role in, and contribution to, the department, the College of Education, and the university. In addition, the Faculty Handbook, section 204, identifies desired attributes of Georgia Southern faculty. Since these attributes must be included in all forms of faculty evaluations at Georgia Southern, tenure candidates should explain briefly how they exhibit these desired attributes.

1.5 Ability of the Candidate to Function within the Academic Community

In addition to the above areas of evaluation, the “ability of the candidate to function within the academic community” must be considered for tenure decisions. One’s ability to function within the Academic Community is determined by evidence for the following:

• Demonstrating responsiveness to students, colleagues, and department staff: for example, responding to emails and phone calls within a reasonable time frame, providing information and/or feedback as requested by the department chair, the department secretary, and one’s colleagues, and generally fulfilling one’s daily responsibilities as a contributing member of the department.
• Accepting responsibility for meeting unit and departmental expectations pertaining to quality supervision of students (i.e., PPB supervision, advisement of graduate students, etc.) if supervision is part of the candidate’s workload.
• Accepting responsibility within the context of service on committees.
• Professional interaction with students and all personnel.

1.6 Length of Service

See section 209 of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook for details about length of service required for tenure candidates.

1.7 Tenure without Promotion

It is common for faculty at the rank of assistant professor to seek both tenure and promotion in rank simultaneously. While it is possible to obtain tenure without promotion in rank since the two are separate processes and decisions, the award of tenure without promotion to associate professor is considered an unusual circumstance. This option is reserved for faculty members who have demonstrated exceptional teaching performance and who present evidence of scholarship and service productivity that corresponds with the potential for promotion, as judged by the committee.

Lastly, those at other ranks who seek tenure will be expected to demonstrate teaching, scholarship, and service activities consistent with the rank sought. For example, those seeking tenure with the rank of professor should have a level of scholarly productivity that exceeds the levels noted for those seeking rank of associate professor, and the quality and stature of such scholarly work will be considered.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor

The areas of evaluation for promotion to Associate Professor are similar to those for tenure, and this includes Faculty Attributes (Faculty Handbook section 204). However, the key areas for promotion decisions are teaching, scholarship, and service. An important distinction from tenure is that for promotion one must demonstrate noteworthy performance in teaching, and noteworthy performance in either scholarship or service (Faculty Handbook section 208). As with tenure, those seeking promotion should provide evidence for the quality and stature of their achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Satisfactory levels of achievement in these three areas are explained above in the 1. Tenure section; below are guidelines for providing evidence for noteworthy performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.

2.1 Teaching

In addition to the teaching evidence discussed above in section 1. Tenure, the CFR promotion review committee will consider any evidence for the following indicators to determine if the candidate has achieved noteworthy productivity in teaching:

• development of new courses to meet the needs of the department,
• reception of very good peer evaluations of teaching,
• student evaluations of teaching that are well above the satisfactory level,
• professional development and utilization of this development in the area of teaching, and
• a high level of committed service on graduate committees.

Each of the above would be considered as supportive of noteworthy accomplishment in teaching.

2.2 Scholarship

In addition to evaluating the quality and impact of the applicant’s scholarly work using the criteria identified in section 1. Tenure above, the promotion review committee will judge noteworthy productivity by considering the following criteria:

• greater number of quality publications than the minimum noted for tenure;
• additional scholarly output in the form of successful grants, creative works, presentations, or exhibits;
• national or international recognition for one’s work; and
• strong evidence for other relevant and highly successful forms of scholarship.

The indicators noted above are not exclusive; any additional evidence for noteworthy performance that the candidate develops and presents will also be considered.

2.3 Service

Minimal, satisfactory levels of service are identified above in 1. Tenure. The service activities listed below may be viewed as supportive of noteworthy accomplishments in service:

• active service on productive, time-intensive committees;
• taking lead roles on productive committees;
• authoring documents/reports for committees;
• providing service to one’s profession and/or the community;
• manuscript review;
• design and development of professional conferences;
• holding service roles with related organizations and conferences; and
• other relevant evidence for service to the institution or community.

Promotion candidates should differentiate those service activities that resulted, or will result, in monetary or tangible rewards.

3. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor, one is expected to demonstrate greater levels of achievement and leadership as broadly described in section 208 of the Faculty Handbook. Candidates for promotion to rank of professor must demonstrate a record of noteworthy performance in teaching, and noteworthy performance in either scholarship or service. The promotion review
committee expects a candidate for promotion to professor to present a strong case for noteworthy performance in teaching, and in scholarship or service.

3.1 Teaching

The evidence for noteworthy performance in teaching identified above in section 2. Promotion to Associate Professor also applies to those seeking promotion to professor. However, the difference for those seeking promotion to professor should be an established and continued record of solid performance. Evidence for such achievement in teaching may include evidence for the following indicators:

- exemplary mentoring of students while on graduate committees;
- exemplary mentoring of students through advising;
- leadership roles in course and program development and revisions;
- consistent record of strong instructional performance as rated by students;
- receipt of teaching awards and honors; and
- sharing of effective pedagogical techniques with others such as through presentations, workshops, and peer mentoring.

The above examples for evidence are not exhaustive, and the creative candidate for promotion may devise myriad ways of demonstrating noteworthy achievement in teaching.

3.2 Scholarship

The evidence required for scholarship is explained above in the section 1. Tenure. For promotion to professor, one should demonstrate continued scholarly growth that results in wider recognition of one’s work. Thus, both the quantity and stature of one’s productivity should increase.

Satisfactory performance in scholarship may be shown by evidence for the following indicators:

- continued output in publications or creative products;
- continued output in grant activities or other outputs identified previously above; and
- continued output of other relevant scholarly activities.

Noteworthy scholarship would require similar or greater levels of productivity than found for satisfactory performance in scholarship, but may also include evidence for the following indicators:

- documented recognition of scholarship nationally or internationally;
- documented impact of published scholarship;
- positive, published scholarship reviews;
- research awards or honors; and
- other means of documenting the impact of one’s scholarly productivity.

3.3 Service
As with teaching and scholarship, the evidence required to document service activities are listed above in sections 1. Tenure and 2. Promotion to Associate Professor.

A satisfactory service record would include continued and consistent service to the institution at all levels (unit, department, college, and university) though committee work and/or advising. A judgment of noteworthy performance in service would include evidence showing sustained leadership roles on multiple committees, service on multiple time-intensive committees, and repeated service to the profession or community. For example, evidence might include the following:

- service to schools;
- external service to professional organizations, or similar entities;
- conference coordinator or officer;
- journal editor, advisory board member, or manuscript reviewer; and
- other relevant professional service to institution, profession, or community.

4. Workload Assignment

It is common for some faculty members in CFR to be assigned a non-traditional workload that could preclude or greatly reduce expectations in one or more of the three key areas of evaluation: teaching, scholarship, or service. For members with non-traditional workload assignments, expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service will be negotiated with the CFR departmental chair. It is critical that this negotiated agreement, and subsequent annual review of that performance, be documented and communicated to the various CFR review committees so reduced expectations in any of the three areas of evaluation are appropriately considered during the review process.