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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language (ESL) are vital components of our faculty. The policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks are outlined in this document (department guidelines), the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual).

Whereas the university and college NTT manuals provide general statements of the expected quality and significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document identifies the concrete forms these achievements should take. In particular, this document articulates the Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL’s criteria for the various rankings that candidates for promotion might receive in the areas of teaching and service. Candidates should consult the college and university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier requirements, and time-in-rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion consideration.

The Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track in three different programs: ESL credit-bearing program, Intensive English Program, and the undergraduate program in Applied Linguistics. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the college manual.

II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER AND PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the department’s NTT faculty promotion review process are as follows:

1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to the department chair.
2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s materials to the departmental review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be made by the committee as a whole).
3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation in printed and e-versions, including any minority reports, to the department chair. The committee members will sign the report(s) on a separate page/pages. The department chair will also provide a copy of the departmental committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the
candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the department chair within three business days.

4. The department chair submits her/his independent recommendation and the recommendation of the departmental committee, including any minority reports and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The department chair will provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond to the Dean’s Office within three business days. The Dean’s Office will provide to the department chair a copy of any response from the candidate to the department chair’s report.

See sections III and IV in the college manual for information on the evaluation processes at the college and university levels.

B. Composition of Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the department (Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the chair of the department and any members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university levels. Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate’s credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet in person to discuss and vote on its final recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation. The signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee’s report(s). Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate’s current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

III. LECTURER REVIEWS

A. General Considerations

There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate’s knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Teaching

As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the college’s policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf). Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to the mission/goals of their respective programs or department. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties, then assessment will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the department. This includes lecturers who may have program service duties as their primary role in the department (see Section B2, paragraph 2 of this document and Appendix of the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty).

For the evaluation of instructional accomplishment, candidates should provide evidence of student accomplishments and achievement of learning; student perceptions of the effectiveness of the instructor; how the instructor’s pedagogy contributes to the program’s, the department’s, the college’s, and the university’s curricular needs, innovations, and improvements; and the quality of their teaching materials. Candidates may also provide evidence of recognition of their pedagogy by constituencies within the program, department, college, or university, or institutions outside the university; the degree to which their pedagogy has been innovative; the degree to which they have assessed their pedagogical innovations; the degree to which they have demonstrated effort to improve the effectiveness of their pedagogy; and their contributions to scholarship on pedagogy and/or curriculum.

As a general rule, evaluators will consider in their assessments of teaching effectiveness the following criteria:

a. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and other elements integrated into the learning environment used by the candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Assessment materials should require students to engage material that is appropriate for
the course level and catalog description. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other course elements that reflect the faculty member’s efforts to foster student engagement and success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that connect students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as evidence of successful teaching. The department also encourages faculty to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance as the semester unfolds. The department recognizes that teachers might use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, demonstrate a sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and designing materials that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that meaningfully improve existing courses: Evaluations will consider the effective development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development of new programs or initiatives and the use of new teaching techniques and practices. The design of courses with a travel component and/or the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another potential achievement. Initiatives in the development of new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are ones that (1) affect significant numbers of students, (2) sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant achievements such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research, or for IEP/ESL, (3) new courses or resources that assist students in obtaining admission to or being successful in degree programs.

c. Student evaluations: The review of a candidate’s materials will include student evaluation scores, which are insightful indicators of student perceptions of instruction. Evaluation scores, which the department will not rely upon exclusively when determining minimum qualifications for ratings, will be considered in the context of the normal range of scores for specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the department. The review will also consider other important variables such as class size, whether the course is required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, the number of students enrolled in the course, and the language proficiency of the students. In addition to average scores, the department will also be attentive to mean and median scores and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative evidence offered by the students’ written comments on the student evaluation forms will receive serious attention from the department as a
meaningful supplement to the quantitative data from the evaluation instruments. In light of these contextual elements, successful candidates for promotion normally earn consistently strong evaluations and high scores, as defined below.

d. Direction of students: The department will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in the direction of student projects for respective programs and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies, honors theses, student research presented at GSURC, as well as individual student engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include time spent offering additional tutoring and mentoring of students at risk for underperforming in the courses in which the faculty teaches and/or additional guidance to students pursuing additional research projects or feedback on language/cultural understanding as it impacts the students' other degree courses. Efforts also include cooperating teacher duties related to working with Practicum students, classroom assistants, and interns. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of recommendation for students might also be viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

e. Development of new skills: The department encourages faculty to continue to develop skills to inform their teaching, for example, with new software, languages, new approaches to teaching language, and technology or other pertinent areas that would improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the department as evidence of their commitment to staying abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The department recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as excellent in teaching.

2. Evaluation of Service

As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university; professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the department, but it is generally at the department or college level. Contributions to service in the Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles, such as administrative roles (e.g., directing a program such as IEP, ESL, departmental undergraduate or graduate studies) or other service duties that are ongoing assignments; instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or presenting seminars on teaching methodology, supervising or mentoring
faculty, or administrative contributions to the IEP/ESL tutoring lab; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts, grant applications, university-based conference proposals and/or scholarship essays; contributions to the department, college, and university, such as student advisement and mentoring, memberships on department/college/university committees, and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as service to professional organizations or advisory boards; community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies, as well as written contributions to public service (editorials, white papers, magazine or newsletter articles, and any other dissemination of academic research to the general populace).

The department's review of candidates' records in service will consider the wide variety of tasks that chairs might assign to particular faculty members. Candidates should document any arrangements made upon or after their initial appointment for them to take on special administrative duties or unusually heavy service loads. The degree to which assigned service responsibilities are made available to the candidate will also be part of the consideration of their service record.

3. Additional Considerations

Other factors and contributions that may be considered as part of the lecturer review include the following:

Professional Development Contributions: The Department shall consider professional development activities (e.g., publications of their research and scholarship, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded) as they bear on the lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production of peer-reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the department certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-reviewed publications, the publication of textbooks, e-books, book chapters, publications or appearances in popular media, participation in academic conferences, facilitation of workshops, and/or the pursuit of grants (e.g., to fund research in the discipline, to fund local/international teacher training initiatives) all enhance the candidates' case that they are modeling the best practices of the profession to students. Such professional development can also help the candidate's case for promotion if it can be shown to augment the faculty member's expertise in subjects relevant to the classroom.

Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction section of the dossier rather than under a Professional Development section.
Role within the department: Since needs of the department often change, the role of
the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or
department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will
include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department and
the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

C. Criteria for Promotion

As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence
submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service
relative to the evaluative terms outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.
The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in each category for each
rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms that may be
referred to in evaluations is included as an appendix to this document.

1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of
competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least excellent,
according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of
assigned service to the department, college, university, and/or to the professional and
practice community that is evaluated as at least very good, which meets the university
standard for promotion to senior lecturer.

a. Teaching

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
rating of excellent, the candidate’s performance and supporting material demonstrate
evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, professional
intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department. Supporting
material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as
diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom,
successful mentoring of students, a classroom environment that consistently supports
learning, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of
student learning should consistently show that students meet course objectives.
Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and comments across
student course evaluations. Taking into account such factors as the topic and format of
the course and the language proficiency of the students, the candidate normally will
have a record of student evaluation scores that consistently fall in the mid-4 out of 5
range.
If appropriate to his or her workload, the candidate should demonstrate commitment to mentoring through individual direction of students and/or contributions to student development as language teachers. This involvement in individual student mentoring may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study courses and/or provision of guidance to students in professional development or course selection; it may also include sharing professional knowledge with teachers in training. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship; examples of such evidence include observation reports, student presentations or publications, applications to graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation.

b. Service

To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of very good, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills his or her assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as opportunities to most effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results for students in the program(s) in which s/he teaches. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the department (service on college or university committees).

2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer

For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as excellent, according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the department, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is evaluated as excellent, which meets the university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. This growth might be in the area of teaching or service or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher ranking in one of these areas, but this need not necessarily be the case so long as the candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made new contributions in teaching or service.

a. Teaching

To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating of excellent, the lecturer’s performance and supporting materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy.
***In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching for promotion to senior lecturer, the successful candidate for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of student evaluations in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range and will have demonstrated extensive, successful mentorship of students in the programs in which they teach and development of new courses or materials for existing courses. There should be evidence that, over the length of his or her teaching career, the candidate has grown pedagogically in ways that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This growth normally will include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which should be assessed by the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as student evaluations, see above); innovations need not always have been successful. In addition, the candidate’s dossier normally will demonstrate accomplishment in one or more of the following areas: teaching awards; production of a refereed journal article or other publication of similar quality on pedagogy; invitation to conduct a teacher training workshop at another institution or a national/international conference; external funding for pedagogical initiatives; the development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the larger teaching community. A candidate whose record of achievement does not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and explain how their record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

b. Service

The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating of excellent if he or she has been diligent and effective in carrying out assigned responsibilities and has contributed consistently to the mission of the department and the respective programs over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of consistently providing assistance to graduate teaching assistants, interns, and student assistants as well as staff and other tenure and non-tenure track faculty (e.g., through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). It may include service-related innovations (e.g., supervising a special program or other initiative), or significant service to the department as a program director. The excellent candidate at this level contributes to the College, University, professional community, and/or professional organization.

D. Other Lecturer Reviews

The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
Conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

1. Annual Review of Lecturers

Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the faculty member, including her/his updated CV, annual report covering the prior calendar year, teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with the departmental executive committee, the department chair will evaluate the lecturer track faculty member's teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's effectiveness and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A departmental review committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the lecturer's record of teaching and service. The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee of the whole. The department chair will provide an independent assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale of adjectives listed in the Appendix. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the fifth-year promotion review; it is meant to review the lecturer's achievements to date and provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year review.

3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers

The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by a committee elected by tenured faculty and senior/principal senior lecturers (departmental NTT review committee of the whole). The elected committee will consist of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks). The department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.
APPENDIX: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be used in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews

A. Teaching

Poor: The lecturer displays an unacceptable record of classroom-based teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III. B.1), minimal/ineffective involvement or no involvement in mentoring students or in programmatic curriculum or reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Fair: The lecturer displays a minimally acceptable record of classroom-based teaching based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III. B.1), minimal involvement and effectiveness in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and minimally adequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Good: The lecturer only minimally demonstrates competence in classroom-related teaching and does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III. B.1).

Very Good: The lecturer is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the department and respective program based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III. B.1). Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the lecturer is an effective teacher, her/his student evaluations show inconsistencies or generally fall in the mid-4 range.

Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):

The lecturer’s performance and supporting material demonstrate evidence of continued commitment to innovative and effective instruction, professional intellectual growth, and engagement with the work of the department, based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III.B.1). Supporting material must exhibit consistently strong evidence of instructional excellence, such as diligent and thoughtful preparation, clearly demonstrated skill in the classroom, successful mentoring of students, a classroom environment that consistently supports learning, and, as a foundation, a coherent philosophy of teaching. Direct measures of student learning should consistently show that students meet course objectives. Successful teaching may be assessed by the pattern of scores and comments across student course
evaluations. Taking into account such factors as the topic and format of the course and the language proficiency of the students, the candidate normally will have a record of student evaluation scores that consistently fall in the mid-4 out of 5 range.

If appropriate to his or her workload, the candidate should demonstrate commitment to mentoring through individual direction of students and/or contributions to student development as language teachers. This involvement in individual student mentoring may include supervision of directed readings, research, or independent study courses and/or provision of guidance to students in professional development or course selection; it may also include sharing professional knowledge with teachers in training. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship; examples of such evidence include observation reports, student presentations or publications, applications to graduate programs, and/or letters of recommendation.

**Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of consistent student evaluations in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher and will have demonstrated extensive, successful mentorship of students in the programs in which they teach and development of new courses or materials for existing courses. There should be evidence that, over the length of his or her teaching career, the candidate has grown pedagogically in ways that reflect changes in the discipline and in the practice of teaching. This growth normally will include innovations in teaching, the impacts of which should be assessed by the candidate (e.g., with student learning outcomes as well as student evaluations, see above); innovations need not always have been successful. In addition, the candidate’s dossier normally will demonstrate accomplishment in one or more of the following areas: teaching awards; production of a significant article or other publication on pedagogy; invitation to conduct a teacher training workshop at another institution or a national/international conference; external funding for pedagogical initiatives; the development and diffusion of pedagogical innovations that are used and/or cited by the larger teaching community.

**Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The lecturer’s impact on students is of the highest level. On top of the expectations for a rating of excellent in teaching appropriate to his or her rank, as described above, the outstanding teacher commands a mastery of instruction in his or her area as evidenced by at least one of the following based on the markers of effectiveness described in this document (Section III, B. 1): successful
pursuit of external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

**Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In the context of review for promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, an evaluation of *outstanding* characterizes a candidate who is at the forefront of the department’s pedagogical mission and the cutting edge of pedagogy in the field with an established national or international reputation. In addition to meeting criteria for *excellent* described above, he or she will have a record demonstrating that his/her classes and instructional programs manifest an innovative pedagogical proficiency that has a broad, positive impact on other faculty and on the departmental curriculum at large. The lecturer rated as *outstanding* at this level normally takes a leadership role in the department’s or respective program’s instructional mission (e.g., learning outcome assessment, retention/progression/graduation initiatives, and curriculum development).

**B. Service**

**Poor:** Lecturers judged to be *poor* in service show no evidence of service accomplishments nor fulfill assigned service obligations and are not responsible citizens of the department.

**Fair:** Lecturers judged to be *fair* in service show no evidence of service accomplishments, do not effectively fulfill assigned service obligations, and are not responsible citizens of the department.

**Good:** Lecturers judged to be *good* in service show evidence of few service accomplishments, do not always effectively fulfill assigned service obligations, and are not consistently responsible citizens of the department.

**Very Good:** The lecturer diligently and effectively fulfills his or her assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as opportunities to most effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results for students in the program(s) in which they teach. Service at this level might include some experiences beyond the department (service on college or university committees).

**Excellent:** The Lecturer will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been diligent and effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed consistently to the mission of the department and the respective programs over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of consistently providing administrative assistance to graduate assistants, interns, and classroom assistants as well as staff and other tenure and non-tenure track faculty (e.g., through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). It may include service-related innovation.
(e.g., supervising a special program) or significant service to the department as program
director. The excellent candidate at this level contributes to the College, University,
professional community, and/or professional organization.

**Outstanding:** The Lecturer will be judged *outstanding* in service if criteria for *excellent*
are met and s/he has a track record of sustained, significant service accomplishments
beyond the department and throughout the college and university; has been
substantially active and engaged in a professional organization (e.g., serving in an
elected leadership position); and/or has won a prestigious service award. He/she has
also taken considerable personal initiative to seek out best practices and new
opportunities for maximizing the success of the department in meeting its stated goals.
Faculty members judged to be *outstanding* in service will have been recognized by their
peers, students, or university administrators as having established a long track record of
success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways