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I. INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are a vital component of the Chemistry Department of Georgia State University filling critical instructional and service roles. The Department of Chemistry has formulated these policies and procedures related to the review and promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks that are in conformity with the minimum general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and with the policies outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences and University guidelines. Faculty members should consult (1) the Georgia State University PROMOTION MANUAL FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY, and (2) the College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University PROMOTION MANUAL FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY. In the event of a conflict between the departmental and college/university documents, the college/university documents take precedence.

The Department of Chemistry employs NTT faculty in the lecturer and academic professional tracks. The ranks of lecturer (listed from most junior to most senior) are: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The ranks of academic professional are Academic Professional and Senior Academic Professional.

For Lecturer positions, the Department of Chemistry will nominate for promotion to Senior Lecturer only those candidates who are evaluated as excellent in teaching. A service evaluation of very good is also required for promotion. For promotion of a senior lecturer to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, evaluations of excellent or better in both teaching and service are required.

For Academic Professional positions, the Department of Chemistry will nominate for promotion to Senior Academic Professional only those candidates who present evidence of a sustained evaluation of excellent in service. For candidates whose workload includes teaching, an evaluation of excellent in teaching that promotes the general goals and welfare of the department and fits the needs of the department is also required for promotion.
II. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER, PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER, AND SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL.

A. Process Overview

The primary stages of the Chemistry department’s NTT faculty review process are outlined below. These steps must be carried out following a time schedule provided by the College of Arts and Sciences.

1. The candidate will receive notification of eligibility from the Dean’s office and will subsequently submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual (College of Arts and Sciences PROMOTION MANUAL FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY) to the department chair according to the schedule provided by the college.

2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s review materials to a subcommittee of the Departmental NTT Review Committee (committee of the whole) to initiate the review. The final review must be made by the committee of the whole.

3. The committee of the whole submits its recommendation, including minority report(s) (if any), to the department chair. The department chair will provide a copy of the committee’s report (including minority report(s)) to the candidate.

4. The department chair submits an independent review of the candidate, and the departmental committee review (including minority report(s)) to the Dean’s Office. The department chair provides a copy of the chair report to the candidate. The candidate has the option of responding to the departmental committee and chair reports, addressed to the Dean’s Office, within three business days. The Dean’s Office will provide the department chair with a copy of any formal response the candidate has to the department committee and chair’s report.

At this point, the review process passes from the department to the college and university. See sections III and IV of the college manual for details on the review process at the college and university level.
**B. Departmental Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee (Committee of the Whole)**

The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of all tenured TT faculty and all NTT faculty of senior rank or above (senior lecturer, principle senior lecturer, and senior academic professional) in the department, except the chair and associate chair of the department and those members of the department serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion application at the college or university level. For each candidate, the department chair will appoint a 3 to 5 member subcommittee, with at least one TT and one NTT member, chosen from the committee of the whole, to initially review each candidate. The department chair shall also appoint a committee chair (selected from the subcommittee) for each candidate. All final recommendations must be made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet, discuss, and arrive at a majority recommendation. The vote will be in the form of signatures on the final recommendation. NTT faculty of equivalent or lower rank to the candidate’s current rank may not vote on the final recommendation of the committee of the whole. However, with the approval of the department chair and dean or appropriate associate dean, faculty of equal rank can be authorized to vote in specific cases. In consultation with the department chair, the dean may augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT members from other departments if the Chemistry department does not have a sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three voting members, with at least one being a tenured TT and at least one being a senior or principal senior NTT faculty member.

The committee of the whole shall review all credentials and make a recommendation to the chair of the department using the review and promotion guidelines adopted by the department of chemistry in accord with the college guidelines. All actions of the committee of the whole shall be approved by majority vote.
Duties of the departmental committee of the whole include the following:

1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the record of each candidate using the promotion and review procedures adopted by the department of chemistry.
2. By majority vote approve an overall recommendation for each candidate.
3. The written recommendation (with a majority of signatures) by the committee of the whole is delivered to the department chair.
4. Committee members who do not sign the written majority recommendation must provide signed separate letters (minority report) indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations.
5. The written statement and all separate letters from the committee of the whole must be sent to the chair of the department.

C. Rating Scales for NTT Faculty in Teaching and Service

The rating system for all structured reviews of NTT faculty will be: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Factors used in the evaluation for NTT faculty for teaching are listed in Table A1 of the Appendix. The corresponding factors for service are listed in Table A2 of the Appendix.

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 their core mission of engaging undergraduate learning in courses ranging from introductory survey of chemistry to advanced lecture and laboratories, study abroad programs, and Internship experience.

Instruction for science majors communicates the discipline of chemistry to students, develops in them an excitement about the molecular structure of the world around them, and trains them to be skilled, responsible members of a chemistry-related profession.

Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must include in the dossier evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as:

1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if these include significant revision of the current documents.

5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.

6. Results of all standardized exams given to all students (e.g., the ACS standardized exams).

7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).

8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.

9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative teaching activities.

10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs; participation in textbook development.

11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

2. Evaluation of Service

For NTT faculty, service can assume a variety of different forms. However, service for lecturers is normally at the departmental and college level and the quantity is dependent upon specific requirements and workload assignments as defined by the Department. University, college, department, professional and/or community level service can be relevant.

Departmental service obligations that need to be effectively handled are:

(a) Safety is always of primary concern in a chemistry department. It is expected that the candidate will maintain the highest safety standards at all times.

(b) Maintenance and oversight of equipment is of vital importance in a chemistry department. Where appropriate, it is expected that the candidate will take a vigorous role in making sure that Departmental equipment is in working order,
both by overseeing equipment purchase and repair, and by training students and
research associates carefully in the use of equipment.

(c) Participation on departmental committees is an important responsibility of all
faculty. Effective participation on the NTT Promotion Review Committee and
other committee appointments is expected.

(d) Faculty are expected to provide limited course oversight/coordination or fulfill
other assigned duties.

The service of Lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality.
Lecturers who have been very diligent in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently
attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks
thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) and who have also completed their assignments
thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of very good in service.

Each Lecturer's service rating will be determined with respect to the assigned service
responsibilities. Lecturers who are assigned a full teaching load each term will have a different
service load than those assigned major departmental and/or College roles. Only service that
meets the Department's mission will be considered.

A. For Lecturers with Full Teaching Loads. Service assignments are limited to (a) safety
issues, (b) equipment oversight, (c) departmental committees, participation in department
activities, and (d) limited course oversight/coordination or limited assigned departmental tasks
(science fair judges, seminar related tasks, etc.).

B. For Lecturers with Major Assigned Obligations in Departmental and/or
College/University Committees/Tasks. Service assignments in addition to (a)-(d) above include
one or more of the following: (e) Undergraduate Director, (f) Area Committee (e.g., Freshman,
Organic, etc.), (g) Pre-Med Advisor (departmental), (h) College/University committee work
(Pre-Med. etc.), (i) course lab manual responsibilities, (j) course/area Web responsibilities, and
(k) Science Olympiads or other major assigned departmental tasks.
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 descriptors: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in both categories is included in the Appendix.

1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has 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. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as excellent in teaching. Table A1 of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. The service of Lecturers is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of quality. Lecturers who have been very diligent and effective in meeting their assignments (e.g., who have consistently attended committee meetings required of them, who have performed all assigned tasks and duties thoroughly and in a timely manner, etc.) qualify for a rating of very good in service. Table A2 of the Appendix gives details for the descriptors used for evaluating the service of NTT faculty.

2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer

For promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching with potential for continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. Additionally, a candidate must provide a high standard of assigned service and play a leadership role in the department, college, university, and/or to the professional community. Each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence
that he/she has 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. In order to be promoted
to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer, each candidate must be rated as excellent in instruction
and excellent in service. Tables A1 (for teaching) and A2 (for service) of the Appendix outline
in detail what is necessary to obtain this.

D. Other Lecturer Reviews

The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion reviews are all distinct
from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and possibly
different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

1. Annual Review

Each faculty member, TT and NTT, undergoes an annual review. The annual report of the
previous year (except for faculty in their first year at GSU), plus an updated curriculum vita and
any other appropriate material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process. The Chair
of the Chemistry Department in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee shall
evaluate performance in instruction and service using the specific standards described in the
Appendix.

2. Third-Year Review (Lecturer)

As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a
dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and
deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental
committee of the whole will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written
assessment addressing the effectiveness in instruction and service to the departmental chair. As
discussed in Section IIB of this document, a subcommittee shall be formed for each candidate to
provide an initial draft evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but the committee of the whole
must meet, discuss, and vote on the final recommendation and ranking. The Chair will provide
an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be
forwarded to the Dean’s Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will
evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*. Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating. Split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as “very good but approaching excellent” may be appropriate.

Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion) review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and dialogue of the lecturer’s accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address possible deficiencies before the fifth-year review.

### 3. Post-Promotion Review (Senior Lecturer and Principal Senior Lecturer)

All Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers must undergo a comprehensive review every 5 years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion Review for Senior and Principal Senior Lecturers is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Lecturer (SL) or Principal Senior Lecturer (PSL) will be notified by the college in advance of the Post-Promotion Review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the SL/PSL to the department chair according to a schedule provided by the college in advance of the review. The departmental executive committee elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least one NTT faculty member of rank equal or higher to that of the SL/PSL). This committee evaluates the SL/PSL in the categories of instruction and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment, and both evaluations will be sent to the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.
IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS

A. General Considerations

There are four types of structured reviews for faculty on the academic professional track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior academic professional, and 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary considerations are contributions in service and teaching. Supplemental consideration will be given to contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate’s knowledge and departmental responsibilities. 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 academic professional.

B. Scope of Evaluations

1. Evaluation of Service

Service is at least 50% of the academic professional’s job functions as discussed in Section VI of the college manual which, in turn, is based on Board of Regents requirements. Service roles are assigned by the department depending on departmental needs and mission. Service effectiveness will be judged with respect to the assigned service duties. Service roles normally assigned by the department (individual assignments may include all or some of these roles) include:

- Facility/Service Management
- Supervisory/Mentoring Activities
- Instructional Service (laboratory coordination is one example)
- Academic Advisement and Curriculum
Contributions to the Department, College or University

Professional Service

Community and Public Service

Published Materials

Additional Service

The rating for Service will be based on the degree of diligence and level of quality. To receive an excellent rating all assigned tasks must be performed thoroughly and in a timely manner. The candidate must also play a leadership role in his/her assigned duties. Safety, cost effectiveness and planning will also be part of the evaluation.

2. Evaluation of Teaching

For academic professional candidates whose workload includes teaching, instructional assignments can vary greatly from term to term depending on departmental needs. The effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated as it relates to the department’s mission and the specific instructional responsibilities of the candidate. It may be necessary on certain occasions to assign an academic professional a class that does not perfectly match their skills/background. The candidate will be shown special consideration under these conditions.

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 academic professionals as it relates to their assigned role in the department.

Candidates for promotion must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. The candidate must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as:

1. Representative syllabi and other handouts given to students.
2. Selected examinations and quizzes.
3. Development of effective innovative courses and effective innovative teaching materials, and/or effective instructional techniques.
4. Laboratory protocols and manuals authored or modified by the candidate, especially if these include significant revision of the current documents.
5. Student evaluation summaries and all student comments. Evidence should be presented for each course taught that has been evaluated during the last three years.
6. Results of all standardized exams given to all students (e.g., the ACS standardized exams).
7. An outline of other student accomplishments (such as undergraduate research and independent study reports, publications in peer reviewed journals and presentations (oral and/or poster) at university, regional, and professional meetings).
8. Publication of papers on instruction; presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.
9. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts (local, state, and federal) to fund innovative teaching activities.
10. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs; participation in textbook development.
11. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
C. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Academic Professional

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 service and instruction relative to the descriptors: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The single measure for achieving the standard for promotion in the categories of instruction and service for each rank is defined in this section. The complete scale of evaluative terms in both categories is included in the Appendix.

1. Promotion from Academic Professional to Senior Academic Professional

In accordance with the college manual, each candidate will be evaluated based on the evidence that he/she has met or not met the standards for promotion in service and teaching (if applicable) relative to the evaluative terms outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. In order to be promoted to the rank of Senior Academic Professional, the candidate must be rated as excellent in service. Table A2 of the Appendix outlines in detail what is necessary to obtain this. The candidate must also be rated as excellent in teaching and Table A1 of the Appendix outlines what this entails.

D. Other Academic Professional Reviews

The annual, third-year, five-year (promotion), and post-promotion reviews are all distinct from each other. Because these different reviews cover different time periods and possibly different evaluating bodies, the ratings of these reviews may differ.

1. Annual Review of Academic Professionals

An appointment to an academic professional position is for a one-year period. Each academic professional undergoes an annual review. The annual report of the previous year (except for faculty in their first year at GSU), plus an updated curriculum vita and any other appropriate material supplied by the candidate, will be used in this process. The Chair of the Chemistry Department in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee shall evaluate performance in instruction and service using the specific standards described in the Appendix.
2. Third-Year Review of Academic Professionals

As discussed in detail in Section V.E of the college manual, the candidate will prepare a dossier containing information on teaching and service for the appropriate review period and deliver it to the chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental committee of the whole will evaluate the required materials and provide a signed written assessment with ranking that addresses the effectiveness of the candidate in instruction and service to the departmental chair. As discussed in Section IIB of this document, a subcommittee of the committee of the whole shall be formed for each candidate to provide an initial draft evaluation, tentative ranking, and review; but the committee of the whole must meet, discuss, modify, and vote on the final recommendation. The Chair will provide an independent assessment which along with the committee report and materials will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office. As stated in the college manual, both committee and chair will evaluate the candidate in teaching and service relative to the descriptors: outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix are used to arrive at a rating and split ratings such as “very good/excellent” are to be avoided. Instead, a phrase such as “very good but approaching excellent” may be appropriate.

Although the third-year review has many similarities to the fifth-year (promotion) review, its purpose is somewhat different. It is meant to encourage an assessment and dialogue of the academic professional’s accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses up to that point. In addition, it will give advice on improving performance and how to address possible deficiencies before the fifth-year review.

3. Post-Promotion Review of Academic Professionals

All Senior Academic Professionals must undergo a comprehensive review every 5 years after their last promotion or Post-Promotion Review. The purpose of the Post-Promotion Review for Senior Academic Professionals is to assess the quality and effectiveness of their long-term teaching and service and possibly identify opportunities that will enable the candidate to reach his/her full potential. The Senior Academic Professional will be notified by the college in
advance of the Post-Promotion Review and the required materials they are required to provide are discussed in Section V.F of the college manual. This material is submitted by the Academic Professional to the department chair according to a schedule provided by the college. The departmental executive committee elects an evaluation committee consisting of at least three faculty (at least one tenured TT and at least one NTT faculty member of rank equal or higher to that of the Senior Academic Professional). This committee evaluates the Senior Academic Professional in the categories of instruction and service using the criteria summarized in the Appendix. The department chair will provide an independent assessment and on both evaluations to the Dean’s Office. For additional information, consult Section V.F of the college manual.
## APPENDIX

### Table A1. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Teaching for NTT Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher, recognized as university-level leader in development of instruction</td>
<td>5 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f): (a) update/revise courses (b) appropriate student perceptions¹ and appropriate grades/drop rates² (c) direct independent study and/or Chem 4160 courses, (d) pub. in instructional jour. (e) instructional creativity, and/or develop new courses (f) appropriate learning outcomes, favorable test results relative to those of other faculty teaching the same or similar courses/ACS exam results²,³ (g) involvement/participation with educationally focused grants/proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Innovative, exceptional, creative teacher; provides major leadership in development of instruction at department level (broad impact)</td>
<td>Normally⁴ 4 of 7 items, including (a), (b) and (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Effective teacher; provides some leadership in instructional development (narrow impact)</td>
<td>3 items: (a), (b), and (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Meets obligations</td>
<td>2 of 7 items, including (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Limited performance; teacher of marginal effectiveness</td>
<td>1 of 7 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Substandard, ineffective teacher</td>
<td>0 of 7 items and pattern of complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Compared to the departmental 4 year average for the area and course level.
2 Department's normal statistics for each level of courses will be used as the standard. Student performance and honors are applicable.
3 Results on ACS national exams meet Departmental goals and expectations (previous results used as criteria).
4 For Academic Professionals assigned limited teaching responsibilities (< 25% of job functions), “appropriate student perceptions, and appropriate grades/drop rates” (item (b) in “Evidence Considered in Evaluation”) is replaced with “appropriate student perceptions and/or appropriate grades/drop rates”.

Table A2. Definitions and Evaluation Factors for Rating of Service for NTT Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service¹ Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence Considered in Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Major effective leadership roles</td>
<td>Major effective role in department. Major effective role in College or Senate or University, or in a professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Effective departmental leadership role(s)</td>
<td>Effective role in department. Effective role in college or senate or university, or in a professional organization will also be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Helpful citizenship. Some leadership role</td>
<td>Effective role in the department; meets departmental obligations effectively and is helpful; provides departmental leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Compared to the departmental 4 year average for the area and course level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Acceptable citizenship</th>
<th>Meets minimum departmental obligations/requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>Does not meet departmental obligations in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs major improvement; negative leader</td>
<td>Hinders department operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Service to the Department and College is expected to be minimal in the Lecturer’s first three years. For Academic Professionals, Service plays a much more significant role.