

Department of Political Science
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION
GUIDELINES

Policy Title:	Department of Political Science Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	07/31/2015
College Approval:	09/14/2015
Effective:	09/14/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of Political Science are vital
3 components of our faculty. The policies and procedures related to the review and
4 promotion of faculty in non-tenure track ranks are outlined in this document
5 (department guidelines), the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-
6 Tenure Track Faculty (college manual), and the Georgia State University Promotion
7 Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (university manual). Whereas the university and
8 college NTT manuals provide general statements of the expected quality and
9 significance of NTT faculty accomplishments, this document identifies the concrete
10 forms these achievements should take. In particular, this document articulates the
11 Department of Political Science’s criteria for the various rankings that candidates for
12 promotion might receive in the areas of teaching and service. Candidates should consult
13 the college and university manuals for matters of process and procedure, dossier
14 requirements, and time-in-rank policies that govern eligibility for promotion
15 consideration.

16 The Department of Political Science employs NTT faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks
17 within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior):
18 Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer
19 track faculty are described in the college manual.

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

22 **A. Process Overview**

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

- 25 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for
26 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual
27 to the department chair.
- 28 2. The department chair forwards the candidate’s materials to the departmental
29 review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation
30 must be made by the committee as a whole).
- 31 3. The departmental committee submits its recommendation, including any minority
32 reports, to the department chair. The committee members will sign the report(s) on
33 a separate page/pages. The department chair will provide a copy of the
34 departmental committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate
35 with a notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the
36 department chair within three business days.
- 37 4. The department chair submits her/his independent recommendation and the
38 recommendation of the departmental committee, including any minority reports
39 and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean’s Office. The department chair

40 will provide a copy of her/his own report to the candidate with a notification that
41 the candidate has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business
42 days. The Dean's Office will provide to the department chair a copy of any response
43 from the candidate to the department chair's report.

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

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

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

65 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

66 **A. General Considerations**

67 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual
68 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
69 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
70 lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
71 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
72 considerations are contributions in teaching and service. Consideration may be given to
73 contributions in the area of professional development that demonstrate the candidate's
74 knowledge and expertise of current trends and developments in the field, insofar as it
75 enhances teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are used in all of
76 the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined

77 in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being considered for
78 promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

79 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

80 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

81 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria
82 of the college's policy (http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf).
83 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core
84 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education
85 requirements. However, if a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of
86 teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to
87 their assigned role in the department.

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

90 **a. Quality of course content:** The quality of course content will be evaluated through
91 review of syllabi, exam questions, essay assignments, in-class exercises, readings, and
92 other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the candidate for
93 promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines. Exam
94 questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course
95 level and catalog description. Writing assignments should develop the students' ability
96 to work with primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer
97 meaningful questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their
98 appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may
99 provide additional materials, such as customized texts, handouts, software, and other
100 course elements that reflect the faculty member's efforts to foster student engagement
101 and success. In particular, credit is given to faculty whose courses are structured in ways
102 that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in their students. Courses that
103 connect students with other university programs and resources and that take advantage
104 of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta will also be viewed as
105 evidence of successful teaching. The department also encourages faculty to design
106 courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who
107 are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their
108 performance as the semester unfolds. The department recognizes that teachers might
109 use a variety of methods. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion
110 expectations, however, encourage student interest in the material and designing
111 assessments that foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

112 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
113 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective
114 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development
115 of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if
116 these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with

117 a travel component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study
118 abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Initiatives in the development of
119 new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or
120 exceed promotion standards are ones that affect significant numbers of students or
121 sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant achievements such as
122 the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research.

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

138 **d. Direction of students:** The department will assess the extent and quality of faculty
139 efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as
140 independent studies, honors theses, student research presented at GSURC, as well
141 individual student engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other
142 institutions or communities. Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering
143 additional tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for underperforming in
144 their Political Science classes and time spent offering additional guidance to students
145 who are pursuing additional research projects connected to their Political Science
146 coursework. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of recommendation for
147 undergraduate and graduate students might also be viewed as evidence of significant
148 effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

149 **e. Development of new skills:** The department encourages faculty to continue to
150 develop skills and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to
151 improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for
152 promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the
153 classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new certifications and
154 competencies may present such achievements to the department as evidence of their
155 commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The department recognizes
156 that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more
157 interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing
158 might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

159 **2. Evaluation of Service**

160 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality
161 instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university;
162 professional service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies
163 depending on the individual's core mission as defined by the department, but it is
164 generally at the department or college level. Contributions to service in the Department
165 of Political Science typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles,
166 such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments;
167 instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or
168 presenting seminars on teaching methodology, or supervising or mentoring faculty;
169 assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and
170 teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts or grant
171 applications; contributions to the department, college, and university, such as student
172 advisement and mentoring, memberships on department/college/university
173 committees, and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if
174 appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards;
175 community and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches,
176 presentations, performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies.

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

183

184 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

187 **1. Professional Development Contributions:** The Department may consider
188 professional development contributions (e.g. publications of their research and
189 scholarship, conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded) that
190 demonstrate the lecturer's knowledge and expertise of current trends and
191 developments in the field, insofar as it enhances teaching performance. While the
192 production of peer-reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of
193 lecturers, the department certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active
194 scholars. Peer-reviewed publications, publications or appearances in popular media,
195 participation in academic conferences, and/or the pursuit of grants to fund research in
196 the discipline all enhance the candidates' case that they are modeling the best practices
197 of the profession to students. Such professional development can also help the
198 candidate's case for promotion if it can be shown to augment the faculty member's
199 expertise in subjects relevant to the classroom.

200 Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction
201 section of the dossier rather than under a Professional Development section.

202 **2. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role of
203 the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or
204 department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will
205 include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department and
206 the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

207 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

214 **1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

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

221 **a. Teaching**

222 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
223 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's record shows consistently high levels of achievement
224 in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her
225 course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually
226 strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, he or she earns scores on student
227 evaluations that fall in the mid- 4-out-of-5 range or higher. Additionally, he or she
228 demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses
229 and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

230

231 **b. Service**

232 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
233 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate diligently and effectively fulfills his or her
234 assigned roles; rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the
235 requisite advisement sessions, he or she actively participates, using these meetings as
236 opportunities to most effectively govern the department and to achieve positive results
237 for undergraduate and graduate students.

238 **2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer**

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

251 **a. Teaching**

252 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating
253 of *excellent*, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five
254 categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her course
255 materials illustrate a long-term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually
256 strives to improve his or her pedagogy. His or her student evaluations are consistently
257 strong, normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range. He or she
258 demonstrates a sustained track record of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or
259 graduate students, as well as developing new courses or protocols for existing courses.
260 In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the
261 candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend into areas beyond those normally
262 associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates normally
263 will engage in one or more of the following activities: production of a publication
264 suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of
265 an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or
266 external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student
267 awards or other accomplishments of mentored students; establishing and/or leading
268 study abroad programs; programs which include student participation in competitive
269 conferences; developing/teaching courses with significant experiential learning
270 component. A candidates whose record of achievement does not self-evidently conform
271 to this standard should document and explain how their record corresponds to a similar
272 level of significance and achievement.

273

274 **b. Service**

275 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
276 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if he or she has diligently and highly
277 effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the
278 mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level

279 normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to departmental advising efforts
280 or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition
281 to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in
282 service should take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as a
283 departmental program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility;
284 recognition as a campus leader; establishing/running programs or services which
285 promote the strategic goals of the university and/or the department; significant service
286 to the profession or community.

287 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

288 The annual, third-year, promotion, and post-promotion cumulative reviews are all
289 distinct from one another. Because these different evaluations cover different time
290 periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, the results of these reviews may
291 diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the
292 conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

293

294 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

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

302 **2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers**

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

315

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

317 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
318 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy
319 and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's
320 teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria

321 listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in
322 the college manual) for evaluation by a committee elected by the departmental NTT
323 review committee of the whole. The elected committee will consist of at least three
324 faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with
325 representation from each when the department has an available principal senior
326 lecturer within its ranks). The department chair will provide an independent assessment
327 and will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

328 **APPENDIX: Complete Ratings Scale for Evaluations of Lecturer-Track Faculty to be used**
329 **in Annual, Third-Year, Promotion, and Post-Promotion Cumulative Reviews**

330

331 **A. Teaching**

332

333 **Poor:** The candidate displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through
334 student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and little to no student mentoring.

335

336 **Fair:** The candidate displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced
337 through student evaluations, course materials of inconsistent effectiveness, and
338 occasional student mentoring.

339

340 **Good:** The candidate's instructional performance barely exceeds adequate, as
341 evidenced through student evaluations, minimally effective course materials, and
342 generally satisfactory but limited effort as a mentor of students.

343

344 **Very Good:** The candidate is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes
345 evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of
346 students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the
347 department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically varied and
348 pedagogically appropriate, resulting in proficient student learning. While the candidate
349 is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of
350 involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a
351 rating of *excellent*, as described below, and/or the candidate's student evaluations show
352 inconsistencies or regularly fall short of departmental expectations.

353

354 **Excellent (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The *excellent* teacher shows consistently high
355 levels of achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section
356 III.B.1. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who
357 continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, his or her student
358 evaluations scores fall in the mid- 4-out-of-5 range or higher. Additionally, he or she
359 demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses
360 and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

361

362 **Excellent (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated expectations
363 for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the
364 rank of principal senior lecturer will have a record of consistently high student
365 evaluations in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range and will have demonstrated successful
366 mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students and development new courses
367 or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of
368 teaching described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher should also extend into
369 areas beyond those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For
370 example, candidates normally will engage in one or more of the following activities:

371 production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty
372 member teaches; production of an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful
373 pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching
374 awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students;
375 establishing and/or leading study abroad programs; programs which include student
376 participation in competitive conferences; developing/teaching courses with significant
377 experiential learning component.

378 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The candidate's impact on students is of
379 the highest level. On top of the expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching, as
380 described above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a mastery of instruction in his or
381 her area as evidenced by at least one of the following: successful pursuit of external
382 funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or
383 other accomplishments of mentored students; establishing and/or leading study abroad
384 programs; programs which include student participation in competitive conferences;
385 developing/teaching courses with significant experiential learning component.

386 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated
387 expectations for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, the candidate for promotion
388 to the rank of principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as *outstanding* if he or she has
389 achieved more than one of the following: production of a publication suitable for use in
390 the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other
391 publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for
392 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other
393 accomplishments of mentored students; establishing and/or leading study abroad
394 programs; programs which include student participation in competitive conferences;
395 developing/teaching courses with significant experiential learning component.

396 **B. Service**

397

398 **Poor:** Candidates judged to be *poor* in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations
399 and are not responsible citizens of the department.

400

401 **Fair:** Candidates judged to be *fair* in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service
402 obligations or are not responsible citizens of the department.

403

404 **Good:** Candidates judged to be *good* in service do not always effectively fulfill assigned
405 service obligations or are not consistently responsible citizens of the department.

406

407 **Very Good:** The candidate will be judged to be *very good* in service if they
408 enthusiastically and effectively fulfill their assigned roles; rather than merely attending
409 committee meetings or holding the requisite advisement sessions, such faculty actively
410 participate, using these meetings as opportunities to most effectively govern the

411 department and to achieve positive results for undergraduate and graduate students.

412

413 **Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been
414 diligent and highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed
415 significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent*
416 candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to
417 departmental advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-
418 tenure track instructors. In addition to continued growth in the areas of service
419 described above, the candidate's growth in service should also take one or more of the
420 following forms: highly effective service as a departmental program director or in a role
421 with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant service
422 to the profession or community.

423

424 **Outstanding:** In excess of the stated expectations to achieve a rating of *excellent* in
425 service, the candidate will be judged to be *outstanding* in service if they have not only
426 fulfilled their assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to
427 seek out best practices and new opportunities for maximizing the success of the
428 department in meeting its stated goals. Faculty members judged to be *outstanding* in
429 service will have been recognized by their peers, students, or university administrators
430 as having established a long track record of success in improving campus life in
431 measurable or noticeable ways. Highly effective service as a departmental program
432 director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility, as well as extraordinary service
433 to the profession or community, establishing/running programs or services which
434 promote the strategic goals of the university and/or the department are also indications
435 of outstanding service.