

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

Policy Title:	Department of Sociology Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	04/24/2015
College Approval:	04/29/2015
Effective:	08/24/2015

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty housed in the Department of Sociology 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 Sociology’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 Sociology employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track.
17 The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most
18 senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for
19 lecturer 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 final
55 recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee of the whole must be
56 signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the
57 recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must
58 provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and
59 supporting rationale. The signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be
60 removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's
61 report(s).

62 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final
63 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the department
64 chair, the dean will augment the departmental promotion review committee with NTT
65 members from other departments when the home department does not have a
66 sufficient number of faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with
67 at least one being tenured and one being NTT faculty.

68 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

69 **A. General Considerations**

70 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual
71 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with
72 promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to principal senior
73 lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion
74 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary
75 considerations are contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to
76 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's

77 knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. This document defines ratings that are
78 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document
79 are defined in the context of departmental expectations specific to candidates being
80 considered for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer.

81 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

82 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

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

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

116 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**
117 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective
118 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development
119 of new programs or initiatives, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if
120 these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with
121 a travel component and/or the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study
122 abroad is another laudable potential achievement. Initiatives in the development of
123 new courses and resources that potentially line up with teaching ratings that meet or
124 exceed promotion standards are ones that affect significant numbers of students or
125 sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant achievements such as
126 the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research.

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

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

153 **e. Development of new skills:** The department encourages faculty to continue to
154 develop skills and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to
155 improve teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for
156 promotion might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the
157 classroom. Faculty who undergo formal training to gain new certifications and
158 competencies may present such achievements to the department as evidence of their

159 commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The department recognizes
160 that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more
161 interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing
162 might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching.

163 **2. Evaluation of Service**

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

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

190 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

193 a. **Professional Development Contributions:** The Department shall consider
194 professional development activities (e.g., publications of their research and scholarship,
195 conference presentations, grants applied for and/or funded, collaborations) as they bear
196 on the lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production
197 of peer-reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the
198 department certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-
199 reviewed publications, book chapters, facilitation of workshops, publications or

200 appearances in popular media, participation in academic conferences, and/or the
201 pursuit of grants to fund research in the discipline all enhance the candidates' case that
202 they are modeling the best practices of the profession to students. Such professional
203 development can also help the candidate's case for promotion if it can be shown to
204 augment the faculty member's expertise in subjects relevant to the classroom.

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

207 **b. Role within the department:** Since needs of the department often change, the role of
208 the lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or
209 department may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will
210 include the role of the lecturer within the context of the mission of the department and
211 the ability of the lecturer to fulfill effectively changing needs of the department.

212 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

226 **a. Teaching**

227 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
228 rating of *excellent*, the candidate's record shows consistently high levels of achievement
229 in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. His or her
230 course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually
231 strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Generally, he or she earns scores on student
232 evaluations that fall in the mid- 4-out-of-5 range or higher. Additionally, he or she
233 generally demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or protocols for
234 existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students
235 (e.g., directed readings, independent study courses, facilitating student presentations,
236 supporting applications to graduate programs, sharing professional knowledge with
237 teachers in training, and/or writing letters of recommendation).

238 **b. Service**

239 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a
240 rating of *very good*, the successful candidate has been very diligent in meeting her/his
241 assignments. The candidate consistently attends required committee meetings,
242 performs all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and completes
243 assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

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

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

257 **a. Teaching**

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

278 **b. Service**

279 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to
280 principal senior lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if he or she has diligently and highly
281 effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the
282 mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level
283 normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to departmental advising efforts
284 or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors (e.g.,
285 through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). In addition to continued growth in the
286 areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in service should take one or
287 more of the following forms: highly effective service as a departmental program director
288 or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader;
289 significant service to the profession or community.

290 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

296

297 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

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

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

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

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

319 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior
320 lecturers and principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy
321 and accomplished in their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's
322 teaching and service records over the last five years and will be based on the criteria
323 listed in the Appendix. Faculty under review will present their dossiers (as described in
324 the college manual) for evaluation by an elected committee of at least three faculty who
325 are either tenured or at the rank of principal senior lecturer (with representation from
326 each when the department has an available principal senior lecturer within its ranks).
327 The committee is elected by the departmental NTT review committee of the whole. The
328 department chair will provide an independent assessment and will then pass on both
329 evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

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

332

333 **A. Teaching**

334

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

337

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

341

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

345

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

355

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

363

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

373 production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty
374 member teaches; production of an article or other publication on pedagogy; invitation
375 to conduct a teacher training workshop at other institutions or a
376 regional/national/international conference, technological pedagogical innovations,
377 successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives;
378 teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored
379 students.

380 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** The candidate's impact on students is of
381 the highest level. On top of the expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching
382 appropriate to his or her rank, as described above, the *outstanding* teacher commands a
383 mastery of instruction in his or her area as evidenced by at least one of the following:
384 successful pursuit of external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching
385 awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

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.

394 **B. Service**

395

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

398

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

401

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

404

405 **Very Good:** The candidate will be judged to be *very good* in service if they have been
406 very diligent in meeting their assignments. The candidate consistently attends required
407 committee meetings, performs all assigned tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner,
408 and completes assignments thoughtfully and effectively.

409

410 **Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been
411 diligent and highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed
412 significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. The *excellent*

413 candidate at this level normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to
414 departmental advising efforts or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-
415 tenure track instructors (e.g., through teaching consultation, guest lecturing). In addition
416 to continued growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in
417 service generally will take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as
418 a departmental program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility;
419 recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the profession or community.

420

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