Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
INTRODUCTION

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism of ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the university. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Great care is taken to ensure accurate assessments and proper outcomes. It is not our intention in this set of guidelines to enumerate every step necessary for promotion and tenure. Rather, this document is an expression of the philosophy that will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the process that will be followed in the Institute. Candidates are directed to both the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors (University Manual) and the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (College Manual) for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and College expectations.

The Gerontology Institute will evaluate all candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. As will be described later in these guidelines, the Institute values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its members in each one.

Candidates will be reviewed and evaluated by both an Institute committee and by the Institute Director. The College Manual describes the review process and the evaluation standards. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development and teaching according to departmental guidelines and evaluated as having provided good
To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be judged excellent in professional development and teaching and very good in the area of service.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Gerontology Institute views professional development as encompassing any activity that advances our discipline by creating or extending gerontological knowledge and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is research, professional development also includes all other activities that support or enhance research in the field of aging, including reviewing, editing, and refereeing. The Gerontology Institute recognizes that gerontological scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods, including basic or applied research, theoretical or empirical work, scholarship of discovery or scholarship of integration, qualitative or quantitative methods, and primary or secondary analyses. Each research topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate to the stated research goal and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore, that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give little credit to published work that was not refereed. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to instruction unless the text can be shown to make significant or seminal contributions to
Obtaining extramural grant support for one’s research is a highly valued professional development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking external grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation. Assistant professors seeking promotion to the next higher rank are expected to begin a focused line of research, which usually involves seeking internal grant support and extramural grants. Grant support, however valuable, is only a means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research.

Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no specific type of such activities is required for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

The Institute recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals does exist within the field of gerontology. The difficulty of ranking journals is most apparent with “specialty” journals, where specialists in one sub-field are technically unable to draw comparisons between their own journals and those of another sub-field. The Institute’s goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship, and we will expect every candidate to meet that standard. Quality of publications will be assessed on several factors: 1) the work’s impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, or other evidence; 2) the prestige or standing of the journal in which an article appears or the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate’s explanation of the
importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the committee’s independent assessment of the work.

The Gerontology Institute recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative scholarship. While we acknowledge the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of determining the relative contributions of several co-authors, modern gerontological research is increasingly a team enterprise, and interdisciplinary research—which we strongly support—by definition, results in publications with multiple authors. We do assume that a candidate who chooses to collaborate should be able to publish a greater number of items than one working alone. We also know that order of authorship does not necessarily convey information about relative contribution to the work. Credit will be assigned based on the candidate’s relative contribution to a multiple-authored work. Again, the quality of the work will be assessed independently.

As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. While the Institute’s primary focus remains the development of the field of gerontology, we do recognize that gerontologists can and do regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in non-gerontology professional publications.

Finally, perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of publications required for promotion and tenure. The Gerontology Institute strongly resists the idea that the evaluation of one’s work can be defined solely by numbers of publications or other scholarly activities, the number or size of grants, or the number of
other scholarly activities. In other words, there is no magic number. As discussed below, we expect candidates to demonstrate both the quality and quantity of their scholarly productivity.

Candidates for promotion must submit all work done since their initial appointment or the completion of the dossier used in the review that led to promotion to his/her current rank at Georgia State University, whichever is relevant. Candidates for tenure at the level of associate professor may submit any relevant prior work done at other institutions, and candidates for tenure at the level of professor must submit any work done since their initial appointments as associate professors at other institutions. Candidates who receive probationary credit must submit work done during the period for which such credit is given as stipulated in the College Manual.

**Categories of Professional Development**

The candidate for promotion and tenure should submit written evidence of professional development organized in the following categories (as outlined in the College Manual and relevant to the discipline): 1) presentations at professional meetings; 2) scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and reviews; 3) achievements in the visual and performing arts; 4) awards and grants; 5) significant professional services; 6) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional associations; 7) general recognition within the discipline of gerontology; and 8) specialized professional activities in the discipline of gerontology.
Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires that a faculty member be recognized by scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has contributed to the advancement and development of gerontology and demonstrates a strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory in terms of high quality and productive research and scholarship. As stated in the College Manual, promotion to this level is available only to those who are judged to be excellent in professional development.

Following college and university standards, a candidate for promotion to the rank of associate professor must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers within and outside of the university, while establishing a national reputation in his/her field. Finally, the candidate’s body of work should indicate a trajectory of continued scholarship to support future promotion to professor.

An assistant professor seeking promotion is expected to have developed a focused research agenda demonstrating the candidate’s expertise in their specialty area. Examples of such a research agenda may include: a significant number (6-8) of high quality refereed articles published in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary journals; and/or a book of comparable quality published by major university or commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be
considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they are of comparable quality.

The products of a candidate’s research agenda should also include grant-seeking activities that establish the foundation for future extramural support of their research. Such activities may include one or more of the following: serving as a principal investigator or co-investigator on an externally funded grant; serving as principal investigator or co-investigator on contracts, subcontracts, or foundation awards; serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving internal funding for pilot studies that may lead to future external grant support; or serving as a consultant on external awards.

To qualify as excellent, a candidate also should have been very active in other research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

As stated in the College Manual, promotion to the rank of professor is recognition by the Institute and the university that a faculty member’s scholarship is of such high quality and importance that s/he has achieved and sustained a national and/or international reputation as a leading scholar in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research and scholarship.

To qualify as excellent, the candidate should have published: a significant number of high-quality refereed articles in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-
tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary
journals; and/or a book (or books) of comparable quality published by a major university
or commercial academic press. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be
considered the equivalent of journal articles if the candidate can demonstrate that they
have been subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, candidates
should normally have served as a principal investigator on external grants of a caliber
that demonstrates the national and/or international prominence of their scholarship. This
includes grants from federal agencies, prestigious foundations, or significant levels of
state funding. A co-investigator may be considered the equivalent of a principal
investigator if the candidate demonstrates a significant leadership role in the project.
Candidates who have not served as principal investigators on grants should present
comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their
research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial
intellectual contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more
nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles
reprinted in high quality edited research volumes. In addition, candidates should
demonstrate activity in additional research roles, such as editorial board member,
conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book
reviewer.
The quality of instruction of faculty members is of paramount importance to the Institute and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. The candidate for promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the following categories (as mandated in the College Manual): 1) courses taught during the last four academic years; 2) perception of students; 3) honors or special recognition for teaching or mentorship; 4) independent studies, practica, honors, theses, and dissertations; 5) published materials relevant to teaching; 6) teaching portfolio; and 7) additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. The candidate may not solicit letters to include in any of these categories.

The Institute will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the College Manual’s evaluative standard based on the evidence submitted. The committee will be mindful of the vagaries inherent in student evaluations; the student evaluation averages mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to reify the numbers. Teaching includes both activities that relate to classroom instruction and the mentoring of individual students. Both are important to effective teaching and student learning. Therefore, the committee recognizes that the balance between the two varies. Thus, effective classroom teaching may be given more weight and significance for a candidate with extensive classroom teaching experience and evidence of high quality
classroom teaching but less mentoring activities; and comparably mentoring may be
given more weight and significance for a candidate who has been very actively involved
in directed theses and dissertation, or co-authoring publications and presentations with
students, or in other activities related to individual student learning.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor

The candidate will usually be judged to be excellent in teaching when the
student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the
overall average is normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and; the course material
presented must show thorough preparation. In addition, the candidate should
demonstrate effective mentoring of students. For candidates for promotion to associate
professor this entails directing at least two theses, as well serving on thesis and
dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring activities. The
candidate may also have accomplished one or more of the following: published a
textbook; published a teaching-related article; won one or more teaching award;
presented papers at professional meetings with one or more students; co-authored with
one or more students. Once again, while candidates must demonstrate excellence in
both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students the relative emphasis on
classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

The candidate will usually be judged to be excellent in teaching when the
student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is normally in the mid-4.0 range or higher) and course material presented show thorough preparation. For promotion to the rank of professor candidates must also demonstrate a trajectory of active and effective mentoring of individual students. This entails having directed completed and ongoing theses as well serving on thesis and dissertation committees and engaging in other student mentoring activities. The candidate may also have accomplished one or more of the following: published a textbook; published a teaching-related article; won one or more teaching award; presented papers at professional meetings with one or more students; co-authored with one or more students. As noted above, while candidates must demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

SERVICE

Service to one’s colleagues, to our Institute, to the College, and to the University is very important elements in judging faculty contributions and performance. Faculty members also owe service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition, gerontology, as a field of study is concerned with aging and age-related issues at the individual, institutional, and societal levels gerontological endeavors are very conducive to a variety of forms of community service. Efforts at applying gerontological knowledge
and methods to address community concerns are highly valued by the Institute. As
mandated by the *College Manual*, the candidate must submit written evidence of service
activity related to his/her areas of professional competence.

**Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor**

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be
evaluated as at least *good* in service. A candidate will be judged *good* if s/he has been
active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service
tasks that are assigned to him or her.

**Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor**

For promotion/tenure to the rank of Professor the candidate must be evaluated
as at least *very good* in service.

A candidate will be judged *very good* if s/he has: 1) been active in assistance to
colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in Institute service by serving on the
executive committee, as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad
hoc committee (e.g., curriculum, graduate admissions, awards); 3) served effectively in
one or more of the following roles: graduate director, undergraduate director, research
director, chair of a recruitment committee, or other major ad hoc committees; and 4)
given significant service on college or university committees or serving as officers in
regional, national, or international professional societies.
The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Gerontology Institute is governed by the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual*. Until which time the Gerontology Institute has sufficient numbers of faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members, the dean, in consultation with the director, will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments. Each committee will elect its own chair, meet and deliberate, and report its evaluation and recommendation by letter to the department chair. All deliberations in the promotion and tenure process are confidential.

An important part of the promotion and tenure evaluation is the assessment of the candidate’s credentials by gerontologists outside Georgia State University. The candidate must submit with his/her dossier a list of eight scholars in the candidate’s specialty area who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s performance in the area of professional development and his/her reputation within the discipline. The Institute director, together with the Institute’s committee on Promotion and Tenure, will, without input from the candidate, prepare a list of eight additional scholars who could perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the *College Manual*. Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, who will select from them at least five persons to perform an outside review. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University. The Institute’s director will review and check the candidate’s dossier before it is sent to the outside reviewers.
All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has produced a focused research agenda demonstrating expertise in her/his specialty area(s). Examples of such a research agenda may include: a significant number of high quality refereed articles published in top-tier general gerontology journals (or top-tier journals in related fields) or top-tier specialty gerontology or interdisciplinary journals; and/or a book of comparable quality published by major university or commercial academic presses. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the faculty member demonstrates that they are of comparable quality. The research agenda ideally will include grant-seeking activities that establish the foundation for current and/or future extramural support of research. Such activities may include: serving as a principal investigator or co-investigator on an externally funded grant; serving as principal investigator or co-investigator on contracts, subcontracts, or foundation awards; serving as a co-investigator on submitted proposals; applying for and receiving internal funding for pilot studies that may lead to future external grant; or serving as a consultant on external awards. The faculty member should also be active in other research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.
Outstanding: The faculty member has met the criteria for excellent and has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Fair: The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.
Excellent: The evidence indicates highly effective classroom teaching and highly involved and effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective faculty will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution with evaluation scores in the mid-4.0 out of 5 range or higher. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate effective mentoring of students. The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, honors and master’s theses and capstone projects. The faculty member may also demonstrate effective mentoring of students by serving on and chairing thesis committees. The candidate may also have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related article, won a teaching award, presented papers at professional meetings with students, and/or co-authored with one or more students. While candidates can demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published award winning textbook, or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.
**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department as well as participating in professional associations.

**Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The articles, book chapters, and/or books of the faculty member judged as excellent are published in journals and by presses that are held in esteem within gerontology. Peer- or editorially-reviewed book chapters may be considered the equivalent of journal articles if the faculty member demonstrates that they have been subject to the same peer-review scrutiny as journals. In addition, the faculty member ideally serves or will have served as a principal investigator on external grants of a caliber that demonstrates the national and/or international prominence of their scholarship. This includes grants from federal agencies or prestigious foundations. The faculty member who has not served as principal investigator on a grant may present comparable evidence of the national recognition of the quality and status of their research. Examples include (but are not limited to): having made a substantial intellectual contribution as a co-investigator on multiple grants; receiving one or more nationally prominent fellowships, awards, or appointments; or having published articles reprinted in high quality edited research volumes. The faculty member also is active in additional research roles, such as editorial board member, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.
Outstanding: The faculty member has met the criteria for excellent and achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues, and so on.

B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Fair: The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.
Excellent: The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, honors and master’s theses, and capstone projects. The faculty member demonstrates effective mentoring of students by serving on and chairing thesis committees and engaging in other student mentoring activities such as serving on or chairing dissertation committees. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member may have published a textbook, or published a teaching-related article, won a teaching award, presented papers at professional meetings with students, and/or co-authored with one or more students. While candidates can demonstrate excellence in both classroom teaching and individual mentoring of students, the relative emphasis on classroom instruction and individual mentoring may vary by candidate.

Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels as well as participating in professional associations.
Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments, often leadership roles, beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.