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.
I. INTRODUCTION

The guidelines contained in the following pages are intended to provide an indication of the level of performance expected at the departmental level for promotion to the various ranks and for the award of tenure. In addition, these guidelines indicate the ways the departmental expectations supplement and apply the criteria for promotion and tenure contained in the College Manual. All faculty members should acquaint themselves thoroughly with those criteria.

The evaluation for promotion and/or tenure of candidates in the department will occur according to the procedures and criteria spelled out in this document. These procedures and criteria have been approved by the Chair (in consultation with the Executive Committee and the full-time faculty of the department) upon the recommendation of the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure. They also require the approval of the Dean upon the recommendation of the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Board. They are intended for the guidance of candidates and of the departmental committees evaluating such candidates.

In accordance with the policies of the Board of Regents of the University System, of the University, and of the College, candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated on the basis of their performance in the areas of (1) Professional development, (2) Teaching and (3) Service. Candidates should note that peer review at the departmental level will take into account both the extent and the quality of their contributions in all three areas. In the area of professional development, evaluations will also be sought outside Georgia State University from established scholars in the candidate's field.

II. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, TEACHING, AND SERVICE

A. Professional Development. Throughout their stay at Georgia State University, all members of the faculty are expected to remain active in their discipline in general, and to make a significant contribution to their area of expertise in particular. The candidate for promotion and tenure is expected to submit documented evidence of professional development
organized according to the Categories for Professional Development in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (section V.E.). The clearest evidence of such activity is the publication of articles in refereed journals or in edited books published by well-regarded presses, and of books by well-regarded presses with a rigorous refereeing policy. Other indicators of significant professional contribution are:

1. Participation in international, national, regional and local programs of professional associations, including presenting papers, organizing sessions, serving as a commentator at sessions, and chairing sessions.

2. Participation in sessions, workshops, and other programs organized and implemented by institutes or other official organs of a foreign government or embassy.

3. Competition for, and securing of, grants and awards for individual research projects, or in support of projects involving the cooperation of other colleagues.

4. Recognition accorded by various scholarly organizations and by colleagues within one's own discipline or area of expertise; also the recognition granted by invitations for listing in refereed WHO's WHO and other professional publications.

5. Membership on editorial boards of professional journals.

6. Service as referee for scholarly journals and publishing houses, and reviewer of books for scholarly journals and newspapers.

B. Teaching. The candidate for promotion and tenure is expected to submit documented evidence of effective teaching organized according to the Categories for Teaching in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (section V.F.). Effectiveness in the classroom will be judged on the basis of student impressions as recorded in student evaluations and the evidence gleaned from the teaching portfolios as defined in that document and adapted to the specific nature of our discipline. While any determination of good teaching depends heavily on the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom, the following items will also be taken as proof of effectiveness and active interest in teaching:
1. Formal recognition of teaching excellence by peers.
2. Activities relating to student advisement and student-
sponsored meetings and projects.
3. Involvement in special services to students such as the
supervision of practica and internships when academic evaluation
of student performance is included, and the supervision of
honors papers, theses and other such individualized work with
students.
4. The placement and success of graduates when the influence of
the instructor is clearly demonstrable.
5. The development of new courses, or the publication of
textbooks, teaching aids, and the like.
6. Participation in workshops on development and refining of
pedagogical methods.

C. Service. All faculty members are expected to make a service
contribution to the local academic community of which they are a
part as well as to the larger community of scholars within their
discipline. The candidate for promotion and tenure is expected
to submit documented evidence of service activity organized
according to the Categories for Service in the College of Arts
and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (section V.G.).
Committee service is the most common expression of this
dimension of one's responsibilities, but other expressions are
also important, including the following:
1. Departmental service such as the administration of the
graduate program, the foreign language competency exams, the
practice and internship programs, the Translation and
Interpretation program, and similar activity.
2. Assistance to colleagues, including help in developing new
programs, grant development, and research projects.
3. College and institutional service, including involvement in
curriculum and program review, development of new emphases or
concentrations, self-studies, recruitment activities, the
various fund-raising projects of the Alumni Association, and the
like.

4. Community service, including involvement with the local and
regional school systems and their representatives, lecturing or
making presentations on discipline-related matters to community
groups, holding workshops or participating in short courses in
continuing education.

5. Membership and participation in professional societies,
including such activities as planning sessions, developing new
avenues and techniques for professional meetings, and editing
newsletters.

6. Public and private sector service relating to academic
expertise.

III. TERMS OF EVALUATION

Candidates must receive an evaluation of excellent in
professional development and teaching, and an evaluation of good
in service, in order to be recommended for promotion to and/or
tenure at the rank of Associate Professor.

Candidates must receive an evaluation of excellent in
professional development and teaching, and an evaluation of very
good in service, in order to be recommended for promotion to
and/or tenure at the rank of Professor.

The definitions of these terms, as they apply to each of the
three areas, will be found below.

IV. DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION TO THE
VARIOUS RANKS

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

1. Professional Development. The tenured and tenure-track
faculty of the Department of World Languages and Cultures
support an array of programs and disciplines. Candidates
for promotion and tenure at the rank of Associate Professor
will be judged according to the usual standards followed in
their discipline.

The Department will evaluate dossiers with a commonly
accepted principle as a guideline: candidates in
literature, culture and civilization normally demonstrate
scholarly activity by the publication of a book or books by
presses of solid standing and by the publication of
articles; candidates in the other areas represented in the
Department normally publish articles rather than books.

It is understood that books should be published by well-
regarded presses.

Articles that will be given weight in the evaluation may
take the form of refereed journal articles, book chapters
in works published by university or respected presses,
invited contributions to collections of essays edited by
recognized scholars in the candidate’s field, and/or
conference proceedings that can be demonstrated to be
significant through peer review, evaluation by prominent
scholars, acceptance rate, or any other measure that
indicates the high quality of the candidate’s contribution.

Obtaining a research-related grant, while not a
substitution for publications, is a significant scholarly
activity and will be evaluated according to the prestige of
the granting agency and the amount of the award.

Book reviews, entries in reference works, and related kinds
of publications are acknowledged as useful but will not be
regarded as the equivalent of other kinds of scholarly
work.

In the case of co-authored books and articles, the
candidate must include documentation about his or her exact
contribution and about the originality of the work
involved. In evaluating such works, the Committee will
consider that the greater the amount of original textual,
scholarly, and interpretative work, the more weight the
edition or the textbook carries.

The Committee recognizes that co-authored works, as
well as textbooks and annotated editions of classroom
texts, are widely regarded as evidence of scholarly productivity in applied linguistics, linguistics, and foreign language pedagogy. The Committee also notes that such works shall be considered only under one area for evaluation purposes; for professors in areas other than those delineated in the preceding sentence, this will normally be Teaching.

Online publications will be regarded as equal to print publications if they are appropriately reviewed by peers and published under the aegis of respected institutions or presses.

Participation at meetings at the regional, national, and international level is expected from all candidates.

The trajectory of the candidate’s productivity will also be taken into account as an indication of his or her potential for future scholarly growth; the successful candidate is poised by dint of his or her publications and growing reputation to achieve promotion to Full Professor within an appropriate amount of time.

In determining a candidate’s level of achievement, the members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will rely on their own professional judgment as informed by the prevailing standards in comparable institutions, the judgment of colleagues most closely associated with the candidate’s area of expertise, and the evaluation of the candidate’s published work by outside reviewers. Candidates can expect to be judged overall on both the quality and the quantity of their published research.

In the following section, books and articles are to be understood as defined according to the above-mentioned criteria. The candidate in applied linguistics, linguistics, or foreign language pedagogy who is rated as excellent has usually published a substantial number of articles (normally at least five) and gives evidence of a national reputation. The candidate in literature, culture, or civilization who is rated as excellent has normally published a book and gives evidence of a national reputation; in certain cases, the candidate may have
published articles impressive enough in quality and number
to merit this rating without an accompanying book, or may
have a book in press as documented by a letter from the
publisher.

2. **Teaching.** The curriculum of the Department of World
Languages and Cultures reflects the Department’s triple
mission: to allow undergraduates majoring in other
departments to fulfill their foreign language requirements
or to complete a minor in the languages where this is
possible; to provide our own majors with courses in their
chosen discipline; and to offer our graduate students a
range of courses leading to the Master’s degree. Depending
on the staffing needs prevailing at any given time, faculty
members can expect to be called upon to teach at every
level of the curriculum. Thus candidates for promotion to
the rank of Associate Professor will be evaluated on their
performance at all levels, from elementary language courses
to the graduate classes in their area of specialization.

The evaluation of the candidate’s teaching performance will
be based in general on the faculty member’s level of
commitment and contribution to the quality of teaching
within the Department, and in particular on all the aspects
of instruction mentioned in the College manual, such as
quality of course content, student perceptions, direction
of undergraduate and graduate students, and such additional
contributions to the Department’s instructional programs as
development of new courses and/or innovative teaching
techniques.

The candidate rated as *excellent* has taught an appropriate
number of courses at the levels required in the language
section in question and presents a portfolio clearly
demonstrating a high degree of commitment to effective
transmission of knowledge and to the development of
analytical skills. The evaluation of teaching will include
student evaluations for all courses taught. These
evaluations will be judged both numerically (average
scores) and qualitatively (written comments). In terms of
numerical scores, in order to be rated as *excellent* the
candidate will have to meet or surpass the range of scores that are typical among tenured faculty for that level and type of course. Other qualifying factors that may be taken into consideration include: whether the course is a lower-level language course or an upper-level content course; whether it is required or elective; whether it is part of the major; whether it is a new course; whether it is taught in English or in the foreign language. In terms of the qualitative analysis of student written comments, the evaluation will take into consideration whether the comments reveal the existence of significant strengths (the instructor is available to students outside of class, goes out of his/her way to assist and mentor students, is innovative and challenges preconceptions, etc.) or a particular pattern of problems (classroom management, frequent tardiness, lack of punctuality in grading tests and assignments, does not respond to e-mails, shows favoritism, etc.) Other examples of the documentation demonstrating the commitment to teaching might include but are not limited to well-constructed syllabi, appropriate tests, and documentation of contributions to student achievements such as mentorship of students, direction of student research projects and theses, supervision of practica and internships when academic evaluation of student performance is included, assistance to students in submitting research for publication, and guidance of students in attaining admission to graduate school at Georgia State or elsewhere. Additional items that contribute to the strength of the portfolio include participation actively in teaching-related projects in the department such as obtaining teaching-related grants; teaching awards; activities relating to student advisement and student-sponsored meetings and projects; the development of new courses; the publication of textbooks, teaching aids, and the like; and participation in workshops on development and refining of pedagogical methods.

3. **Service.** In order to receive a rating of *good* in service, the candidate will present a record of conscientious contributions in a few of the areas listed above in Section
II, C. The service may be at either the departmental or extra-departmental level.

B. Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor.

As indicated in the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences, promotion to the rank of professor is a recognition awarded only to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing in their professions and at Georgia State University. Successful candidates will be expected to demonstrate that their record substantially surpasses in quality and/or quantity the departmental requirements for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As mentioned above, candidates must receive a ranking of excellent in both professional development and teaching, and very good in service.

1. Professional Development. In order to be considered excellent, candidates in all areas of research represented in the Department must have published at least one book or a substantial number of articles since their last promotion and must demonstrate that they have achieved an international reputation. The latter can be demonstrated through documentation of such activities and accomplishments as publication of books by prestigious foreign presses or of articles in prestigious foreign journals, invited presentations at international meetings, or the reception of international grants to support the candidate’s research.

2. Teaching. The contributions in Teaching of the candidate for promotion to Full Professor are expected to be more diverse than those of the candidate for promotion to Associate Professor and will often involve a leadership role in the teaching mission of the Department. Candidates are expected to provide documentation for their contributions and accomplishments in the various areas.

Candidates who are evaluated as excellent are expected to have taught an appropriate number of courses, the exact number and level depending on the particular needs of their language section and on whether the section offers courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Student
perceptions of candidates in these courses will be based to a great extent on the student evaluations included in the teaching portfolio. As with the promotion to Associate Professor, these evaluations will be judged both numerically (average scores) and qualitatively (written comments). However, in order to be rated as excellent the candidate will have to exceed the range of scores that are typical among Associate Professors and at least meet the range of scores that are typical among Professors for that level and type of course. In terms of the qualitative analysis of student written comments, the evaluation will take into consideration whether the comments reveal the existence of a particular pattern of strengths (the instructor is available to students outside of class, goes out of his/her way to assist and mentor students, etc.) or problems (classroom management, frequent tardiness, lack of punctuality in grading tests and assignments, does not respond to e-mails, shows favoritism, etc.) Additionally, to be judged excellent the candidate will have to demonstrate strong leadership and to have made significant contributions to the teaching mission of the Department in several of these areas: a) development of new and innovative courses, including Honors components for existing courses, Honors seminars, Perspectives courses, CTW courses, and courses cross-listed with other departments and taught in English; b) significant redesign of existing courses particularly when it involves the adoption of new pedagogical tools, instructional technologies and delivery methods; c) writing grants that support the teaching mission of the Department; d) extensive student advising and mentoring that goes beyond the standard amount expected of all faculty members; e) a leadership role in developing materials and/or participating actively in the Learning Outcomes Assessment program; f) the direction of independent studies courses, practica, honors theses, mini-theses and Master’s theses, all of which contribute to the University’s goals of retention and progress towards graduation; g) assisting students in research projects that lead to conference presentations and/or publications, or in successfully applying for fellowships; h) publication of pedagogical
materials such as textbooks or lab programs that receive national recognition as measured by the quality of the publishing venue, positive revues in specialized journals, and adoption by language departments elsewhere (research-based publications are evaluated under Professional Development); i) special invitations to teach at other universities or invitations to present workshops on pedagogical methods at professional meetings or at other universities; j) participation in the University’s efforts to encourage study abroad by organizing and directing study abroad programs or directing international exchange programs.

A candidate who is rated excellent is able to document his or her success in teaching an appropriate number of courses and has contributed in a very significant way in some of the teaching-related areas delineated above.

3. Service. In order to receive a rating of very good, the candidate must document contributions in at least two of the activities described above in II, C. The service must be of high quality.

V. DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

All members of the department who anticipate seeking promotion and/or tenure are urged to establish as early as possible a portfolio of materials organized according to the prescribed format, and to update the portfolio every semester. The departmental Chair will be ready to discuss with prospective candidates any aspect of the promotion and tenure process, the main stages of which are described in the College Manual.
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 faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

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 book or a comparable body of research. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications, as scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential to many areas of studies in foreign languages. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Further evidence for a rating of excellent includes documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation in areas such as the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies. An evaluation of excellent indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.
Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by extensive publications (two or more books and/or a comparable body of articles or research published in other forms). Further evidence may include, in addition to the achievements mentioned in the preceding section, national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.

B. Teaching

The evaluation in teaching takes into consideration a number of factors, including those noted in the various explanations that follow.

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through deficiencies noted in 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 deficiencies noted in 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, as well as 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 that have not been satisfactorily explained by the candidate.

**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 dissertations. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation and creativity in teaching. The evaluation of teaching will be based on a combination of the criteria listed.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent at either level, 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 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 faculty member’s professional development contributions are limited in scope and impact.

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 books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles of the faculty member judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. Other important evidence may include the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field. The evidence may include, in addition to extensive publications (two or more books and/or a comparable body of research published in other forms), achievements in the ways described in the preceding section, national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues, and so on.
B. Teaching

The evaluation in teaching takes into consideration a number of factors, including those noted in the various explanations that follow.

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through deficiencies noted in 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 deficiencies noted in 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, as well as 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 that have not been satisfactorily explained by the candidate.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of honors and master’s theses and/or dissertations to completion. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member evaluated as excellent also will have demonstrated a substantial variety of activities related to instruction as well as innovative pedagogy. Such a faculty member will also have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs in a timely fashion; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; presenting or publishing their work, completing their programs, and advancing into subsequent programs or into the profession. Such a faculty member advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work. The evaluation of teaching will be based on a combination of the criteria listed.

**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 beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.