

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

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

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

22 **A. Process Overview**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 65 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

#### 66 **A. General Considerations**

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

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

## 79 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

### 80 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

159 **2. Evaluation of Service**

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

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

183

184 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

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

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

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

## 207 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

#### 221 **a. Teaching**

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

230

#### 231 **b. Service**

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

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

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

251 **a. Teaching**

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

273

274 **b. Service**

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



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

#### 287 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

293

##### 294 **1. Annual Review of Lecturers**

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

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

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

315

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

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

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

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

330

331 **A. Teaching**

332

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

335

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

339

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

343

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

353

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

361

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

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

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

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

## 396 **B. Service**

397

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

400

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

403

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

406

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

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

412

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

423

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