

**Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies**  
**College of Arts and Sciences**  
**Georgia State University**  
**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION**  
**GUIDELINES**

Policy Title:	Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Institute Approval:	08/26/2015
College Approval:	04/29/2014
Effective:	08/26/2015

## 1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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

16 The Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies employs regular, full-time NTT  
 17 faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following  
 18 (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior  
 19 Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the college  
 20 manual.

## 21 **II. INSTITUTE REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER AND** 22 **PRINCIPAL SENIOR LECTURER**

### 23 **A. Process Overview**

24 The primary stages of the Institute-level NTT faculty promotion review process are as  
 25 follows:

- 26 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean’s Office, the candidate standing for  
 27 promotion will submit the required review materials to the Institute Director as  
 28 outlined in the college manual.
- 29 2. The Institute Director forwards the candidate’s materials to the Institute promotion  
 30 review committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation  
 31 must be made by the committee as a whole).
- 32 3. The Institute promotion review committee submits its recommendation, including  
 33 any minority reports, to the Institute Director. Members of the committee must not  
 34 be identified to the candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate  
 35 page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided with his or her  
 36 copy of the committee’s report(s). The Institute Director will provide a copy of the  
 37 Institute committee’s report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a  
 38 notification that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the Institute  
 39 Director within three business days.

40 4. The Institute Director submits an independent recommendation along with the  
 41 recommendation of the Institute review committee, including any minority reports  
 42 and any responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. A copy of the Institute  
 43 Director's report will be provided to the candidate with a notification that the  
 44 candidate has the option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days.  
 45 The Dean's Office will provide to the Institute Director a copy of any response from  
 46 the candidate to the Institute Director's report.

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

#### 49 **B. Composition of Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee**

50 The Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of tenured WGSS  
 51 faculty and NTT faculty in the Institute of a rank equal to or above that sought by the  
 52 candidate (Senior Lecturer, Principal Senior Lecturer), except the Director of the  
 53 Institute and any members of the Institute serving in a position that will review the  
 54 candidate's promotion application at the college or university levels. According to the  
 55 college manual, units may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially  
 56 review and evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be  
 57 made by the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss  
 58 and vote on its final recommendation. The letter from the departmental committee  
 59 must be signed by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the  
 60 recommendation. Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must  
 61 provide a separate letter (minority report) indicating their recommendation and  
 62 supporting rationale. Members of the committee must not be identified to the  
 63 candidate; therefore, the signatures must appear on a separate page so that they can be  
 64 removed when the candidate is provided with his or her copy of the committee's  
 65 report(s).

66 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final  
 67 recommendation of the committee of the whole. In consultation with the Institute  
 68 Director, the Dean will augment the Institute promotion review committee with NTT  
 69 members from other units when the Institute does not have a sufficient number of  
 70 faculty to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at least one being  
 71 tenured and one being NTT faculty.

### 72 **III. LECTURER REVIEWS**

#### 73 **A. General Considerations**

74 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual  
 75 review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with  
 76 promotion to Senior Lecturer, 4) subsequent review with promotion to Principal Senior  
 77 Lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion  
 78 cumulative review (five-year structured review). In these reviews, the primary  
 79 considerations are contributions in instruction and service, with consideration given to

80 contributions in the area of professional development bearing on the candidate's  
81 knowledge as it relates to pedagogical practice. This document defines ratings that are  
82 used in all of the reviews listed above; however, the ratings in the body of the document  
83 are defined in the context of Institute expectations specific to candidates being  
84 considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Senior Lecturer.

## 85 **B. Scope of Evaluations**

### 86 **1. Evaluation of Teaching**

87 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria  
88 of the college's policy ([http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching\\_effectiveness.pdf](http://www2cas.gsu.edu/docs/as/teaching_effectiveness.pdf)).  
89 Evaluators will assess the teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core  
90 mission of engaging undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education  
91 requirements. Additionally, if lecturers have primarily been assigned an alternate set of  
92 teaching and administrative duties, then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to  
93 their assigned role in the Institute.

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

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

120 **b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that**  
121 **meaningfully improve existing courses:** Evaluations will consider the effective  
122 development and execution of new courses, significant involvement in the development  
123 of new teaching programs, and the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if  
124 these are part of the responsibilities of the faculty member. The design of courses with a  
125 travel component and the subsequent successful recruitment of students to study  
126 abroad or domestic field schools is another laudable potential achievement. The  
127 Institute values efforts to develop new courses and resources, particularly those that  
128 positively affect significant numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual  
129 students so as to result in significant achievements such as the presentation or  
130 publication of undergraduate and/or graduate research.

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

145 **d. Direction of students:** The Institute will assess the extent and quality of faculty  
146 efforts in the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as  
147 independent studies, honors theses, MA thesis committees, student research or  
148 creative work presented at GSURC, as well as individual student engagement in  
149 academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or communities. Such  
150 efforts might also include faculty time spent advising students, offering additional  
151 tutoring and mentoring of students who are at risk for underperforming in their  
152 Women's, Gender, and Sexuality classes and time spent offering additional guidance to  
153 students who are pursuing extracurricular research projects connected to their  
154 Women's, Gender, and Sexuality coursework. Faculty members' willingness to write  
155 letters of recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be  
156 viewed as evidence of significant effort in this category of instructional effectiveness.

157 **e. Development of new skills:** The Institute encourages faculty to continue to develop  
158 skills and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to improve  
159 teaching. Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for promotion  
160 might exhibit an ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty

161 who undergo formal training to gain new certifications and competencies may present  
 162 such achievements to the Institute as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of  
 163 current research in feminist and/or critical pedagogies. The Institute recognizes that  
 164 new skills need not involve technology; for example, the incorporation of more  
 165 interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical conversation and writing  
 166 might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as *excellent* in teaching (as defined  
 167 in the Appendix).

## 168 **2. Evaluation of Service**

169 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include strong  
 170 instructional service; contributions to the Institute, college, or university; professional  
 171 service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies depending on  
 172 the individual's core mission as defined by the Institute, but it is generally at the  
 173 Institute or college level. Contributions to service in the Institute for Women's, Gender,  
 174 and Sexuality Studies typically fall into the following categories: assigned service roles,  
 175 such as administrative roles or other service duties that are ongoing assignments;  
 176 instructional service, such as developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or  
 177 presenting seminars on teaching methodology, or supervising or mentoring faculty and  
 178 graduate teaching assistants; assistance to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing,  
 179 consulting about educational and teaching issues, and providing advice about or reviews  
 180 of manuscripts or grant applications; contributions to the Institute, college, and  
 181 university, such as student advisement and mentoring, advising of student groups,  
 182 memberships on Institute/college/university committees, and development of teaching  
 183 and service programs; professional service (if appropriate), such as memberships on  
 184 professional societies and advisory boards; community and public service (if  
 185 appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations, performances, short  
 186 courses, and assistance to government agencies.

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

193

## 194 **3. Additional Considerations**

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

### 197 **Professional Development Contributions:**

198 It is expected that lecturers will manifest in their classes a rich intellectual background  
 199 and a familiarity with current trends and methods in the discipline. Though not required  
 200 for promotion, one way of achieving such a proficiency is through a program of scholarly  
 201 or creative activities. Other ways include attending or participating in panels at

202 professional conferences, and remaining current on scholarship and readings in the  
203 field.

204 Since a lecturer's professional development is evaluated as a secondary element to the  
205 overall record in instruction and service, the scholarly or creative work included in  
206 candidates' dossiers should be clearly related to their fields of instruction. The specific  
207 forms of professional development that a lecturer may produce are identical to those  
208 described in the Institute promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure track faculty:  
209 publications, editorial work, book reviews, hypertext projects, lectures, involvement  
210 with academic conferences, awards and grants, and so forth. Scholarship focused on  
211 pedagogy and curriculum should be included in the Instruction section of the dossier  
212 rather than under a Professional Development section.

### 213 **Role within the Institute:**

214 Since needs of the Institute often change, the role of the Lecturer also may change. For  
215 example, if student enrollments shift, the college or Institute may need to offer more  
216 sections of a course, or fewer. The promotion review will include the role of the Lecturer  
217 within the context of the mission of the Institute and the ability of the Lecturer to fulfill  
218 the changing needs of the Institute.

## 219 **C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

227 For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, candidates must demonstrate a level of  
228 competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least *excellent*,  
229 according to the college manual. Additionally, candidates must provide a level of  
230 assigned service to the Institute, college, university, and/or to the professional and  
231 practice community that is evaluated as at least *very good*, which meets the university  
232 standard for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

#### 233 **a. Instruction**

234 To meet the standard in instruction for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with a  
235 rating of *excellent*, candidates' records show consistently high levels of achievement in  
236 the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. Their course  
237 materials illustrates a trajectory of accomplished teaching and demonstrates creative  
238 and reflective pedagogy. Normally, they earn scores on student evaluations that fall in  
239 the mid- 4-out-of-5 range or higher, or in the 4-out-of-5 range as appropriate to the  
240 course size and level. Additionally, they demonstrate a track record of developing new

241 courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate  
242 or graduate students.

243 **b. Service**

244 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with a  
245 rating of *very good*, successful candidates diligently and effectively fulfill their assigned  
246 roles. Rather than merely attending committee meetings or holding the requisite  
247 advisement sessions, they actively participate, contributing concretely to the work of  
248 the committees and to the overall goals and mission of the Institute.

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

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

262 **a. Instruction**

263 To meet the standard in instruction for promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer with a  
264 rating of *excellent*, candidates show consistently high levels of achievement in the five  
265 categories for assessing instruction detailed in Section III.B.1 above. Their course  
266 materials illustrate a long-term trajectory of accomplished teaching that demonstrates a  
267 creative and reflective pedagogy. Their student evaluations are consistently strong,  
268 normally earning scores that fall in the mid- to upper 4-out-of-5 range. They  
269 demonstrate a sustained track record of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or  
270 graduate students, as well as developing new courses or protocols for existing courses.  
271 In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching described above, the  
272 candidate's growth as an instructor should also extend into areas beyond those  
273 normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates  
274 might engage in one or more of the following activities: production of a publication  
275 suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of  
276 an article or other publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or  
277 external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student  
278 awards or other accomplishments of mentored students. Candidates whose record of



279 achievement does not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and  
 280 explain how their record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

## 281 **b. Service**

282 Candidates will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to Principal  
 283 Senior Lecturer with a rating of *excellent* if they have diligently and highly effectively  
 284 carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the  
 285 Institute over a sustained period. The *excellent* candidate at this level normally exhibits  
 286 a track record of providing assistance to Institute advising efforts or to graduate  
 287 teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors. In addition to continued  
 288 growth in the areas of service described above, the candidate's growth in service should  
 289 take one or more of the following forms: highly effective service as an Institute program  
 290 director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility; recognition as a campus leader;  
 291 significant service to the profession or community.

## 292 **D. Other Lecturer Reviews**

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

298

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

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

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

308 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's  
 309 effectiveness and progress toward promotion to Senior Lecturer. An Institute review  
 310 committee composed of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty  
 311 and principal senior lecturers or senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the  
 312 Lecturer's record. The committee is elected by the full faculty (core and affiliate) of the  
 313 Institute. The Institute Director will provide an independent assessment before  
 314 forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further evaluation of the record.  
 315 The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale used for promotion  
 316 reviews. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the

317 promotion review; it is meant to review the Lecturer's achievements to date and  
318 provide mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the  
319 fifth-year promotion review.

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

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

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

334

335 **A. Teaching**

336

337 **Poor:** Candidates judged to be poor in instruction display an unacceptable record of  
 338 teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, ineffective course materials, and  
 339 little to no student mentoring.

340

341 **Fair:** Candidates judged to be fair in instruction display a minimally acceptable record of  
 342 teaching as evidenced through student evaluations, ineffective pedagogical techniques,  
 343 and only occasional student mentoring.

344

345 **Good:** Candidates judged to be good in instruction manifest a teaching performance  
 346 that barely exceeds adequate, as evidenced through student evaluations, course  
 347 materials that fail to demonstrate competent pedagogical skill, and generally  
 348 satisfactory but limited effort as a mentor of students.

349

350 **Very Good:** Candidates judged to be very good in instruction are competent instructors  
 351 whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and  
 352 instruction but also of some mentoring of students, thoughtful and reflective pedagogy,  
 353 and a commitment to the instructional mission of the Institute. Class assignments are  
 354 creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting in  
 355 proficient student learning. While these candidates are effective instructors, their  
 356 teaching records may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of  
 357 individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of *excellent*, as described  
 358 below, and/or the candidate's student evaluations show inconsistencies or often fall  
 359 short of Institute expectations.

360

361 **Excellent (Required for Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** Candidates judged to be *excellent*  
 362 instructors show consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for  
 363 assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1. These candidates' course materials  
 364 illustrate a trajectory of accomplished teaching that demonstrates a creative and  
 365 reflective pedagogy that may include a substantial variety of activities related to  
 366 instruction. Normally, these candidates' student evaluation scores fall in the mid- 4-out-  
 367 of-5 range or higher. Additionally, they demonstrate a track record of developing new  
 368 courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate  
 369 or graduate students.

370

371 **Excellent (Required for Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated  
 372 expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching above, successful candidates for  
 373 promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer will demonstrate growth as an  
 374 instructor that also extends into areas beyond those normally associated with one's

375 teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more  
 376 of the following activities: production of a publication suitable for use in the kinds of  
 377 classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other publication on  
 378 pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical  
 379 initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of  
 380 mentored students.

381

382 **Outstanding (Promotion to Senior Lecturer):** Candidates judged to be outstanding in  
 383 instruction manifest an impact on students that is of the highest level. In excess of the  
 384 expectations for a rating of *excellent* in teaching appropriate to their rank, as described  
 385 above, *outstanding* instructors command a mastery of instruction in their area as  
 386 evidenced by at least one of the following: successful pursuit of external funding for  
 387 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other  
 388 accomplishments of mentored students.

389 **Outstanding (Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer):** In addition to the stated  
 390 expectations for a rating of *outstanding* in teaching above, candidates for promotion to  
 391 the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer will be evaluated as *outstanding* if they have  
 392 achieved more than one of the following: production of a publication suitable for use in  
 393 the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of an article or other  
 394 publication on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for  
 395 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or other  
 396 accomplishments of mentored students.

## 397 **B. Service**

398

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

401

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

404

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

407

408 **Very Good:** Candidates will be judged to be *very good* in service if they conscientiously  
 409 and effectively fulfill their assigned roles. Rather than merely attending committee  
 410 meetings or holding the requisite advisement sessions, such faculty actively participate  
 411 in a way that contributes concretely to the goals and mission of the Institute,  
 412 particularly in terms of the goal to achieve positive results for undergraduate and  
 413 graduate students.

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

424  
425 **Outstanding:** In excess of the stated expectations to achieve a rating of *excellent* in  
426 service, candidates will be judged to be *outstanding* in service if they have not only  
427 fulfilled their assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to  
428 contribute concretely to the goals and mission of the Institute. Faculty members judged  
429 to be *outstanding* in service will have been recognized by their peers, students, or  
430 university administrators as having established a long track record of success in  
431 improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways. Highly effective service as an  
432 Institute program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility, as well as  
433 extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also indications of  
434 outstanding service.