

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

Policy Title:	Department of African American Studies Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines
Version:	1
Department Approval:	11/13/2019
College Approval:	01/16/2020
Effective:	01/16/2020

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

13
 14 The Department of African-American Studies employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the
 15 lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior
 16 to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for
 17 lecturer track faculty are described in the college manual.

18 19 II. DEPARTMENT REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER AND PRINCIPAL 20 SENIOR LECTURER

21 22 A. Process Overview

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

- 25
 26 1. Following notification of eligibility from the Dean's Office, the candidate standing for
 27 promotion will submit the required review materials outlined in the college manual to
 28 the Department Chair. The Chair will review the materials for completeness and
 29 conformity to Department and College policies.
- 30
 31 2. The Department Chair forwards the candidate's materials to the Department review
 32 committee (or subcommittee for initial review, but the final recommendation must be
 33 made by the committee as a whole).
- 34
 35 3. The Department committee submits its recommendation, including any minority
 36 reports, to the Department Chair. The committee members will sign the report(s) on a
 37 separate page/pages. The Department Chair will provide a copy of the Department
 38 committee's report, including any minority reports, to the candidate with a notification
 39 that the candidate has the option to respond directly to the Department Chair within
 40 three business days.
- 41
 42 4. The Department Chair submits their independent recommendation and the
 43 recommendation of the Department committee, including any minority reports and any
 44 responses from the candidate, to the Dean's Office. The Department Chair will provide a

45 copy of their own report to the candidate with a notification that the candidate has the
 46 option to respond to the Dean's Office within three business days. The Dean's Office will
 47 provide to the Department Chair a copy of any response from the candidate to the
 48 Department Chair's report.

49

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

52

53 B. Composition of Department Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee

54 The Department's Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee consists of all tenured
 55 faculty and all NTT faculty of Senior rank and above in the Department (Senior Lecturer,
 56 Principal Senior Lecturer), except the Department Chair and any members of the Department
 57 serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion application at the college or
 58 university levels.

59

60 Departments may operate through a system of subcommittees that initially review and
 61 evaluate each candidate's credentials. All final recommendations must be made by the
 62 committee of the whole. The committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its
 63 final recommendation. The letter from the Department committee of the whole must be signed
 64 by the committee chair and all committee members who agree with the recommendation.
 65 Committee members who do not sign this recommendation must provide a separate letter
 66 (minority report) indicating their recommendation and supporting rationale. The signatures
 67 must appear on a separate page so that they can be removed when the candidate is provided
 68 with the copy of the committee's report(s).

69

70 Faculty of equal or lower rank to the candidate's current rank may not vote on the final
 71 recommendation of the committee of the whole. The Committee shall consist of any available
 72 NTT faculty members at a higher rank than the candidate, and all the tenured faculty in the
 73 department of African American Studies. In consultation with the Department Chair,
 74 the dean will augment the Department promotion review committee with NTT members from
 75 other departments when the home department does not have a sufficient number of faculty
 76 to constitute a committee of at least three members, with at least one being tenured and one
 77 being NTT faculty.

78

79

80 III. LECTURER REVIEWS

81

82 A. General Considerations

83 There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual review
 84 leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review with promotion to senior
 85 lecturer, 4) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review); and 5) review for
 86 promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer. In these reviews, the primary considerations are
 87 contributions in teaching and service, with consideration given to contributions in the area of
 88 professional development bearing on the candidate's knowledge as it relates to teaching

89 performance. This document defines ratings that are used in all of the reviews listed above;
90 however, the ratings in the body of the document are defined in the context of Department
91 expectations specific to candidates being considered for promotion to senior lecturer or
92 principal senior lecturer.

93

94 B. Scope of Evaluations

95

96 1. Evaluation of Teaching

97

98 As stated in the college manual, evaluation of teaching effectiveness will use the criteria of the
99 college's policy [https://cas.gsu.edu/document/teaching-effectiveness-assessment-
100 policy/?wpdmdl=9194&refresh=5e20da38a0ade1579211320](https://cas.gsu.edu/document/teaching-effectiveness-assessment-policy/?wpdmdl=9194&refresh=5e20da38a0ade1579211320) Evaluators will assess the
101 teaching effectiveness of lecturers as it relates to their core mission of engaging
102 undergraduate learning in survey classes fulfilling general education requirements. However, if
103 a lecturer has primarily been assigned an alternate set of teaching and administrative duties,
104 then their assessment will reflect criteria suitable to their assigned role in the Department.
105 As a general rule, evaluators will consider in their assessments of teaching effectiveness the
106 following criteria:

107

108 a. Quality of course content: The quality of course content will be evaluated through review of
109 syllabi, exam questions, essay or paper assignments, in-class exercises, readings, web pages,
110 creative projects, and other elements integrated into the learning environment created by the
111 candidate for promotion. Syllabi should be reviewed for conformity with university guidelines.
112 Reading assignments should be appropriate to course level and catalog description. Exam
113 questions should require students to engage material that is appropriate for the course level
114 and catalog description. Writing assignments should develop the students' ability to work with
115 primary and secondary sources in crafting coherent arguments that answer meaningful
116 questions. Course materials should also be assessed for their appropriateness in relation to the
117 current state of knowledge in the field. Lecturers may provide additional materials, such as
118 customized texts, handouts, software, and other course elements that reflect the faculty
119 member's efforts to foster student engagement and success. In particular, credit is given to
120 faculty whose courses are structured in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical
121 acumen in their students. Courses that connect students with other university programs and
122 resources and that take advantage of opportunities created by our campus location in Atlanta
123 will also be viewed as evidence of successful teaching. The Department also encourages faculty
124 to design courses with sufficient points of assessment to allow faculty to identify students who
125 are struggling and to provide those students with an opportunity to improve their performance
126 as the semester unfolds. The Department recognizes that teachers might use a variety of
127 methods.

128

129 Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding promotion expectations, however, demonstrate
130 a sustained interest in encouraging student interest in the material and designing materials that
131 foster the mastery of significant skills and concepts.

132

133 b. Development of new courses or development of new teaching resources that meaningfully
134 improve existing courses: Evaluations will consider the effective development and execution of
135 new courses, significant involvement in the development of new programs or initiatives, and
136 the use of new teaching techniques and practices, if these are part of the responsibilities of the
137 faculty member. The design of courses with a travel component and/or the subsequent
138 successful recruitment of students to study abroad is another laudable potential achievement.
139 Initiatives in the development of new courses and resources that potentially line up with
140 teaching ratings that meet or exceed promotion standards are ones that affect significant
141 numbers of students or sufficiently impact individual students so as to result in significant
142 achievements such as the presentation or publication of undergraduate and/or graduate
143 research.

144
145 c. Student evaluations: The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student
146 evaluation scores, and qualitative feedback consistent with the former and the new SEI
147 instruments. Student evaluation
148 scores and feedback, which the Department will not rely upon exclusively when determining
149 minimum
150 qualifications for ratings, will be considered in the context of the normal range of scores for
151 specific courses and for similar level courses (i.e., 1000, 2000, etc.) within the Department. The
152 review will also consider other important variables such as class size, whether the course is
153 required or an elective, the response rate on the evaluations, and number of students enrolled
154 in the course. In addition to average scores, the Department will also be attentive to mean and
155 median scores and to the impact of any outlying scores on averages. Qualitative evidence
156 offered by the students' written comments on the student evaluation forms will receive serious
157 attention from the Department as a meaningful supplement to the quantitative data from the
158 evaluation instruments. In light of these contextual elements, successful candidates for
159 promotion normally earn consistently strong evaluations and high scores, as defined below.

160
161 d. Direction of students: The Department will assess the extent and quality of faculty efforts in
162 the direction of student projects and academic activities at GSU, such as independent studies,
163 practica, honors theses, student research presented at GSURC, as well as individual student
164 engagement in academic projects or programs hosted by other institutions or communities.
165 Such efforts might also include faculty time spent offering additional tutoring and mentoring
166 of students who are at risk for underperforming in their classes and time spent
167 offering additional guidance to students who are pursuing additional research projects
168 connected to their coursework. Faculty members' willingness to write letters of
169 recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students might also be viewed as evidence
170 of significant effort in this category of teaching effectiveness.

171
172 e. Development of new skills: The Department encourages faculty to continue to develop skills
173 and to master new software, languages, and technology in order to improve teaching.
174 Candidates evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations for promotion might exhibit an
175 ongoing willingness to adopt new practices in the classroom. Faculty who undergo formal
176 training to gain new certifications and competencies may present such achievements to the

177 Department as evidence of their commitment to stay abreast of best practices in pedagogy. The
 178 Department recognizes that new skills need not involve technology; for example, the
 179 incorporation of more interactive classroom exercises geared toward fostering critical
 180 conversation and writing might contribute to a faculty member's assessment as excellent in
 181 teaching.

182

183 2. Evaluation of Service

184 As stated in the college manual, contributions in the area of service include high-quality
 185 instructional service; contributions to the department, college, or university; professional
 186 service; and community and public service. Service for lecturers varies depending on the
 187 individual's core mission as defined by the Department, but it is generally at the Department or
 188 college level. Contributions to service in the Department of African-American Studies typically
 189 fall into the following categories: assigned service roles, such as administrative roles or other
 190 service duties that are ongoing assignments; teaching service beyond the classroom (i.e.,
 191 instructional service), such as developing teaching materials and curricula, organizing or
 192 presenting seminars on teaching methodology, and supervising or mentoring faculty; assistance
 193 to colleagues, such as guest-lecturing, consulting about educational and teaching issues, and
 194 providing advice about or reviews of manuscripts or grant applications; contributions to the
 195 Department, college, and university, such as program development (i.e., developing
 196 instructional collaborations with other units), memberships on department/college/university
 197 committees, and development of teaching and service programs; professional service (if
 198 appropriate), such as memberships on professional societies and advisory boards; community
 199 and public service (if appropriate), such as giving lectures, speeches, presentations,
 200 performances, short courses, and assistance to government agencies as well as written
 201 contributions to public service (editorials, interviews, white papers, magazine or newsletter
 202 articles, and any other dissemination of academic research to the general populace).

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

209

210 3. Additional Considerations

211 Other factors and contributions that may be considered, but are not required as part of the
 212 lecturer review, include the following:

213

214 a. Professional Development Contributions: The Department shall consider professional
 215 development activities (e.g., publications of their research and scholarship, conference
 216 presentations, research grants applied for and/or funded, collaborations) as they bear on the
 217 lecturer's knowledge as it relates to teaching performance. While the production of peer-
 218 reviewed publications is not central to the assigned duties of lecturers, the Department
 219 certainly encourages lecturers to maintain profiles as active scholars. Peer-reviewed
 220 publications, book chapters, facilitation of workshops, publications or appearances in popular

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

226

227 Scholarship focused on pedagogy and curriculum will be considered as contributions to
228 Teaching.

229

230 b. Role within the Department: Since needs of the Department often change, the role of the
231 lecturers also may change. For example, if student enrollments shift, the college or Department
232 may need to offer more sections of a course, or fewer. The review will include the role of the
233 lecturer within the context of the mission of the Department and the ability of the lecturer to
234 fulfill effectively changing needs of the Department.

235

236 C. Criteria for Promotion

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

243

244 1. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

245 For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of
246 competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least excellent, according to
247 the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned service to the
248 Department, college, university, and/or to the professional and practice community that is
249 evaluated as at least very good, which meets the university standard for promotion to senior
250 lecturer.

251

252 a. Teaching

253 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of
254 excellent, the candidate's record shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five
255 categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. The candidate's course
256 materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve
257 their pedagogy. The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student evaluation
258 scores and qualitative feedback consistent with the former and new SEI instruments.
259 Additionally, the candidate generally demonstrates a track record of developing new courses or
260 protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate
261 students (e.g., directed readings, independent study courses, facilitating student presentations,
262 supporting applications to graduate programs, sharing professional knowledge with teachers in
263 training, and/or writing letters of recommendation).

264

265 b. Service

266 To meet the standard in service for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer with a rating of
267 very good, the successful candidate has been very diligent in meeting their assignments.

268 The candidate consistently attends required committee meetings, performs all assigned
269 tasks thoroughly and in a timely manner, and completes assignments thoughtfully and
270 effectively.

271

272 2. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Senior Lecturer

273 For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a
274 sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as excellent,
275 according to the college manual. Additionally, the candidate must provide a level of assigned
276 service, in terms of quality and quantity, to the department, college, university, and/or to the
277 professional and practice community that is evaluated as excellent, and that meets the
278 university standard for promotion to principal senior lecturer. Successful candidates for
279 promotion to principal senior lecturer will

280 demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. This must include
281 growth in the area of teaching and may also include growth in the area of service. This
282 growth may or may not result in a higher ranking in one or both of these areas as long as the
283 candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new
284 skills or has made substantial new contributions.

285

286 a. Teaching

287 To meet the standard in teaching for promotion to principal senior lecturer with a rating of
288 excellent, the candidate shows consistently high levels of achievement in the five categories for
289 assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1 above. The candidate's course materials illustrate a
290 long-term trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve their
291 pedagogy. The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student evaluation scores
292 and qualitative feedback consistent with the former

293 and new SEI Instruments. The candidate demonstrates a sustained track record of successfully
294 mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, as well as developing new courses or
295 protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth in the areas of teaching
296 described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher generally will extend into areas beyond
297 those normally associated with one's teaching responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates
298 might engage in one or more of the following activities: production of publication(s) suitable for
299 use in the kinds of classes that the faculty member teaches; production of articles or other
300 publications on pedagogy; successful pursuit of internal and/or external funding for
301 pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; invitations to conduct teacher training
302 workshops at other institutions or regional/national/international conferences; technological
303 pedagogical innovations; and/or student awards or other accomplishments of mentored
304 students. Evidence of ongoing investment in their own pedagogy (i.e. workshop attendance and
305 teaching certificates) is also an indication of excellence in teaching. Candidates whose record of
306 achievement does not self-evidently conform to this standard should document and explain
307 how their record corresponds to a similar level of significance and achievement.

308

309 b. Service

310 The candidate will be judged as meeting the standard in service for promotion to principal
 311 senior lecturer with a rating of excellent if they have diligently and highly effectively carried
 312 out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the Department
 313 over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level frequently volunteers for service
 314 opportunities and exhibits a track record of providing assistance to Department advising efforts
 315 or to graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors (e.g., through
 316 teaching consultation, guest lecturing). In addition to continued growth in the areas of service
 317 described above, the candidate's growth should take one or more of the following forms: highly
 318 effective service as a Department program director or in a role with a similar level of
 319 responsibility; recognition as a leader on campus or beyond; significant service to the
 320 profession or community.

321

322 D. Other Lecturer Reviews

323

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

329

330 1. Annual Review of Lecturers

331 Along with tenure track and other non-tenure track faculty, all lecturer track faculty are
 332 evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based on the materials supplied by the
 333 faculty member, including their updated CV, annual report covering the prior calendar year,
 334 teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate materials. In consultation with the Department
 335 executive committee, the Department Chair will evaluate the lecturer track faculty member's
 336 teaching and service using the criteria described in the Appendix.

337

338 2. Third-Year Review of Lecturers

339 The third-year review for lecturers is designed to assess the faculty member's effectiveness
 340 and progress toward promotion to senior lecturer. A Department review committee composed
 341 of at least three faculty, which will include both tenured faculty and principal senior lecturers or
 342 senior lecturers, will prepare an evaluation of the lecturer's record. The committee is elected
 343 by the Department NTT review committee of the whole. The Department Chair will provide an
 344 independent assessment before forwarding both evaluations to the Dean's Office for further
 345 evaluation of the record. The third-year review will employ the terms of the six-point scale
 346 used for promotion reviews. However, the spirit of the third-year review is different from that
 347 of the fifth-year review; it is meant to review the lecturer's achievements to date and provide
 348 mentoring regarding possible deficiencies that should be addressed before the fifth-year
 349 review.

350

351 3. Post-Promotion Review of Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers

352 The post-promotion five-year cumulative review is designed to ensure that senior lecturers and

353 principal senior lecturers remain effective and current in their pedagogy and accomplished in
 354 their service profiles. The review will cover the faculty member's teaching and service records
 355 over the last five years and will be based on the criteria listed in the Appendix. Faculty under
 356 review will present their dossiers (as described in the college manual) for evaluation by an
 357 elected committee of at least three faculty who are either tenured or at the rank of principal
 358 senior lecturer (with representation from each when the Department has an available principal
 359 senior lecturer within its ranks). The committee is elected by the Department NTT review
 360 committee of the whole. The Department Chair will provide an independent assessment and
 361 will then pass on both evaluations to the Dean's Office for response.

362

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

365

366 A. Teaching

367

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

370

371 Fair: The candidate displays a minimally acceptable record of classroom-based teaching based
 372 on the markers of effectiveness described in this document, minimal involvement and
 373 effectiveness in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective
 374 pedagogical techniques and minimally adequate effort as an instructor that results in the
 375 deficient transmission of the course content to students.

376

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

380

381 Very Good: The candidate is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence
 382 not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students,
 383 effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the instructional mission of the Department. Class
 384 assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate, resulting
 385 in proficient student learning. While the candidate is an effective teacher, their teaching
 386 record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student
 387 work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the
 388 candidate's student evaluations show inconsistencies or regularly fall short of Department
 389 expectations.

390

391 Excellent (*Promotion to Senior Lecturer*): The excellent teacher shows consistently high levels of
 392 achievement in the five categories for assessing teaching detailed in Section III.B.1. Their
 393 course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to
 394 improve their pedagogy. The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student
 395 evaluation scores and qualitative feedback consistent with the former and new SEI Instruments.
 396 Additionally, they demonstrate a track record of developing new courses or protocols for

397 existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

398

399 Excellent (*Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer*): In addition to the stated expectations for a
 400 rating of excellent in teaching above, the successful candidate for promotion to the rank of
 401 principal senior lecturer will generally have a record of consistently positive student
 402 evaluations. The review of a candidate's materials will include overall student evaluation scores
 403 and qualitative feedback consistent with the former and new SEI Instruments. The candidate
 404 will have demonstrated successful mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students and
 405 development of new courses or protocols for existing courses. In addition to continued growth
 406 in the areas of teaching described above, the candidate's growth as a teacher generally will
 407 extend into areas beyond those normally associated with one's assigned teaching
 408 responsibilities at GSU. For example, candidates might engage in one or more of the following
 409 activities: production of publications suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the faculty
 410 member teaches; production of articles or other publications on pedagogy; invitations to
 411 conduct teacher training workshops at other institutions or regional/national/international
 412 conferences, technological pedagogical innovations, successful pursuit of internal and/or
 413 external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching awards/recognitions; student awards or
 414 other accomplishments of mentored students.

415

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

422

423 Outstanding (*Promotion to Principal Senior Lecturer*): In addition to the stated expectations
 424 for a rating of outstanding in teaching above, the candidate for promotion to the rank of
 425 principal senior lecturer will be evaluated as outstanding if they have achieved more than
 426 one of the following: production of publications suitable for use in the kinds of classes that the
 427 faculty member teaches; production of articles or other publications on pedagogy; successful
 428 pursuit of internal and/or external funding for pedagogical initiatives; teaching
 429 awards/recognitions; student awards or other accomplishments of mentored students.

430

431 B. Service

432

433 Poor: Candidates judged to be poor in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations and are
 434 not responsible citizens of the Department.

435

436 Fair: Candidates judged to be fair in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service obligations or
 437 are not responsible citizens of the Department.

438

439 Good: Candidates judged to be good in service do not always effectively fulfill assigned service
 440 obligations or are not consistently responsible citizens of the Department.

441

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

446

447 Excellent: The candidate will be judged to be excellent in service if they have been diligent and
448 highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the
449 mission of the Department over a sustained period. The excellent candidate at this level
450 normally exhibits a track record of providing assistance to Department advising efforts or to
451 graduate teaching assistants and/or other non-tenure track instructors (e.g., through teaching
452 consultation, guest lecturing). In addition to continued growth in the areas of service described
453 above, the candidate's growth in service generally will take one or more of the following forms:
454 highly effective service as a Department program director or in a role with a similar level of
455 responsibility; recognition as a campus leader; significant service to the profession or
456 community.

457

458 Outstanding: In excess of the stated expectations to achieve a rating of excellent in service, the
459 candidate will be judged to be outstanding in service if they have not only fulfilled their
460 assigned responsibilities but also taken considerable personal initiative to seek out best
461 practices and new opportunities for maximizing the success of the Department in meeting its
462 stated goals. Faculty members judged to be outstanding in service will have been recognized by
463 their peers, students, or university administrators as having established a long track record of
464 success in improving campus life in measurable or noticeable ways. Highly effective service as a
465 Department program director or in a role with a similar level of responsibility, as well as
466 extraordinary service to the profession or community, are also indications of outstanding
467 service.