

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Policy Title:	NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES
Department Approval:	08/19/2018
College Approval:	08/30/2018

PROMOTION REVIEW PROCEDURES

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This set of guidelines contains the procedures and standards that govern the recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty made by the Department of Philosophy. It is to be used in conjunction with the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (College Manual) and the Georgia State University Promotion Manual for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (University Manual). The policies, procedures, and standards of the College and University Manuals take precedence over and govern the material in this document.
2. In general, material found in the College and University manuals is not copied into these guidelines. Candidates should read these guidelines in conjunction with the College Manual.
3. The Department of Philosophy employs regular, full-time NTT faculty in the lecturer track. The ranks within the lecturer track include the following (listed from most junior to most senior): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer. The general duties for lecturer track faculty are described in the college manual.
4. This document must be reconsidered at least once every five years and will be reconsidered at any time if so requested by the Dean, the Chair of the Department, or by a majority of the departmental faculty. Any changes in policies or procedures will require a two-thirds vote of the members of the Department, and any changes in substantive standards will require a two-thirds majority vote of those faculty who are tenured, senior lecturers, or principal senior lecturers. All changes must also be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.
5. There are five types of structured reviews for faculty on the lecturer track: 1) annual review leading to re-appointment, 2) third-year review, 3) fifth-year review for promotion to senior lecturer, 4) subsequent review for promotion to principal senior lecturer (the timing for which is defined in the college manual), and 5) post-promotion cumulative review (five-year structured review).

II. PRE-EVALUATION PROCEDURES

6. The Departmental Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee is composed following the rules in the College Manual. The promotion committees of the Department of Philosophy do not employ subcommittees. Each promotion committee will elect its chair and the chair has full voting privileges.
7. No later than the date specified each year in the College NTT Promotion Review Calendar, the Department Chair will remind all those who are eligible that they may apply for promotion.
8. No later than the date specified each year in the College NTT Promotion Review Calendar, all who wish to apply must inform the Department Chair that they wish to be considered for promotion.
9. No later than the date specified each year in the College NTT Promotion Review Calendar, the candidate must submit a complete dossier to the Department Chair. The material must be precisely in the format required by the College Manual and this document.
10. Candidates should be aware that the format required by the College Manual is complex (and includes a detailed pagination system). The dossier includes two statements of interests and goals, one for teaching, and one for service. Candidates must allow sufficient time to write these statements and compose the dossier.
11. Candidates should include the student evaluation and numerical scores for all courses taught in the previous four years. These reports can be obtained from reports created for annual reviews.
12. In addition to the material required by the College, the Department of Philosophy requires that candidates submit a teaching portfolio that conforms to the Department's rules. The rules for this portfolio are the same as those for the annual review portfolios and candidates may be able to use substantial portions of their annual portfolio materials in the promotion and tenure dossier.
13. This portfolio must include:
 - the charts from annual review narratives that include all courses taught by semester for the last four years, enrollments for each section, AB% by section, DWF % by section, and score on Q17 of student evaluations for each section.
 - a list of all MA thesis students directed, MA thesis committee membership, honors theses directed, independent studies and directed readings during the period under review.
 - the syllabi for all courses taught in the last four years,
 - for each of these courses, the major assignments (papers and exams/tests), unless a course is taught multiple times with no significant changes.
14. At the candidate's discretion, the portfolio may include additional materials as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Such evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, peer evaluations, use of technology for teaching, student accomplishments, other course

materials providing evidence of teaching effectiveness, and materials from courses taught at previous institutions.

15. In this Manual, “all courses taught” refers to all those courses that, according to the College Manual, are included in the promotion dossier.

16. The most senior member of the Departmental Committee will organize the election of its chair and inform the Chair of the Department of the results of this election.

17. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will call a meeting(s) for the purpose of evaluating the candidate. Prior to the first meeting, the members of the Committee will familiarize themselves with these guidelines, the College Manual, and all of the candidate’s materials. The Department Chair may attend all meetings of the Committee and may answer questions about these guidelines, the College and University Manuals, and other Department, College, and University policies. Apart from this, the Department Chair attends as an observer and may not take part in the committee evaluation process in any way.

18. The Chair of the Committee will bring a complete copy of the candidate’s dossier to all the meeting(s). All members of the committee are expected to attend all committee meetings.

19. The Chair will begin the Committee’s first meeting by reminding all members of the Committee that the deliberations of the Committee are confidential. All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved. The candidate should receive no information about the deliberations apart from the letters sent forward to the Department Chair.

III. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

20. As stated in the college manual, candidates will be evaluated based on the evidence submitted as having met or not met the standards for promotion in teaching and service relative to the evaluative terms poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, and outstanding.

Overall Standards

21. For promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as at least *excellent*, according to the college and university manuals. Additionally, the candidate must provide service to the department, college, university and the profession or community that is evaluated as at least *very good*.

22. For promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained level of competence and effectiveness in teaching that is evaluated as *excellent*. Additionally, the candidate must provide service to the department, college, university and the profession or community that is evaluated as *excellent*. Successful candidates for promotion to principal senior lecturer will demonstrate continued growth in the time period since the last promotion. This growth might be in the area of teaching or service or both. It might be growth resulting in a higher ranking in one of these areas, but this need not necessarily be the case so long as the candidate has made improvements in discrete areas of their teaching or has mastered new skills or has made new contributions in teaching or service.

III.A. Evaluation of Teaching

Course Teaching

23. The evaluation of course teaching is based on four factors:

appropriate rigor,
quality of course content,
course organization, and
student perceptions.

24. The Committee will thoroughly discuss the candidate's performance relative to each of the four factors. Every member of the Committee will then announce her evaluation of the candidate. The evaluations are: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, and outstanding.

25. Student evaluations are used in the assessment of student perception. The material in student evaluations is also relevant to the evaluation of the other factors. For example, written student evaluations that consistently indicate that a candidate's courses are badly organized would be a relevant consideration in the evaluation of organization, while written student evaluations that consistently indicate that the challenging nature of the course material motivated students to work hard would be a relevant consideration in the evaluation of both rigor and quality of course content.

Rigor

26. Rigor: Do the candidate's courses require an appropriate amount of effort from the students? The Committee will review the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the rigor of the candidate's courses.

27. Guidelines for Rigor

The amount of reading required is one factor relevant to rigor.

The amount and nature of the various course assignments is one factor relevant to rigor.

It is possible for a course to be too rigorous. For example, a Phil 2010 course that required five five-page papers would be too rigorous.

A Phil 2010 course that had only multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank exams would show evidence of poor rigor.

A course with a variety of appropriately difficult assignments would show evidence of excellent rigor.

28. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to rigor.

Quality of Course Content

29. Quality of Course Content: Does the candidate assign appropriate, interesting, and high-quality materials in her courses? The Committee will review the materials in the candidate's

dossier and discuss the quality of the content of the candidate's courses. In this context, "content of a course" refers to the readings assigned and the materials in the teaching portfolio.

30. Guidelines for Quality of Course Content

A course that used *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* as its primary text would show evidence of poor quality of course content.

An introductory course that assigned only Heidegger's *Being and Time* would show evidence of poor quality of course content.

An introductory course that assigned only Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* would show evidence of poor quality of course content.

A course in which exam questions were not clearly written would show evidence of poor quality of course content.

A course with confusing power point slides would show evidence of poor quality of course content.

A course that used a collection of high-quality readings of interest to many students would show evidence of excellent course content.

31. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to quality of course content.

Course Organization

32. Course Organization: Both in their plan and in their execution, how well organized are the courses? The Committee will review the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the organization of the candidate's courses. In this context, "organization" refers both to the organization of the course as a whole and to the organization of individual class meetings. It is demonstrated by features such as syllabi that present materials in a coherent order, well-structured handouts, and assignments that proceed in a logical order.

33. Guidelines for Course Organization

A course whose organization would be unclear to most students or a course that was not organized at all would show evidence of poor course organization.

An introductory course with all assignments due in the last four weeks of the semester would show evidence of poor organization.

A course with a clear plan and assignments appropriately distributed throughout the term would show evidence of excellent course organization.

34. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to course organization.

Student Perception

35. Student Perception: How good are the numerical and written student evaluations? The Committee will review all the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the student perception of the candidate's courses.

36. First, the committee will consider the numerical scores for all courses taught during the prior four years.

37. Next, the committee will consider the written student evaluations, their content, and whether they are consistent with the numerical scores. Lack of written comments will not be held against the candidate.

38. Guidelines for Student Perception

A candidate whose numerical scores are typically 4.3 or better is likely to be ranked as excellent in student perception. A candidate whose scores are typically in the 4.0 - 4.29 range is likely to be ranked as very good in student perception. A candidate whose scores are typically in the 3.7 - 3.99 range is likely to be ranked as good in student perception.

The type and level of course, patterns of course enrollment, and grade distributions are among the factors relevant to the evaluation of student perception and of numerical scores and written comments. For example, a pattern of decreasing course enrollments might be evidence of poor student perception. For example, scores are typically expected to be higher in graduate seminars than undergraduate courses. For example, high scores in a course where every student receives an A might be discounted.

39. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to student perception.

Holistic Teaching Evaluation

40. The Committee will then discuss its holistic evaluation of the candidate's teaching. In addition to issues listed above, this discussion will cover at least the following issues: trajectory, conformity to teaching policies, variations among the types of courses taught, non-course teaching, and professional development contributions.

Trajectory

41. In considering trajectory, the Committee will review the candidate's Statement of Interests and Goals for Teaching. They will also consider the temporal patterns of changes in teaching.

Conformity to Policy

42. In holistically evaluating the teaching record, the Committee will take into account the conformity of the candidate's courses with University, College, and Departmental policies regarding teaching. These policies can be found in the Department's "Handbook for Instructors in the Department of Philosophy."

Variations of Course Type

43. In holistically evaluating the teaching record, the Committee will take into account variations among the types of courses taught. For example, teaching larger courses may require skills different from those needed to teach seminars, and teaching introductory logic may require skills different from those needed to teach other introductory courses.

Non-Course Teaching

44. Though not required for promotion, non-course teaching is a valuable contribution to the Department and, if the candidate has engaged in non-course teaching, that work is relevant to the holistic evaluation of teaching. Examples of non-course instruction include:

- Pedagogical and curricular innovation (e.g., designing new courses, or developing new teaching techniques)
- Textbooks, articles, or paper presentations related to teaching
- Direction of theses
- Membership on thesis committees
- Direction of independent study and directed reading courses
- Student presentations and publications for which the candidate was instrumental
- Student honors, awards, fellowships, grants, and acceptance in advanced programs for which the candidate was instrumental.

Professional Development Contributions

45. It is expected that lecturers will manifest in their classes a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in philosophy. Examples of ways to manifest a rich intellectual background and a familiarity with current trends and methods in philosophy include:

- Attending conferences and colloquia
- Refereeing for academic journals
- Giving presentations at conferences and colloquia
- Publishing articles

It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate how the scholarly work included in the dossier enhances his or her teaching.

46. After following the procedures above, each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate's teaching (as a whole) is poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding.

47. Guidelines and Paradigms for Holistic Evaluation

The "Handbook for Instructors in the Department of Philosophy" contains paradigms of syllabi that the Department judges to be excellent.

A candidate is not likely to be ranked as outstanding on a factor unless the candidate has earned a significant teaching award.

The more that a candidate's courses are out of conformity with University, College and Departmental policies, the less likely it is that the candidate will receive an affirmative recommendation.

A candidate ranked as very good on two of the four factors and excellent on the other two factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation.

A candidate ranked as good on one of the four factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation unless the candidate is outstanding in at least one of the other factors and excellent in all the remaining factors.

A candidate ranked as poor or fair on one of the four factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation even if the candidate is outstanding or excellent in all the others.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the teaching standards for promotion is someone who ranked as excellent on all four factors.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the teaching standards for promotion is someone who ranked as excellent on three factors and very good on one.

III. B. Evaluation of Service

Overall Standards

48. The evaluation of a candidate's service is based primarily on a consistent record of effective service to the Department, the College, and/or the University.

49. Candidates who have been efficient in meeting their assignments and who have also completed their assignments thoughtfully and effectively qualify for a rating of *very good* in service.

50. Candidates who have very efficiently and highly effectively carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period qualify for a rating of *excellent* in service.

Procedures

51. After reviewing the workload statements from the Department Chair (if any), the Chair of the Committee will announce whether the candidate has any teaching reductions for service. Candidates who have teaching reductions for service must do significantly more service than candidates with no such reductions. While it is not possible to measure such things with precision, the amount of service work done as a result of the teaching reduction should be equivalent to the amount of work required to teach a course.

52. The Committee will then discuss the quality of the candidate's service. This discussion will consider at least the following four factors:

organization,
effectiveness,
leadership, and
timeliness.

53. The Committee will discuss each factor in turn. At the end of the discussion of a factor, every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to that factor.

Holistic Service Evaluation

54. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the quality of the candidate's service. The evaluations are: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, and outstanding.

55. Guidelines and Paradigms for Holistic Evaluation of Service

Very Good in Service

To merit a ranking of very good in service, a candidate should, at a minimum, serve on departmental-level committees or fulfill other departmental service roles (e.g., organizing the colloquium series or advising the undergraduate philosophy club) each year.

A candidate ranked as poor or fair on one of the four service factors is not likely to receive a holistic ranking of very good even if the candidate is outstanding or excellent in all the others.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the standards for very good in service is someone who, due to a high teaching load, has not done a large quantity of service, but has provided very good quality of service in all assigned service roles.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the standards for very good in service is someone who has served on an average of two departmental committees per year and ranked as very good on all four factors.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the standards for very good in service is someone who has served on two departmental committees per year and ranked as excellent on one factor, very good on two factors, and good on the fourth factor.

Excellent in Service

To merit a ranking of excellent in service, a candidate should serve on at least two department, college, or university committees or fulfill other service roles (e.g., organizing the colloquium series or advising the undergraduate philosophy club) each year.

A candidate ranked as good on one of the four service factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation unless the candidate is outstanding in at least one of the other factors and excellent in all the remaining factors.

A candidate ranked as poor or fair on one of the four service factors is not likely to receive a holistic ranking of excellent even if the candidate is outstanding or excellent in all the others.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the standards for excellent in service is someone who, due to a high teaching load, has not done a large quantity of service, but has provided excellent quality of service in all assigned service roles.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the standards for excellent in service is someone who has served on two departmental committees per year and ranked as excellent on all four factors.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the standards for excellent in service is someone who has served on two departmental committees per year and ranked as excellent on three factors and very good on the fourth factor.

IV. PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

56. Each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate merits promotion to the rank that the candidate seeks. Each member's announcement must be consistent with the member's previous announcements and the College and University policies. For example, a member of the committee may not hold that a candidate's teaching is very good and then hold that a candidate merits promotion.

57. Members of the Committee may not abstain. They must announce a view as to whether the candidate merits promotion to the rank that the candidate seeks.

58. The Chair of the Committee will announce the count of the views of the members of the committee. The Chair will then announce the recommendation of the majority of the Committee. If the vote is tied (i.e., there is no majority), the Chair will announce this fact.

V. POST-EVALUATION PROCEDURES

59. If the Chair of the Committee is among the members of the majority of the committee, she will write a letter to the Department Chair expressing the majority's recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. If there is a minority, the members of the minority will elect a member of the minority to write a minority letter to the Department Chair.
60. If there is a majority but the Chair of the Committee is not among the majority, the members of the majority will elect a member of the majority to write the majority letter to the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee will write a minority letter to the Department Chair.
61. If the Committee vote is tied (i.e., there is no majority), the Chair of the Committee will write the letter for the group of which she is a member and the members of the other group will elect a member of their group to write a letter to the Department Chair.
62. Members of the Committee may write their own letters.
63. Every member of the Committee must sign precisely one letter.
64. When discussing teaching, the letters will not discuss the overall ranking of the candidate as poor, fair, good, or very good, excellent, or outstanding. They will merely indicate whether the candidate's teaching is excellent.
65. When discussing service, the letters will not discuss the overall ranking of the candidate as poor, fair, good, or very good, excellent, or outstanding. If the candidate seeks promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, they will merely indicate whether the candidate's service is very good. If the candidate seeks promotion to the rank of principal senior lecturer, they will merely indicate whether the candidate's service is excellent.
66. All letters will be given to the candidate at least three days before they are due to the Department Chair. At least two days before the letters are due to the Department Chair, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Committee is not obligated to make any changes.
67. The final versions of the letters of the Committee will be given to the Department Chair no later than the date specified each year in the College NTT Promotion Review Calendar. At the same time, copies will be given to the candidate.
68. The Department Chair will review the Committee's letter(s) and conduct an independent review of the candidate's qualifications in teaching and service. In conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria in this document. The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Non-Tenure Track Promotion Review Committee expressing her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation.
69. The Department Chair's letter will be given to the candidate at least three days before they are due to the Office of the Dean. At least two days before the letters are due to the Office of the

Dean, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Department Chair is not obligated to make any changes.

70. The Committee's letters, the Department Chair's letter, and the candidate's dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date specified each year in the College NTT Promotion Review Calendar. At that time, a copy of the Department Chair's letter will be given to the candidate.

71. The remainder of the promotion process is described in College and University manuals.

APPENDIX I. ANNUAL REVIEW

72. The departmental policies regarding annual review are to be used in conjunction with and are governed by the annual review policies of the College and the University.

73. By the deadline set by the College, every member of the Department (including visiting faculty) will submit to the Department Chair the following materials:

- a. A CV.
- b. An annual report in the format specified by the College.
- c. A 1-2 page narrative self-evaluation.

This narrative should be written in the third person and include at least a paragraph on teaching and a paragraph on service.

The information on teaching must include a chart that indicates

- a. the sections taught by the faculty member,
- b. the enrollment of those sections, and the number of students responding to question 17,
- c. the DWF and AB rates for those sections, and
- d. the average on question 17 for each section. Standard rules for rounding to the hundredths place will be employed. Cross-listed sections at the same degree level (e.g., a section cross-listed as Phil 4900 and Phil 4990) are treated as if they were one section. Sections cross-listed at different degree levels (e.g., a section cross-listed as Phil 4820 and Phil 6820) are treated as separate sections. When calculating combined scores for cross-listed sections at the same degree level, averages are weighted based on the number of students responding to question 17.

The paragraph(s) on service should include an overview of the faculty member's service activities.

Administrative contributions to professional associations (e.g., treasurer of a professional society) count in service. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations (e.g., memberships on editorial boards, memberships on conference program committees) count in the professional development.

Faculty members are encouraged to include in their narratives any information relevant to putting their teaching and service in context.

- d. A teaching portfolio. This portfolio must include, from the relevant academic year:
 - i. a list of all MA thesis students directed, MA thesis committee membership, honors theses directed, independent studies and directed readings.
 - ii. The syllabi for all sections taught.
 - iii. for each of these courses, the major assignments (papers and exams/tests), unless a course is taught multiple times with no significant changes. Other course materials can be included if they provide essential evidence of teaching effectiveness.

74. These materials will be reviewed by the Departmental Executive Committee. Each member of that committee will individually and confidentially provide the Department Chair with their ranking of each faculty member using the terms of evaluation specified in the College's Annual Review Policy (i.e., poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, outstanding).

75. When making recommendations regarding non-tenure track faculty, members of the Executive Committee will be guided by the Department's Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Guidelines.

76. A member of the Executive Committee will not evaluate herself.

77. Visiting Instructors are ranked only on teaching. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are ranked on teaching and service.

APPENDIX II. THIRD-YEAR REVIEW RATINGS GUIDELINES

78. The procedural rules regarding the pre-promotion review process are in the College Manual. This document covers the rating guidelines to be used in this process.

Teaching

79. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the four teaching factors specified above are mostly poor.

80. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the four teaching factors specified above are mostly fair.

81. Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will leave him/her significantly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above.

82. Very Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will leave him/her modestly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above.

83. Excellent: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified in above.

84. Outstanding: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will produce an exceptional teaching record, a teaching record of a kind rarely seen in junior faculty at any institution.

Service

85. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above are mostly poor.

86. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above are mostly fair.

87. Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines for good in service but below the guidelines for very good in service specified above.

88. Very Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines for very good in service specified above.

89. Excellent: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will put him/her significantly above the guidelines for very good in service specified above.

90. Outstanding: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion review, will produce an exceptional service record, a service record of a kind rarely seen in junior faculty at any institution.

APPENDIX III. POST-PROMOTION REVIEW RATINGS GUIDELINES

91. The procedural rules regarding the post-promotion review process are in the College Manual. This document covers the rating guidelines to be used in this process.

Teaching

92. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the four teaching factors specified above are mostly poor.

93. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the four teaching factors specified above are mostly fair.

94. Good: The faculty member is significantly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above.

95. Very Good: The faculty member is modestly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above.

96. Excellent: The faculty member meets the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above.

97. Outstanding: The faculty member has done exceptional teaching, teaching of a kind rarely seen in senior faculty at any institution.

Service

98. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above are mostly poor.

99. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above are mostly fair.

100. Good: The faculty member meets the guidelines for good in service specified above.

101. Very Good: The faculty member meets the guidelines for very good in service specified above.

102. Excellent: The faculty member meets the guidelines for excellent in service specified above.

103. Outstanding: The faculty member has done exceptional service, service of a kind rarely seen in senior faculty at any institution.