

**RTP STANDARDS**  
**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ART & ART HISTORY**  
**(2022-2023)**

**Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Standards**

The Department of Art & Art History will evaluate faculty performance based on the standards outlined in this document. These standards serve as a guide to candidates and evaluators regarding the inclusion of appropriate evidentiary materials in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). In accordance with the Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP), all evaluations and assessments of faculty performance in the RTP process will be entirely and exclusively based on documented evidence contained in the candidate's WPAF. The most current FPPP is available on the University's website - Faculty Affairs home page:

<https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/fppp.shtml>

Information on the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) can be found at:

<https://www.csuchico.edu/csueu/cba.shtml>

Each faculty member shall maintain a dossier concerning their teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service (other contributions to the University). For further information regarding the appropriate format of the WPAF, Dossier, and Support Material please consult the Department's Guidelines for Personnel Review Process, and follow the templates provided to prepare the dossier.

**Art & Art History Mission Statement:**

The Department of Art & Art History is dedicated to developing students' critical thinking, creativity, visual literacy, technical skills, and knowledge about the history of art. We provide high-quality instruction in Art Education, Art History, Studio Art, and Interior Architecture. In all areas, we endeavor to create an environment which supports professional artistic activities and research in traditional and new media and methodologies.

Our faculty are committed to fostering a sense of community that enables students to be simultaneously nurtured and challenged. The faculty take pride in being easily accessible, eager to explore ideas with students and to help them realize their creative concerns. As teachers, we pride ourselves on maintaining high standards that employ

both well-tested and innovative methods. We integrate the investigation of the visual with political, historical, and moral issues. [See [Mission Statement – Department of Art & Art History](#)].

## **Goals of Evaluation**

The Department seeks to foster excellence in teaching, professional development, and service work, and to support our colleagues as they pursue these goals. The process is designed to be pedagogic and developmental rather than punitive. It is our intention to provide the information, assistance, and encouragement necessary for candidates to be successful. Honest, clear, and direct critiques are frequently vital, and should be offered in a constructive manner. The Chair and RTP Committee will provide guidance throughout the RTP process, and, if requested, will assign a tenured faculty member to mentor the candidate.

## **Tenure-Track Evaluation Cycle**

Tenure-track hires are reviewed in an alternating series of “periodic evaluations” and “performance reviews.” As the [FPPP](#) (10.1.4-5) explains:

*Probationary* faculty are subject to two different types of evaluations. The first, called *periodic evaluation*, focuses on providing the *probationary* faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by all involved with the process. The second type of evaluation is called the *performance review*, wherein a critical assessment of the faculty member’s performance is conducted and the probability of a successful tenure/promotion decision is estimated. Formal *ratings* of performance in each area of review are used, and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member.

Normally, *periodic evaluations* are done in the faculty members’ first, third, and fifth years; *performance reviews* are conducted in the faculty members’ second, fourth, and sixth years. It is in this sixth year that the decision is normally made to offer tenure or to release the faculty member from employment.

In each performance review, candidates will be ranked in the three areas of evaluation (explained below). Ratings are “Exceeds expectations,” “Meets expectations,” and “Does not meet expectations.” Note that this change applies to all campus probationary and tenured faculty probationary evaluations. The [FPPP](#) (10.3.3) defines these three rankings as follows:

### **Exceeds expectations**

The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record unambiguously supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and achievement in the area being evaluated. Exceeds Expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.

### **Meets expectations**

The candidate has demonstrated competence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual and valued contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated. An evaluation of “Meets expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Meets Expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining).

### **Does not meet expectations**

The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to the department’s criteria in the area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and correction.

### **Period of review**

For all hires starting from academic year 2020-2021 forward, all levels of review are cumulative. All work from May 31 of the academic year preceding the faculty’s appointment should be included.

For hires who began prior to academic year 2020-2021, consult the RTP Committee Chair to ensure correct dates are used for “periodic evaluations” and “performance reviews.”

### **Areas of Evaluation**

There are three primary areas of evaluation considered in the review process for probationary and tenured faculty:

1. Instruction

## 2. Professional Growth and Achievement

### 3. Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community.

While effective teaching is the primary, essential, and minimum criterion for success at this University, the Department of Art & Art History recognizes that there are various ways for faculty to contribute to the University and to achieve professional success. Different types of accomplishments are valued; each candidate is not expected to excel in all areas in order to be retained, tenured, or promoted. To some extent, exceptional performance in one area of review may compensate for lesser contributions in other areas of review, as indicated in the [FPPP](#).

Full and part time temporary faculty should focus on Instruction. Documentation of Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community are *not required* of temporary faculty. However, they are welcome to submit documentation of these activities.

The Department supplies template documents to facilitate the dossier process.

### **Standards for Evaluating Instruction:**

#### **Reflective statement on your teaching philosophy**

The [FPPP](#) (8.1.3.e.3) requires:

A reflective statement on the candidate's teaching philosophy/strategies/objectives and how these have impacted the candidate's teaching, (i.e., how these are evidenced in the candidate's classes, assignments, and other learning experiences provided for students)

Teaching effectiveness is fundamental to the University's mission; it is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion for teaching faculty. Instruction may be defined as classroom and related instructional activities, which should include innovative, high quality, student-centered learning experiences and activities. This may incorporate inclusive pedagogy, and modern technologies, techniques, modalities, and materials. Data beyond the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs) that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance therefore must be provided. The narrative must describe self-reflection and growth as an instructor based on analyzing feedback and improving one's practice. The narrative should also describe instructional commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion by

providing examples of how consideration of diverse student needs has improved success in the classroom. (Limit to two pages).

**Examples of evidence of teaching effectiveness (to be documented in the Supplemental Materials folder):**

- Copies of course syllabi, examinations, readings, and other classroom handouts.
- Peer evaluations: classroom visitation and observation reports by members of the department faculty, as indicated in the [FPPP](#).
- Evidence of inclusive pedagogy, and other teaching methods proven to improve student success, such as substantial student interaction and involvement with instructors and each other.
- Evidence of innovative and/or experiential teaching and assignments (e.g. overseeing students curating exhibitions, producing public art projects, publishing journal issues, etc.).
- Demonstration of use of BlackboardLearn (Canvas as of Fall 2023) to provide syllabi, assignments, readings, grading criteria, grades, etc.
- Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs): this data will be carefully considered, but will not weigh excessively in overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness.
- Documentary Materials: signed letters, emails, or evaluations from students and colleagues, and other documentary materials relevant to the assessment of the candidate's teaching.
- Student Outcomes: samples of tests and student responses, paper assignments and samples of student papers, studio assignments and samples of student artwork, and evidence of outstanding student achievements.
- Participation in Faculty Development activities.

**Standards for Evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement: (Optional for temporary faculty)**

**Reflective statement on your professional growth and achievement**

The [FPPP](#) (8.1.3.e.3) requires:

A reflective statement on the candidate's professional development, describing what they do and why, how it has evolved and where it might be going in the next few years, and how it has impacted the candidate's teaching.

A primary purpose of professional activity among faculty is to enhance the quality of teaching by ensuring that content is substantial and current. Professional growth and achievements are essential considerations for retention, tenure, and promotion. For professional achievements in all areas, as relevant, we consider quality, quantity, location, venue, and media. We therefore ask that candidates provide *clearly annotated* details in their dossiers. Since members of the Department RTP Committee review colleagues from all four departmental areas (Art Education, Art History, Art Studio, and Interior Architecture), and a subsequent review is conducted by the College of Humanities and Fine Arts RTP Committee, it is essential that candidates explain to those outside of their fields the significance of their accomplishments (e.g. "the flagship journal in my field"; "a prestigious national gallery specializing in my medium"; "the annual award for innovation by the main national organization in my field"; etc.). The Department Chair and RTP Committee will provide advice on if the candidate is achieving an appropriate amount of quality, professional activities.

### **"Predatory" journals and vanity galleries**

Acceptance into "predatory" journals and vanity galleries are not considered quality achievements. There are now numerous "predatory" journals and publishers that solicit articles and book manuscripts from faculty. They frequently send emails offering a smooth path to publication. These can seem like very appealing offers to those who feel they need more publications on their CV, but they should be avoided. The journal *Nature* has published a [thorough article](#) on the subject, and defines these enterprises as follows:

Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices.

The clearest indicator that a venue is predatory is "Aggressive, indiscriminate solicitation":

Although legitimate journals might solicit submissions, predatory journals often use aggressive solicitation such as repeated e-mails. These might

be excessively flattering in tone, or might mention researchers' past publications while noting that related submissions are urgently needed for a forthcoming issue. A clear warning sign is that the invitee's expertise is outside the journal's scope.

### **Forthcoming work**

Note, as stated in the College of HFA Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion (A.4):

Claims made by candidates about specific achievements should be accurately identified [i.e., the claim of a candidate that a book or article or anthology entry or encyclopedia entry, etc. as "forthcoming" should be supported by appropriate documentation that the publisher has accepted the work (not "tentatively accepted" or "conditionally accepted")].

This recommendation is applicable to all levels and periods of review, not only Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion.

### **Extraordinary levels of service**

The Department acknowledges that faculty members from underserved groups are often asked to participate in a disproportionately high number of professional activities, such as individual mentoring of underserved students; advising of underserved and social justice-oriented student groups; recruitment and retention of underserved students and faculty; outreach and advocacy within underserved communities; and activism at various levels. We value this work highly, and realize that it also takes time and energy from typical professional growth and achievement activities (e.g., publications, exhibitions, grant writing). The department therefore will consider extraordinary levels of service to and with our underserved students and colleagues as a contribution to professional growth and achievement, if clearly described and documented.

The [FPPP](#) (10.3.3) enumerates the following criteria for each ranking within the category of Professional Growth and Achievement:

#### **Exceeds expectations**

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's significant, highly regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

### **Meets expectations**

The evidence demonstrates appreciable scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

### **Does not meet expectations**

The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

Each of the four areas in the Department (Art Education, Art History, Art Studio, and Interior Architecture) has somewhat different, discipline-specific criteria for Professional Growth and Achievement. The following are *typical* activities considered relevant to department faculty in each area.

**Examples of evidence of Professional Growth and Achievement (to be documented in the Supplemental Materials folder) include, but are not limited to:**

- Creative activity resulting in exhibitions of work, film screenings, and distributions, in significant galleries, museums, and festivals and selection into relevant collections. An annotated list must be provided; for example, activities that are peer reviewed, juried, or invitational, regional, national, or international must be clear.
- Publications in peer reviewed journals, books, and digital resources.
- Professional curatorial projects resulting in exhibitions in galleries, museums, and alternative art spaces.
- Essays and substantial entries in museum collections or exhibition catalogs.
- Service as editor of books, journals, and series.
- Receipt of awards, fellowships, prizes, grants, commissions, honors, and contracts in the candidate's professional area(s) of expertise.
- Service on committees and boards of professional societies and organizations.



- Presentation of papers at and other participation in seminars, conferences, professional meetings, and other activities that lead to growth in the candidate's area(s) of expertise.
- Published reviews and peer reviews for professional journals, magazines, and presses.
- Consultation of a professional nature relevant to the candidate's area of expertise.
- Extraordinary support of retention of underserved students, such as establishing and administering a new and effective program, outside of that expected as service work, and clearly distinguished from it in all documentation.
- Other items of specific professional activity (e.g. public lectures, serving as juror for competitive exhibitions, the tenure of significant and special appointments such as visiting professorship and lectureship).

**Standards for Evaluating Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community (Optional for temporary faculty)**

**Part 1: Service to Department, College, University, and Community**

The [FPPP](#) (8.1.3.e.4) requires:

Other materials that would help evaluators assess the candidate's performance and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College and University and to the Community should be included. When compiling these materials, the candidate should keep in mind that the reviewers will assess the quality as well as the quantity of activities; therefore, this section of the dossier should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments about such quality and quantity.

All candidates are required to participate in committee work and other activities necessary for the normal functioning of the Department and College. New tenure-track faculty should begin with lighter departmental work (e.g. Scholarship Committee; Honors Program Advisor), and build up to heavier departmental work starting in their third year (e.g. Curriculum Committee; Hiring Committees; BFA Coordinator/Advisor). The Department Chair and RTP Committee will provide advice on reasonable and appropriate service work.

To achieve tenure and promotion, College and/or University level committee work is also expected.

The Department has mandatory advising of all students in all majors, and every tenure-track and tenured faculty member is expected to participate actively by advising students in their areas. CSU Chico is a Hispanic-Serving Institution, with greater than 50% of our students First-Generation, Pell Grant eligible, and students of color. Service work that demonstrates evidence of contributions to such historically underserved populations will be given particular weight in the process of evaluation.

**In addition to the required service work noted above, typical activities (to be documented in the Supplemental Materials folder) include, but are not limited to:**

- Leadership/officer positions in campus affinity groups that facilitate faculty professional development and diverse student success (e.g. Black Faculty & Staff Association, Chican@/Latin@ Council, 1st Generation Faculty & Staff Association, LGBTQ+ Faculty and Staff Association, Asian & Pacific Islander Council)
- Participation and/or presentations in diversity, equity, and inclusion professional development venues (e.g. Faculty Learning Community on Inclusive Pedagogy, Diversity Academy and/or Certificate Program, Safe Zone Ally Training)
- Extraordinary time advising and/or mentoring students
- Contributions aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, HSI related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiative priorities, and Basic Needs Initiative priorities.
- National, state, and local organization committee work, leadership, and other significant participation.
- Professional contracts within and outside of the University.
- Advocacy work for the arts.
- Curriculum and program innovation and development, such as significant contributions to the Department curricular reviews, accreditation reviews, and development of new program options and degrees.

- Student advising support, such as BFA, MA, and MFA student committee assignments; advising of student organizations, clubs, and activities; advising students regarding career objectives; overseeing internships and other experiential programs.
- Representing the Department at campus-wide and department specific student recruitment and retention events.
- Participation in College or University student recruitment and retention efforts.
- Service to the Community, such as campus and community exhibitions of creative work, workshops, lectures and seminars, open to the general public and community on and off campus.

## **Part 2: Contributions to Strategic Plan**

The [FPPP](#) (8.1.3.e.4) notes that:

The candidate may add a statement that guides reviewers to the evidence in the dossier that relates to strategic plans and goals. Such activities or achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, civic engagement, and service to the North State.

While the areas of review listed above (**Part 1: Service to Department, College, University, and Community**) will address much of the candidate's performance relative to strategic plans and goals, the candidate should ensure that any additional evidence regarding performance towards the [Strategic Plan](#) is included and explicitly described as such.

### **University Goals and Strategic Priorities:**

- Equity, Diversity & Inclusion
- Civic & Global Engagement
- Resilient & Sustainable Systems

### **University Enduring Commitments:**

- Academic Distinction
- Transformative Student Experience

- Prominent Scholarship and Innovation
- Culture of Excellence and Accountability

The College of Humanities & Fine Arts has its own [Mission, Values & Strategic Plan](#) that can also be addressed in this section.

### **Department Standard for Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion**

The [FPPP](#) (10.5.3) states that:

To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) be rated “Exceeds expectations” as defined in 10.3.3 in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment.

College of HFA Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion allow for such “only in cases of exceptional merit, i.e., when in addition to meeting the criteria normally expected for promotion, the candidate has received professional recognition from off and/or on campus that is professionally meritorious beyond question.”

In line with these guidelines, the Department of Art & Art History determines that a faculty who achieves positive ratings (“Exceeds expectations” and “Meets expectations”) in all three categories (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Services) in each performance review, who is deemed to “Exceed expectations” in all three categories at the time of application for Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion, and who documents meritorious professional recognition shall be considered exceptional for the purposes of consideration for Early Tenure and/or Promotion. The candidate must clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at *and beyond* the University, as well as evidence of the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review

Note that the FPPP (10.5.3) states that a candidate for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion must have ‘worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment.’ For most tenure-track faculty, the third year is the first with ‘conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment’ because this is the year that new hire course releases typically end. This

means that candidates are generally eligible to apply for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion in their fourth year.

Candidates wishing to be considered for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion must supply to the Chair and Dean a letter of intent that includes a clear statement of how they have met the Department, College, and University criteria. It is highly recommended that faculty considering this option speak with the RTP Committee Chair, Department Chair, and Dean of HFA before submitting their letter of intent.

### **Department Standard for Promotion to Full Professor**

The [FPPP](#) (11.1.2) states that:

Promotion of Tenured Faculty will follow the provisions under 10.3, Evaluation of Probationary Faculty – Performance Review Process. In consideration of promotion, the period of review shall be the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank. Candidates for promotion to full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation. In addition, Candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement. (Emphasis added)

Promotion to Full Professor is based on the same standards outlined above, with the addition of "substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself," as outlined in the FPPP.

### **Right of Rebuttal**

Candidates are entitled to submit rebuttals to each level of review in each cycle, as established by the [FPPP](#) (10.2.8), which reads in part:

*At all levels of evaluation, in periodic evaluation or performance review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, a faculty member being evaluated shall be given a copy of the report(s) and recommendation(s), which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation(s). The faculty member shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request an opportunity to discuss the recommendation(s) from each level no later than ten calendar days following receipt of the recommendation(s).*

Additional resources can be found in the [Collective Bargaining Agreement \(10.12\)](#), which reads in part:

If an employee disagrees with the record of a performance evaluation which has been placed in their personnel file, the employee may submit a rebuttal statement which shall be attached to the performance evaluation. The evaluation shall be reconsidered by the Appropriate Administrator in light of the rebuttal statement and/or the Provision 10.11 meeting, and if the evaluation is amended, the amended evaluation shall replace the original evaluation and its rebuttal.



## Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

---

Process:

- a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to OAPL via email for review.
- c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to OAPL.
- e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, OAPL adds *Provost Approved Date* footer to the document and:
  - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,
  - b. Uploads document to OAPL Department Standards website, and
  - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to OAPL website location.

---

Chair/Director Approval: *Cameron Crawford* Date: May 24, 2023

Dean Review: *Tracy R. Butta* Date: May 25, 2023

OAPL Review: *Mahalley D. Allen* Date: May 25, 2023

Provost Approval:  Date: May 25, 2023



---

# MEMORANDUM

---

DATE: May 23, 2023  
TO: Cameron Crawford, Department Chair  
CC: Tracy Butts, Dean  
FROM: Mahalley Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel  
SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of Department RTP Standards

---

Thank you for submitting revised department RTP standards incorporating the [three new evaluation ratings](#) in each area of faculty performance.

Interim Provost Perez has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2023-2024 academic year. This approval is provisional, and your department needs to address and revise specific areas of your standards as noted in the document's comments and tracked changes. In addition, we have called out here critical items that must be addressed:

1. Provide concrete criteria for the ratings of “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” for all three evaluation categories for decisions about retention (preferably for years 2 and 4), tenure, promotion to associate, promotion to full, accelerated promotion to associate, and accelerated promotion to full.
2. Address additional comments in document.

Based on our review of recently reviewed department standards, we offer these general observations, which we highly recommend departments consider as they work on revising their provisionally approved standards.

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.
2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.



3. Departments need to develop clear definitions and criteria for the three evaluation ratings in each area of performance. Clearly defined expectations provide fair and necessary guidance for faculty undergoing review and encourage professional growth.
4. We encourage departments to consider differential expectations for faculty members as a function of time in rank. The criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in service, for example, may be different for retention of probationary faculty than for the granting of tenure. Similarly, the criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement may be different for promotion to associate professor than for promotion to full professor.

Please submit your revisions, with tracked changes, to our office no later than Friday, December 1, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and the Provost have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2024-2025 academic year. If revisions are not received by that date, your department standards will revert to the version posted prior to this submission.

Our office will route for signatures your provisionally approved department standards in Adobe Sign and will post them to the [Department Standards page](#). You may now provide these provisionally approved standards to faculty in your department.