

# College of Business

## Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

The Faculty of the College of Business, hereby recommend this College-wide process for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion. FPPP 4.0.2.c allows guidelines and procedures to be established at the College level. As a college of business, we are governed by one single standard for accreditation, and therefore we find it appropriate for departments to follow the same process for retention, tenure, and promotion. Nevertheless, the FPPP specifies that “Department procedures, constitutions, and by-laws govern the way departments preserve subject matter expertise and manage Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP).” Standards for evaluation continue to be part of the Department standards and by-laws and remain under control of department faculty, with approval by the Dean and Provost in accordance with the FPPP.

### **Preamble**

The faculty of the College of Business (COB) supports our vision and mission by seeking to achieve excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. We are a place devoted to the academy’s most fundamental tenets: reason, respect, civility, and community. This Policy on retention, tenure, and promotion, is designed to assist in achieving these goals by providing faculty with guidelines for performance assessment that reflect the unique nature and distinctive mission of the University and the COB.

The faculty of the COB believe that we are part of an honored worldwide profession. Our University tenure and promotion processes and values should reflect this global context and reach beyond a local and statewide focus. As academics, we have had the opportunity to pursue advanced degrees in our disciplines for which we are both grateful and humbled. Society has invested in us and subsidized our educations so that we can think deeply and innovatively, so we can push society towards greater humanity, so we can challenge the boundaries that limit our world, and so we can professionally disseminate these insights to our students, our disciplines, and each other.

The sections below contain descriptions of the activities performed by individuals who are tenured and/or promoted by demonstrating *Meets Expectations* or *Exceeds Expectations* performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. While these descriptions are an attempt to characterize a faculty member who would receive tenure or promotion, it should be understood that these activities are not equally valued. In the COB, research-active faculty normally devote 60% of their time to teaching and 40% of their time to research and service activities. **In this regard, it is incumbent upon the department personnel committee, the college personnel committee, the department chair, and the dean to trade-off the many factors involved in each tenure case in making their recommendations.**

45 **Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

46

Area	Retention*	Tenure	Accelerated Tenure‡	Promotion to Associate Professor	Promotion to Full Prof. †	Accelerated Promotion to Assoc. or Full Prof. §
Instruction	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Professional Growth and Achievement	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

47

48

49 \* **Retention** requires candidate ratings of “Meets Expectations” in all areas, except the  
 50 Performance Review of Probationary Faculty Retention 1-2 Years, where two of the three areas  
 51 require a “Meets Expectations” rating.

52

53 †**Promotion to Professor** requires substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the  
 54 University itself (see FPPP 11.1.2). The rank of Professor designates the faculty member as  
 55 having achieved recognition as an outstanding member of the academic community and of his or  
 56 her professional discipline based on sustained productive performance in teaching, scholarship,  
 57 and service. A professor is a faculty member who has been recognized by his or her peers within  
 58 the University as well as regionally, nationally or internationally for the quality of these  
 59 contributions to his or her discipline. Examples include but are not limited to:

- 60 - Being appointed to the editorial board of a reputable journal
- 61 - Being invited to be an editor, co-editor, or contributor to a special issue of a reputable  
62 journal
- 63 - Being invited to be an editor, co-editor or contributor to a book addressing academic or  
64 professional issues related to your field
- 65 - Consistently presenting papers at regional, national or international conferences
- 66 - Conducting workshops, moderating a session, being on the organizing committee or  
67 performing other official duties at regional, national or international conferences
- 68 - Being personally invited to be part of a panel at a regional, national or international  
69 conference (workshop organizer, conference speaker, etc.) due to recognized expertise in  
70 the field
- 71 - Consistent service as a reviewer for manuscripts submitted for publication at reputable  
72 regional, national or international journals
- 73 - Being invited to serve the local or regional community (or beyond) due to recognized  
74 expertise in the field

75

76 ‡ **To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion**, the candidate must: (1) have been rated  
 77 “Exceeds Expectations” in a Performance Review as defined in FPPP 10.3.3 in all three  
 78 categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions

79 to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of  
80 performance will continue and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the  
81 conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment. See FPPP 10.5.3

82  
83 **§ To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor**, the candidate must: (1) be ranked  
84 “Exceeds Expectations” in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth  
85 and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate  
86 the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and (3) clearly demonstrate  
87 substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. Inasmuch as  
88 consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a  
89 recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an  
90 exceptional record at each level of review. See FPPP 11.1.3

## 91 92 93 94 **General Ratings and Definitions for Retention, Tenure, and** 95 **Promotion**

96  
97 **Ratings:** The outcome of the process by which candidates for promotion are graded at all levels  
98 of evaluation in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service  
99 that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University,  
100 and to the Community. Recognized ratings are “Exceeds expectations,” “Meets expectations,”  
101 and “Does not meet expectations.” A tenure-track faculty member rated as “Does not meet  
102 expectations” in any one of the three areas may be recommended for retention at the two-year  
103 Performance Review but will not be recommended for retention beyond year two, or for tenure  
104 or promotion.

105  
106 **Definitions:** In each written performance review report, the reviews of Instruction, Professional  
107 Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community will each  
108 conclude with a summary rating. These evaluations are defined in the remainder of this section  
109 and supersede discipline-specific nomenclature as outlined in the Unit’s department standards.  
110 Here, expectations are defined as (see FPPP 10.3.3):

### 111 112 **Exceeds Expectations**

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

### 119 120 **Meets Expectations**

121 The candidate has demonstrated competence in the specific area of evaluation. The  
122 evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual,  
123 and valued contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated. An

124 evaluation of “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall  
125 achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Meets  
126 expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of  
127 evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due  
128 course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining).  
129

### 130 **Does Not Meet Expectations**

131 The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the specific  
132 area of evaluation. The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is  
133 making the minimum contributions with regard to the department’s criteria in the area  
134 being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and  
135 correction.  
136  
137  
138  
139

## 140 **Ratings & Standards Applied to Instruction**

141  
142 Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention,  
143 tenure, or promotion of faculty. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, student feedback on  
144 teaching data (SFOTs) shall be used but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of  
145 instructional effectiveness, and shall not be used when determining a candidate’s knowledge of  
146 his/her field (FPPP 10.2.5.a). Therefore, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide  
147 data in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance. Evidence  
148 should speak to the candidate’s: (1) currency of knowledge of the field(s) in which the faculty  
149 member instructs; (2) organization and level of development of course materials; and (3)  
150 effective communication.  
151

152 Candidates must include evidence of teaching effectiveness in the dossier which may include but  
153 is not limited to the following:

- 154 • Student and peer evaluations of teaching
- 155 • A clear listing of all courses taught during the review period.
- 156 • Copies of most recent course syllabi for all courses taught during the review period.
- 157 • A summary and interpretation of SFOT data over the duration of the review period.
- 158 • Examples of current or relevant classroom materials such as presentation slides, lecture  
159 notes, or other course materials.
- 160 • Examples of course assessments including but not limited to examinations, quizzes,  
161 business case studies, assignments, papers, handouts and grading rubrics.
- 162 • Evidence of pedagogical innovations and/or use of instructional technologies.
- 163 • Evidence of Professional Growth and Achievements activities making impact in teaching
- 164 • Attendance at pedagogical conferences or workshops leading to improvements or  
165 innovations in pedagogy.
- 166 • Evidence of the candidate's role in course, curriculum, and program development.
- 167 • Letters from students or colleagues.

- 168
- Listing of teaching-related awards and/or recognitions.
  - As Equity, Diversity & Inclusion is one of the University Strategic Priorities, the implementation of inclusive teaching practices and the creation of equitable learning environments may be used by a candidate as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence may include: efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps in the candidate’s courses, the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning, the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors, the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, the creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment, and/or the completion of training and professional development opportunities that center around equity, diversity, and inclusion.
- 179

180 **Exceeds Expectations**

181 The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in instruction and the record unambiguously  
182 supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and  
183 achievement in instruction. The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s model professionalism  
184 and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed  
185 above, the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. Candidates  
186 that exceed expectations will have **positive curricular impact within and beyond** their  
187 classroom through innovation, creativity, and/or pedagogical scholarship.

188

189 Standards include, but are not limited to:

- Demonstrating superior (positive curricular impact within and beyond their classroom) teaching performance as evidenced by peer review.
  - Demonstrating superior (positive curricular impact within and beyond their classroom) teaching performance as evidenced by student feedback.
  - Demonstrating superior (positive curricular impact within and beyond their classroom) teaching across a variety of environments, courses, and student abilities.
  - Developing curricula through designing new courses and teaching state-of-the-art content.
  - Developing and disseminating innovative and creative instructional methods.
  - Mentoring other faculty members on teaching.
  - Receiving teaching-related awards and/or recognitions.
- 200

201 **Meets Expectations**

202 The candidate has demonstrated competence in instruction. The evidentiary record generally  
203 supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, and valued contribution to the  
204 academic community in instruction. The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s professionalism  
205 and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed  
206 above, the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. An  
207 evaluation of “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement  
208 consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. An evaluation of “Meet Expectations”  
209 corresponds to candidates having **positive curricular impact within their classroom** through  
210 innovation, creativity, and/or pedagogical scholarship.

Approved 4-30-23

211  
212 “Meeting Expectations” for **Promotion to Professor** requires substantial professional  
213 recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (see FPPP 11.1.2). See Standards (page 2) for  
214 further explanation.

215  
216 Standards include, but are not limited to:

- 217 • Demonstrating competent and effective teaching performance (positive curricular impact  
218 within their classroom) as evidenced by peer review.
- 219 • Demonstrating competent and effective teaching performance (positive curricular impact  
220 within their classroom) as evidenced by student feedback on teaching.
- 221 • Demonstrating competent and effective teaching (positive curricular impact within their  
222 classroom) across a variety of environments, courses, and student abilities.
- 223 • Adopting methodologies for teaching critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
- 224 • Adopting innovative and creative instructional methods.
- 225 • Contributing to curricula by teaching state-of-the-art content.
- 226 • Demonstrating assimilation of current and challenging content in the classroom.

227  
228 **Does Not Meet Expectations**

229 The evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence  
230 as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, in the  
231 Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA (i.e., the evidence  
232 demonstrates less than satisfactory levels of performance). The evidentiary record does not  
233 demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to the  
234 department’s criteria in the area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require  
235 immediate attention and correction.

236  
237  
238  
239

240 **Ratings & Standards Applied to Professional Growth and**  
241 **Achievement**

242  
243 College of Business faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship and creative  
244 professional activities for purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion. In evaluating  
245 professional growth and achievement, all forms of scholarship—basic or discovery scholarship,  
246 applied or integration/application scholarship, and teaching and learning scholarship—will be  
247 considered. Faculty members must provide evidence of active and on-going scholarly inquiry  
248 and a record of intellectual contributions and other academic engagement activities, with an  
249 emphasis on both the number of contributions as well as on the quality of the contributions over  
250 the duration of the review period. In line with AACSB Standard 8, intellectual contributions are  
251 original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business. Further,  
252 intellectual contributions may have the potential to address issues of importance to broader  
253 society. The contributions are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted  
254 academic research principles and are disseminated to appropriate audiences.

Approved 4-30-23

255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296

The COB values cross-disciplinary research relevant to contemporary business scholarship. In these circumstances, a candidate’s scholarly work may be published in a journal from a discipline other than his/her primary discipline. In this case, credit should be given as long as the standards for publication in that journal are comparable to the standards for journals in the candidate’s primary discipline. This determination, as well as a rating for the journal article should be made according to the procedures in Appendix 5 of the COB Policy Manual for departments to add acceptable outlets to their journal list.

All published scholarship listed must be presented in a bibliographical format that clearly identifies the order of authorship as it appears or will appear in the published work. The judgment of the candidate's overall scholarship record should be based not only on the quantity of publications, but also on the quality of those publications and the consistency of their performance over time, with due consideration that publication schedules are beyond the control of the candidate.

Standard evidence that could be used to establish performance may include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Peer-reviewed articles published (or accepted) in journals recognized as reputable and of high quality (i.e., journals in the ABDC list plus Department-approved journals based on College of Business Policy and Procedures Manual, Appendix 5).
- Paper presentations at professional conferences including abstracts and papers published in proceedings.
- Books, book chapters, or manuscripts published or accepted for publication that are reviewed by professional and/or academic reviewers.
- Published cases with instructional materials.
- Invited papers presented at professional meetings.
- Research monographs.
- Authoring a significant part of a major public policy analysis conducted through or on behalf of the University.
- Conducting a significant part of a funded research project, including a major contribution to a final written report or product.
- Technical reports related to funded research projects.
- Published computer software.
- Published news briefs or updates that provide an overview on current trends, new findings, or recent occurrences relevant to the candidate’s discipline.
- Published book reviews or other published reviews on technical or professional tools offering a comprehensive content overview and recommendations to readers.
- Other published pieces that do not meet the College of Business definition of quality under Appendix 5 of the College of Business Policy and Procedures Manual but are not proven to be predatory outlets.

**Weighted Values of Publications.** The college uses the Australian Business Dean’s Council (ABDC) list as a guideline to assign ratings of quality for journals containing faculty publications. For journals not appearing on the list, the department journal review committee

300 determines whether the journal is of acceptable quality, and assigns a rating level (A, B, C or  
301 unacceptable) to the journal as appropriate, following procedures in COB Manual Appendix 5.  
302 Works in law reviews published by an ABA-accredited law school or ranked on the Washington  
303 and Lee list meet the quality criteria but will need to be rated. For candidates who include journal  
304 articles in their dossier that are not on the ABDC list and have not been approved by the  
305 department journal review committee prior to the candidate entering the RTP process, the  
306 department RTP committee will make this determination. In working towards the peer-reviewed  
307 journal publication requirements for the ratings below, “C” level publications will count as 1.0  
308 research-related works, “B” level publications will count as 1.5 research-related works and “A”  
309 (or above) level publications will count as 2.0 research-related works.

310  
311 **Uniqueness of Research.** Faculty are encouraged to disseminate their research to have an  
312 impact in a variety of ways – indeed, taking research results to different audiences ensures the  
313 work will have a greater impact than a more limited distribution. In a typical publication process,  
314 manuscripts can undergo significant changes, potentially making different publication works  
315 unique. Nevertheless, these works must be sufficiently unique from each other to count  
316 separately for tenure and promotion. The Department RTP committee determines whether the  
317 research-related works submitted in the dossier are unique while conducting their review of the  
318 evidence in the WPAF. Candidates that have research-related works in their dossier with a  
319 potential to be judged as non-unique should clarify the differences in their dossier. As an  
320 example, this situation can arise when one research effort results in

- 321 a. A paper being presented at a conference
- 322 b. The same paper appearing in the conference proceedings
- 323 c. The same paper appearing as a publication in an academic journal
- 324 d. The academic journal article being re-written and published in a practitioner or trade  
325 journal

326  
327 It is unlikely that all four of the above products would count as unique research-related works.  
328 However, there could be some degree of overlap amongst products in development that may be  
329 counted as more than one research-related work. Thus, it is feasible for a research effort to  
330 develop into multiple unique research-related works as long as they represent unique efforts. It is  
331 unlikely that a paper presented at a conference (a), and the same paper appearing in the  
332 conference proceedings (b) would count separately as two research-related works.

### 333 334 **Exceeds Expectations**

335 The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in research and the record unambiguously  
336 supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and  
337 achievement in research. The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s significant, highly-regarded  
338 scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the  
339 professional community (representative activities are listed above, in Dept/Unit standards, in  
340 other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA).

341  
342 For candidates applying for tenure and / promotion, Exceeding Expectations is attained by  
343 accumulating seven (7) or more unique research-related works during their review period. At  
344 least five (5) works must come from peer-reviewed journal articles published in outlets



345 appearing on the College of Business Quality Journals list. In order to be rated “Exceeds  
346 Expectations” at least two (2) of the candidate’s five (5) publications must be rated as “B” level  
347 journals (or higher).

348  
349

350 **Meets Expectations**

351 The candidate has demonstrated competence in research. The evidentiary record generally  
352 supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, and valued contribution to the  
353 academic community in research. The evidence demonstrates appreciable scholarly and  
354 professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional  
355 community (representative activities are listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other  
356 sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA). The use of “appreciable” conveys the necessary trade off  
357 in producing influential scholarship and the quantity/types of scholarship produced. The  
358 definition of appreciable is “large or important enough to be noticed,” allowing evaluators to  
359 focus on the quality of the work (i.e., to be noticed) rather than the quantity. The quality of these  
360 activities is more important the quantity of activities (see FPPP 8.1.3e.4 and Appendix A in  
361 FASP policy implementing RTP changes, 2022-2023).

362

363 For candidates applying for tenure and / promotion Meets Expectations is attained by  
364 accumulating five (5) or more unique research-related works during their review period. At least  
365 four (4) works must come from peer-reviewed journal articles published in outlets appearing on  
366 the College of Business Quality Journals list. For retention, candidates must also provide  
367 evidence of a research pipeline leading to tenure and/or promotion.

368

369 “Meeting Expectations” for Promotion to Professor requires substantial professional recognition  
370 at and/or beyond the University itself (see FPPP 11.1.2). See Standards (page 2) for further  
371 clarification.

372

373 **Does Not Meet Expectations**

374 The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that  
375 contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative  
376 activities are listed in above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the  
377 CBA) (i.e., the evidence demonstrates less than satisfactory levels of performance such as failing  
378 to meet the required minimum number of publications). The evidentiary record does not  
379 demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to the  
380 department’s criteria in the area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require  
381 immediate attention and correction.

382

383

384 **Ratings & Standards Applied to Service to the Department, College,**  
385 **University, and Community**

386

387 There are many ways by which a faculty member can contribute to the success of the  
388 Department, College, University, and the surrounding community. Faculty members should find  
389 appropriate means of documenting any such contributions. While the College of Business does

390 not particularly value any one form of contribution over another, reviewers should consider the  
391 impact and quality of these efforts/outcomes as they relate to facilitating the achievement of  
392 Department/College/University strategic plans and goals.

393  
394 Faculty members must provide evidence regarding his/her service on committees, task forces,  
395 and other service-related activities such as (1) the service group's name, (2) the faculty  
396 member's role (e.g., Chair, member), (3) the duration of service, (4) a contact person for  
397 verification of the faculty member's contributions, and (5) the ways in which the faculty member  
398 effectively contributed to the group's tasks and outcomes as well as to the strategic plans and  
399 goals of the Department/College/University. The Narrative contained within one's dossier  
400 provides an important opportunity to describe these contributions.

401  
402 Standard evidence that could be used to establish performance in Service may include (but are  
403 not limited to) the following:

- 404 • Maintain an active involvement and/or provide leadership in Department, College, and/or  
405 University-wide committees and important internal projects.
- 406 • Maintain an active involvement within the faculty member's discipline (such as serving  
407 as a session chair, officer, or committee member in international, national, regional, or  
408 local academic or professional organizations and/or conferences).
- 409 • Serve as an editor, associate editor, serve on the editorial board, or serve as a manuscript  
410 reviewer for journals and/or conferences
- 411 • Other substantial service in the community with meaningful impact.

412  
413

#### 414 **Exceeds Expectations**

415 The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in service and the record unambiguously supports  
416 the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and achievement in  
417 service. The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in  
418 activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA.  
419 "Exceeds Expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) assuming key roles in significant  
420 committees, (2) high levels of involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3)  
421 facilitating significant activities as well as demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to  
422 the University's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

423  
424 Examples include:

- 425 • Maintain an active involvement and provide leadership in Department, College, and/or  
426 University-wide committees and important internal projects.
- 427 • Maintain an active involvement within the faculty member's discipline (such as serving  
428 as a session chair, officer, or committee member in international, national, regional, or  
429 local academic or professional organizations and/or conferences).
- 430 • Serve as an editor, associate editor, or on the editorial board of academic journals or  
431 practitioner-oriented business publications.
- 432 • Other substantial service in the community with meaningful impact.

433  
434

#### 434 **Meets Expectations**

Approved 4-30-23

435 The candidate has demonstrated competence in service. The evidentiary record generally  
436 supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, and valued contribution to the  
437 academic community in service. The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s on-going  
438 involvement in activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP,  
439 and in the CBA. “Meets Expectations” performance is evidenced by (1) occasionally assuming  
440 roles in important committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3)  
441 facilitating activities, as well as demonstrating on-going contributions to the University’s mission  
442 and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

443  
444 Examples include:

- 445 ● Maintain an involvement in Department, College, and/or University-wide committees  
446 and internal projects.
- 447 ● Maintain an involvement in the academic or professional organizations and/or  
448 conferences in the faculty member's discipline.
- 449 ● Serve as a manuscript reviewer for academic journals and conferences.
- 450 ● Other service in the community.

451  
452 “Meeting Expectations” for **Promotion to Professor** requires substantial professional  
453 recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (see FPPP 11.1.2). See Standards (page 2) for  
454 further explanation.

455  
456 **Does Not Meet Expectations**

457 The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed above, in  
458 the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA (i.e., the evidence  
459 demonstrates less than satisfactory levels of performance). “Does Not Meet Expectations”  
460 performance is evidenced by a lack of the candidate’s (1) assuming roles on committees, (2)  
461 involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities as well as  
462 demonstrating limited contributions to the University’s mission and strategic plan on campus  
463 and/or in the community. The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is  
464 making the minimum contributions with regard to the department’s criteria in the area being  
465 evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and correction.

466  
467  
468




## 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 the Office of Academic Personnel via email for review.
- c) The Office of Academic Personnel 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 the Office of Academic Personnel.
- e) If not approved, the Office of Academic Personnel forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/ Director.
- f) If approved, the Office of Academic Personnel 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 the Office of Academic Personnel Department Standards website, and
  - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to the Office of Academic Personnel website location.

-----  
Chair/Director Approval:  Date: May 19, 2023

Chair/Director Approval:   
Kirk Aiken (May 20, 2023 22:20 PDT) Date: May 20, 2023

Dean Review:   
Terence Lau (May 21, 2023 04:11 PDT) Date: May 21, 2023

Academic Personnel Review:  Date: May 24, 2023

Provost Approval:  Date: May 24, 2023