



**CONCRETE INDUSTRY
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**
*College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Construction
Management*

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Standards

Effective May 16, 2023

I. PREAMBLE

One of the most striking features of a faculty position in a comprehensive university is its multidimensionality. Teaching, scholarship, and service are critical components of every faculty member's job. The Mission Statement of CSU, Chico affirms the importance of instruction, professional growth, and contributions to the University. New hires to tenure-track positions in the Concrete Industry Management (CIM) Program should be aware of the many facets of their position and the expectations of the University, College, and Program. All candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion (RTP) are expected to fulfill the relevant University requirements.

The University standards for retention, tenure, and promotion are governed by the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures ([FPPP](#)¹), which are updated annually. *“Three areas of evaluation must be considered at all review levels in making recommendations on retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP): Instruction; Professional Growth and Achievement; and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community.”* This document seeks to clarify those areas of evaluation for all faculty of the CIM Program.

Instruction refers to the broad area of student and faculty interaction for educational purposes. This includes activities inside and outside the classroom that result in student development. Faculty are expected to continually improve their teaching through scholarship that enlists creativity, critical thinking, and self-reflection.

Professional growth and achievement involve research, scholarship, professional development, and creative activities in the creation of new knowledge and the continual testing and reevaluation of previous work. Research in the broad sense includes not only scientific investigations, but also design, creative problem solving, and other forms of creative activity. The principal part of the research function is the development of funded research proposals and the dissemination of research results through publication and presentation.

Service is the application of professional knowledge by a faculty member in a responsible manner to consequential problems. Faculty should be consistently involved in service work inside the university to help achieve the strategic mission of the university. Faculty should also engage in service activities to further their profession inside and outside the university.

All periodic and performance evaluations of probationary and tenured faculty shall adhere to procedures identified in FPPP. The evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure is based upon the candidate's performance in their assigned workload over the period under review, which may include time spent at other institutions. The relative proportion of time assigned to teaching, research, and service varies among candidates, including those with release time and must be considered in all performance evaluations.

¹ The current version of the FPPP can be accessed from <https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/fppp.shtml>.

In addition to the general requirements, candidates under consideration for retention, tenure, or promotion in the CIM Program must possess one of the following:

1. an earned doctorate in civil engineering, construction management, or business administration, or another relevant field.
2. a graduate degree in civil engineering, construction management, or business administration with a minimum of 5 years, relevant professional career experience

Any one of the two criteria above is sufficient to fulfill this basic CIM requirement for all RTP actions at the Assistant and Associate Professor levels. However, candidates for promotion to Full Professor in the CIM Program must possess one of the following:

- an earned doctorate in civil engineering, construction management, or business administration or another relevant field.
- 10 years of relevant industry experience and an earned Master's degree in civil engineering, construction management, or business administration or another relevant field.

The term "Department Standards Rubric" is used in this document to refer to a department or program specific rubric. The Department Standards Rubric is intended to provide RTP candidates and Personnel Committees with an instrument for evaluation that both recognizes each department and program's unique activities and requirements as well as maintain a consistent framework among candidates across departments and programs within the college.

II. DEFINITIONS OF RATINGS

The following ratings of evaluation are defined by the 2022-2023 [FPPP](#):

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.

III. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

3.01 Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure or from Associate Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

According to the [FPPP](#), “*candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation.*” Evaluation of a candidate’s performance must take into account the relative proportions assigned to these areas in the candidate’s appointment. Some faculty will have a lower teaching load due to buyout from externally funded research activities or assignment of other non-instructional responsibilities. They are not to be down rated for their teaching when receiving release time due to externally funded projects or other circumstances.

For the CIM program a candidate must achieve a minimum level of *Meets expectations* in all evaluation areas for tenure and promotion.

(a) Instruction

A candidate for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor must demonstrate the ability to transfer knowledge effectively to undergraduate students and/or graduate students. Their students should be prepared for succeeding classes and for further development in professional practice or graduate school. The academic advising of undergraduate students is an important aspect of teaching and candidates are expected to provide effective undergraduate advising.

According to the [FPPP](#), “*Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of teaching faculty.*” As stated previously, faculty members are expected to continuously improve in all areas of evaluation, especially in teaching. Candidates must diligently document and provide meaningful evidence of incorporating feedback from both students and peers into methods of improvement in their teaching.

Examples of instructional activities are listed below. The CIM program standard rubric (attached in appendix A of this document) is used to determine ratings.

Examples of Instruction Activities

- a. Instruction
 - i. SFOT Average Rating
 - ii. SFOT Overall Comments
 - iii. Peer Evaluations
 - iv. Assessment of Student Learning
 - v. Professional Development in Instruction
 - vi. Additional optional areas:
 - a. Students site visits/field trips

- b. Self-evaluation.
 - i. Overview of teaching activities, student, and peer evaluations.
 - ii. innovations in instruction.
 - iii. support of student learning.
 - c. Written input from individuals or organizations
 - d. Coordination and/or collaboration on course development and/or delivery Other
- b. Innovation in instruction and Support of student learning
- i. Teaching recognition
 - ii. Supervision of student projects
 - iii. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through a variety of in-class pedagogical means (e.g., cooperative learning, case study presentation, debate, etc.)
 - iv. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through the introduction and use of various instructional technologies/devices
 - v. Supervision of student internships

Examples of the above may include, but are not restricted to the following:

- a) Support of student projects (e.g., capstone, thesis)
 - b) Service on thesis committees
 - c) Development and supervision of student internships
 - d) Contribution to the development of student leadership
- c. Other
- The CIM Program RTP committee invites candidates to submit for consideration other related instructional and activities not listed above. The committee shall give appropriate credit for such activities in proportion to the activities listed above.

(b) Professional Growth and Achievement

A candidate for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor should show the ability and commitment to conceive, develop and direct research projects, the ability to disseminate peer accepted results of that research, advances professional discipline, and activities highly regarded in the profession. The candidate must show demonstrable results of their research. These results can include graduate students that have completed their programs under their direction, published results (peer-reviewed journal papers, peer-reviewed conference proceedings papers, etc.), conference presentations, and external funding of research projects.

Examples of professional growth and achievement activities are listed below. The CIM program standard rubric (attached in appendix A) shall be used to determine ratings.

Examples of Professional Growth and Achievement Activities

- a. Authorship
 - i. Peer reviewed a book (equivalent to four peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - ii. Peer reviewed manuscript in a professional publication
 - iii. Peer reviewed book chapter (equivalent to one peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - iv. Peer reviewed conference manuscript (equivalent to one peer reviewed manuscripts)

- v. Development of a new technology or patent (equivalent to three peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - vi. Non-Peer reviewed book (equivalent to two reviewed manuscripts)
 - vii. Non-Peer reviewed manuscript in a professional publication (equivalent to half peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - viii. Non-Peer reviewed book chapter (equivalent to half peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - ix. Consultancy reports and funded research reports (equivalent to one peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - x. Developing a day-long workshop (equivalent to one peer reviewed manuscripts)
 - xi. Receiving a California Professional Engineer (PE) License (equivalent to two peer reviewed manuscripts); note: no credit is given for faculty previously licensed
- b. Research and grants
- i. PI or Co-PI of large grants and contracts (\geq \$50,000) (equivalent to three grants)
 - ii. PI or Co-PI of medium grants (\$10,000-49,999) (equivalent to two grants)
 - iii. Submitted, but not funded, grants and/or contracts (equivalent to one grants)
 - iv. PI or Co-PI of small grants (\leq \$9,999) (equivalent to one grants)
 - v. Co-operator on a grant or contract (equivalent to one grants)
- c. Scholarly activities within one's profession
- i. Editor of a professional publication (equivalent to three presentations)
 - ii. Presentation of research at a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium
 - iii. Organization/offering of a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium (equivalent to two presentations)
 - iv. Reviewer/referee of a professional publication (equivalent to one presentations)
 - v. Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or symposia (equivalent to half presentations)
- d. Consultancy
- i. Professional consultant dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's areas of expertise.
 - ii. Expert witness dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's areas of expertise.
 - iii. Service as a non-paid consultant or member of an advisory board or council, dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's area of expertise.
- e. Other
- The CIM Program RTP committee invites candidates to submit for consideration other professional activities not listed above. The committee shall give appropriate credit for such activities in proportion to the activities listed above.

(c) Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as to the Community

The service function includes service to the department, the college, the university, the community, and to the faculty member's profession. The area of service includes university committee work, community service, advisor to student clubs and competition teams, fundraising, outreach, and recruitment. Service activities are considered an essential component of a candidate's performance, but these opportunities are usually and appropriately less for tenure track faculty.

Examples of service activities are listed below. The CIM program standard rubric (attached in appendix A) is used to determine ratings.

Examples of Service Activities

- a. Service to the Department/Program, College, and University
 - i. Serve as Chair of a Department/Program, College, or University committee
 - ii. Serve as member of a Department/Program, College or University committee
 - iii. Serve as Chair of an Academic Senate subcommittee
 - iv. Serve as member of an Academic Senate subcommittee
 - v. Serve as member of the Academic Senate
 - vi. Writing and contributing to the program accreditation reports
 - vii. Student mentoring/advising
 - viii. Attending or serving at graduations ceremonies
- b. Perform outreach/recruiting/extension activities
 - i. Class visits to K-14 classrooms or field activity
 - ii. Hosting K-14 students for a lecture or lab activities
 - iii. Participating in on and off-campus recruiting and outreach activities (e.g. Choose Chico, Open day)
- c. Service to professional organizations
 - i. Service as an elected/appointed official of a professional organization
 - ii. Service as a committee member of a professional organization
 - iii. Membership in a professional organization
 - iv. Moderating a technical session at conferences and professional gatherings
- d. Other
The CIM RTP committee invites candidates to submit for consideration other types of service not included above. The committee shall give appropriate credit for such activities in proportion to the activities listed above.

3.02 Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

In accordance with the [FPPP](#), promotion to Full Professor must clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. For the CIM program this means that a candidate must achieve a minimum level of *Meet Expectations* in all evaluation areas.

Examples of Instruction, Professional growth and achievements, and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as to the Community are given in Section 3.1. The CIM program standard rubric (attached in appendix A) shall be used to determine ratings.

3.03 Accelerated Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure or from Associate Professor to Professor with Tenure

In accordance with the [FPPP](#) faculty members who meet the stated expectations can apply for early promotion and tenure. It is acknowledged that consideration of accelerated tenure is not the normal pattern, and the faculty must demonstrate an exceptional record during the review period. The CIM program require that faculty shall have a rating of *Exceed expectations* in all three areas at the department and college level review to be considered for accelerated tenure and/or promotion.

IV. DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE

Included are the recommendations to document the evidence of the RTP candidate. The college utilizes an electronic dossier folder and file structure for consistency between all departments and programs. In addition, the candidate is encouraged to use the Department Standards Rubric and associated Department Standards Rubric Template to aide in organization. The Rubric provides examples of evidence for the three areas of evaluation at the three rating levels. The Template may be used by the candidate and/or Personnel Committee to document the evidence included within the dossier submission. (To be finalized later after input from the departments)

Structure and Recommended Contents of Electronic Folders:

1. Department Standards
 - a. Department Standards that the candidate elects to follow. This may be the department standards at the time of hiring or newer department standards the candidate chooses to follow.
2. Curriculum Vitae
 - a. The candidates professional work history
3. Narrative
 - a. Highlights on Teaching, Professional Growth, and Service
 - b. As per FPPP: *The narrative should provide a context for the reviewers to understand and evaluate the candidate's activities and achievements contained in the dossier. The candidate should use the narrative to highlight the scope and quality of their performance in all the areas to be evaluated, making the case that the performance under review has met or exceeded expectations as stated in the Department standards, other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA. At a minimum, the narrative should include the following:
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), and
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.*
4. Data and Interpretation

- a. Instruction
 - i. List of courses taught (including enrollment, MOI, other)
 - ii. Summary of SFOTs from all classes all years taught at Chico State
 - iii. Summary of Peer Evaluations
 - iv. Reflections on evaluations
 - b. Professional Growth
 - i. List of publications delineated by peer-reviewed book, journal, article, proceeding and non-peer reviewed book, journal, article, proceeding (if possible, link to Support Materials)
 - ii. Invited lecturer/presenter
 - iii. Grants Awarded
 - iv. Grants Not awarded
 - c. Service
 - i. Department
 - ii. College
 - iii. University
 - iv. Community outside university
5. Support Materials
- a. Individual files referenced in Dossier and provided in Box with link in dossier to file in Box as per instructions provided by OAPL "[Using Box Links for Dossiers](#)"
6. Index
- a. Copy of all support materials in bibliographic format to be included in the candidate's PAF.

V. APPENDIX A

Instruction

	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Doesn't meet expectation
1- SFOT Average Rating			
Year 1-2	>3.25	>2.75	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 3-4	>3.75	>3.25*	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 5-6	>4.25	>4*	anything less than "meet expectation"
2- SFOT Overall Comments			
Year 1-2	Mostly positive; indicate a classroom environment that is conducive to learning.	A reasonable portion of both positive and negative; indicate a classroom environment that may or may not be conducive to learning.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 3-4	Predominantly positive; indicate a classroom environment that is conducive to learning*.	Mostly positive but does not clearly indicate a classroom environment that is conducive to learning*.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 5-6	Uniformly positive; indicate a superior classroom environment that promotes student learning*.	Mostly positive; indicate a classroom environment that is conducive to learning*.	anything less than "meet expectation"
3- Peer Evaluations			
Year 1-2	Peer Evaluations should be mostly positive. Detailed feedback should be provided for any areas that do not meet expectations. Faculty should address those areas and make plans for improvement.	Peer Evaluations may be positive or negative. Detailed feedback should be provided for any areas that do not meet expectations. Faculty should address those areas and make plans for improvement.	anything less than "meet expectation"

Year 3-4	Peer Evaluations should be nearly uniformly positive. Detailed feedback should be provided for any areas that do not meet expectations. Faculty should address those areas and make plans for improvement.	Peer Evaluations should be mostly positive. Detailed feedback should be provided for any areas that do not meet expectations. Faculty should address those areas and make plans for improvement.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 5-6	Peer Evaluations should be nearly uniformly positive. Detailed feedback should be provided for any areas that do not meet expectations. Faculty should address those areas and make plans for improvement.	Peer Evaluations should be mostly positive. Detailed feedback should be provided for any areas that do not meet expectations. Faculty should address those areas and make plans for improvement.	anything less than "meet expectation"
4- Assessment of Student Learning			
Year 1-2	Align course content and course learning objectives with program SLOs for all classes taught.	Update course syllabus to reflect course learning objectives and program SLOs.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 3-4	Align course content and course learning objectives with program SLOs for all classes taught and collect assessment data.	Align course content and course learning objectives with program SLOs for all classes taught.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 5-6	Align course content and course learning objectives with program SLOs for all classes taught and collect assessment data. Re assess student learning.	Align course content and course learning objectives with program SLOs for all classes taught and collect assessment data.	anything less than "meet expectation"
5- Professional Development in Instruction			
Year 1-2	Attend at least one training workshop and develop active learning strategies for at least one course.	Attend at least one training workshop.	anything less than "meet expectation"

Year 1-4	Attend at least two appropriate training workshop and develop active learning strategies for two courses.	Attend at least two appropriate training workshop and develop active learning strategies for one course.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-6	Attend at least three appropriate training workshop and develop active learning strategies for courses. And develop at least one new course	Attend at least three appropriate training workshop and develop active learning strategies for all courses being taught.	anything less than "meet expectation"
6- Innovation in instruction and Support of student learning			
Year 1-2	Develop student projects, use various teaching methods, mentor student research projects.	Supervise student projects, use various teaching methods, mentor student research projects.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-4	Develop student projects, use various teaching methods, mentor student research projects.	Supervise student projects, use various teaching methods, mentor student research projects.	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-6	Develop student projects, use various teaching methods, mentor student research projects.	Supervise student projects, use various teaching methods, mentor student research projects.	anything less than "meet expectation"

* Except for newly taught course

Categories	Overall instruction rating for tenure and promotion		
	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Doesn't meet expectation
1- SET scores	Exceeds expectation in four of the six categories with at least meet expectations in SFOT Average Rating	Meet expectation in four of the six categories with at least meet expectations in SFOT Average Rating	anything below/lower than meet expectation
2- SET comments			
3- Peer evaluations			
4- SLO assessment			
5- Prof. dev. In teaching			
6- Innovation in instruction			

Professional Growth and Achievement Activities (PGA)

	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Doesn't meet expectation
1- Authorship (refer to section 3.01b-a)			
Year 1-2	≥2 or equivalent in total	1 or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-4	≥3 or equivalent in total	2 or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-6	≥4 or equivalent in total	3 or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
2- Research and grants (refer to section 3.01b-b)			
Year 1-2	≥3 grant or equivalent in total	1 grant or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-4	≥4 grant or equivalent in total	3 grant or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-6	≥5 grant or equivalent in total	4 grant or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
3- Scholarly activities within one's profession (refer to section 3.01b-c)			
Year 1-2	≥3 presentation or equivalent in total	1 presentation or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-4	≥4 presentation or equivalent in total	2 presentation or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
Year 1-6	≥5 presentation or equivalent in total	3 presentation or equivalent in total	anything less than "meet expectation"
4- Consultancy (refer to section 3.01b-d)			
Year 1-2	≥1	<i>Not required</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Year 1-4	≥1	<i>Not required</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Year 1-6	≥1	<i>Not required</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>

Overall Professional Growth and Achievement Activities (PGA) rating for tenure and promotion			
Categories	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Doesn't meet expectation
1- Authorship	Exceed expectation in at least 2 of the four main categories and minimum of meet expectation in Authorship	Meets expectation in at least 2 of the three first categories	anything below/lower than meet expectation
2- Research and grants			
3- Scholarly activities within one's profession			
4- Consultancy			

Service

	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Doesn't meet expectation
1- Service to the Program, College, and University (refer to section 3.01c)			
Year 1-6	≥3 of the areas listed on the program/department level, one of the areas listed on the college level and one of the areas listed on the university level. In addition, participate in the Student Advising.	≥2 of the areas listed on the program/department level, one of the areas listed on the college level and one of the areas listed on the university level. In addition, participate in the Student Advising.	anything less than "meet expectation"
2- Perform outreach/recruiting/extension activities (refer to section 3.01c)			
Year 1-6	≥2 outreach activities	1 outreach activity	anything less than "meet expectation"
3- Service to professional organizations (refer to section 3.01c)			
Year 1-6	≥3	≥2	anything less than "meet expectation"

Overall Service rating for tenure and promotion			
Categories	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Doesn't meet expectation
1- Service to the Program, College, and University	Exceed expectation in all of the three categories	Meets expectation in at least 2 of the three categories	anything below/lower than meet expectation
2- Perform outreach/recruiting/extension activities			
3- Service to professional organizations			



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: *Nick Steinberg* Date: May 25, 2023

Dean Review: *[Signature]* Date: May 25, 2023
Terence Lau (May 25, 2023 12:18 PDT)

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

Provost Approval: *[Signature]* Date: May 25, 2023



MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 23, 2023

TO: Nick Steinberg, Program Chair Chair

CC: Terence Lau, Interim 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 criteria for the ratings of “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” for all three evaluation categories for decisions about promotion to full professor.
2. Provide complete requirements for accelerated tenure and promotion to associate and accelerated promotion to full – see relevant sections of FPPP.
3. 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.