

California State University, Chico
Computer Science Department
RTP Standards
Version 1.5

Monday 21st August, 2023

Contents

1	OVERVIEW	3
2	DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	3
2.1	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION	3
2.2	INSTRUCTION	4
2.2.1	Evaluating Instruction	6
2.3	PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT	6
2.3.1	Scholarly Activities	6
2.3.2	Evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement	9
2.4	SERVICE	9
2.4.1	Evaluating Service	12
2.5	RATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE	12
2.5.1	Rating Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full	12
2.5.2	Rating Expectations for Accelerated Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full	13
3	DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR LECTURER FACULTY	13
3.1	Evaluation of Lecturers	13

1 OVERVIEW

The university standards for retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are governed by the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP), which are updated annually. For the latest version of the FPPP, go to our campus Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) website at <https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/fppp.shtml>

From the FPPP: “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 Department of Computer Science.

2 DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

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, research, and public service. New hires to tenure-track positions in the Department of Computer Science shall be aware of the many facets of their position and the expectations of the university, college, and department.

In addition to the general requirements of the FPPP, the Computer Science candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion must meet one of the following requirements in the field of computing:

1. a doctorate in an appropriate discipline; or
2. a graduate degree in Computer Science, and a significant professional career and/or a national or international reputation as an expert in the field.

Any exceptions to these requirements and the timetable for meeting the requirements as they relate to retention, tenure, and/or promotion will be spelled out in the hiring letter.

The following standards are those required by the department for retention, tenure, and promotion. Reports at all levels of review shall indicate whether or not progress toward retention, tenure, and/or promotion is satisfactory, and if not, what corrective action or additional accomplishment is required.

2.1 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION

In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the individual shall normally possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneous to promotion. In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, the individual shall possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneous to the promotion.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Full Professor shall 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.

To evaluate faculty for RTP purposes, the department will use the following rubrics for each of the three areas of evaluation.

2.2 INSTRUCTION

Instructional effectiveness is the primary and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and ultimately, promotion. When assessing a faculty member's instruction, both quantity and quality shall be considered. Each instructional category shall be classified according to its quality:

- **Major:** These demonstrate standard activities
- **Rare:** These are rare activities that are non-standard that require extra effort or recognition.

Each instructional activity shall be classified according to the highest criteria it meets, as described in the following table.

Category	Major	Rare
Instructional Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates and/or revises courses. • Exhibits content knowledge. • Prepares materials and resources that are factually correct and are at an appropriate level for the courses taught. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepares significant updates to course materials to stay current with research and industry practice. • An award recognizing contribution in instructional design • Participates in designing new programs, certificates, etc.
Instructional Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates aptitude and skills that facilitate students' engagement and learning (e.g., approachability, enthusiasm, interactive skills) • Communicates concepts effectively • Checks for students' understanding of the presented material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An award recognizing contribution in instructional delivery • Usage of a variety of evidence-based pedagogical practices • Practicing the state-of-the-art teaching strategies to maintain high level of students' engagement • Developing innovative teaching methods • Demonstrating aptitude and skills that allow to connect with students on personal level (e.g., caring for students' success)

Category	Major	Rare
Assessment of Student Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses common approaches for assessing student learning (e.g., tests, quizzes, projects) • Provides reasonable feedback to students in relation to a class size • Continuous improvement of assessment strategies based on SET/SFOT and peer comments • If required by the department, participating in program assessment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops innovative tools, procedures or strategies for assessing student learning • Develops innovative procedures for meaningful and effective feedback to students • Adopt variety of successful tools and techniques from research
Commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helpful and available during office hours • Creating an inclusive learning environment where each student is encouraged to contribute to the learning process • Reflecting on local training, conferences, FLC, articles, equity-gap dashboards, etc. related to EDI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides sustained extra office hours • Provides sustained extra tutoring sessions • Practices sustained individual approaches for struggling students • Utilizes the university's resources to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion • Attends external conference, talks, or workshops on diversity, equity and inclusion • Creates programs (workshops, research activities, camps, etc.) that promote diversity, equity and inclusion
Continuous Improvement of Teaching/Learning process ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection of peer reviews and SET/SFOT to improve teaching/learning process • Updating course materials to reflect SET/SFOT and peer comments if necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attending an external computer science educational conference (or workshops). Providing evidence of how this knowledge applies in their classroom. • Participation in local educational workshops, faculty learning communities, or conferences. Providing evidence of how this knowledge applies in their classroom.

¹SET/SFOT scores are less important than faculty addressing how they are continuously improving their teaching based on the feedback from students and peers.

Category	Major	Rare
Subject-area Professional growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of a textbook(s) or other relevant materials such as research papers, or trusted online resources to maintain subject knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate content into a course learned from expert sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Attending an external subject-related conference – Taking a course in subject area from a leader in the field – Having an external industry or research experience • Integrates state-of-the-art research and/or technologies into courses

2.2.1 Evaluating Instruction

When evaluating faculty members on instruction, the preceding guidelines shall inform the ratings. Faculty members shall be rated accordingly:

Meets Expectations: Meets expectations candidates must satisfy all major activities, over the review period.

Exceeds Expectations: Exceeds expectations must meet expectations and have at least 3 distinct rare activities (bullet points) over the review period. At least one rare must come from the Instructional Design or Instructional Delivery activities.

2.3 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Professional growth and achievement are essential characteristics of effective instruction. It is by this means that faculty remain current in their discipline, maintain credibility with students and peers, and sustain their intellectual vitality. It is expected that the faculty member demonstrates and documents activities that contribute to his/her professional growth.

2.3.1 Scholarly Activities

Scholarship, in all its varied forms, has the common attribute of the creation of something that did not exist before which is then validated and communicated to others. Areas such as teaching and learning, and the discovery, integration or application of knowledge are all fundamental activities that constitute scholarly activities. The forms of scholarship that support professional growth and achievement in Computer Science include, but are not limited to, those listed in this section.

As a field, Computer Science evolves rapidly and areas within the field do not all adhere to the same standards of publication. For example, some areas follow a convention of ordering paper authors by the significance of their contribution while other areas order authors alphabetically. Likewise, the value of journal and conference publications differs by area. When the conventions for an area of research are deviating from the expectations described in this document, the faculty member shall supplement the records of their scholarship with a self-report assessment (along with sufficient evidence) to clarify and elaborate upon the significance of their scholarship. Conferences or journals that are predatory in nature do not count in faculty professional growth and achievement.

Both IEEE² and ACM³ require authors and co-authors to have made significant contributions to the intellectual merits of the scholarship as well as to the paper. Consequently, author orders on papers at venues sponsored by IEEE or ACM shall not impact the judgment of the quality of the faculty member's contribution. For other venues, evidence should be provided by the faculty member to attest to the significance of their authorship by the standards of that venue.

The Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) are the leading professional and scholarly organizations for Computer Science. Conference papers and journals that are sponsored by ACM and/or IEEE are considered very high quality. In Computer Science, ACM and IEEE conference papers are peer-reviewed as complete papers (not just abstracts), published in conference proceedings, and are considered comparable quality to refereed journal articles. Both ACM Digital Library and IEEE Xplore include archived publications that are not from their respective venues; consequently, a publication's presence in these databases alone does not necessarily evidence that the paper was published in an ACM or IEEE sponsored publication.

Computer Science is conducive to interdisciplinary scholarship that can yield quality publications that are not affiliated with either ACM or IEEE. When faculty publish in other venues, it is especially important to provide resources that demonstrate the standard practices of that particular discipline as well as the quality of the publication. For example, expectations for ordering authors may be cited in documentation from publishers or professional organizations.

When assessing a faculty member's professional growth and achievement, both quantity and quality shall be considered. Each professional growth and achievement outcome can be classified as a primary or supplementary outcome. The primary category shall be further classified according to its quality as follows:

- **Major:** These outcomes demonstrate significant accomplishments with rigorous external validation.
- **Rare:** These outcomes are rare accomplishments that exceed expectations by earning acknowledgment of quality among the highest in the field.

Each primary outcome shall be classified according to the highest criteria it meets, as described in the following table.

Primary Outcome Quality Classification Criteria		
Category	Major	Rare
Refereed Publications	Any peer-reviewed publication with venue corresponding acceptance rate ⁴ below 60% -OR- IEEE or ACM-sponsored publication -OR-	Venue with a corresponding acceptance rate below 25% -OR- Article in a journal that is prestigious in the research area. Candidate must provide evidence of why this venue is prestigious. -OR-

²<http://ieeauthorcenter.ieee.org/publish-with-ieee/publishing-ethics/definition-of-authorship/>

³<https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/authorship>

⁴Acceptance rate of the venue during the same year the faculty member's paper was accepted

Primary Outcome Quality Classification Criteria		
Category	Major	Rare
	Article in a journal with SJR Impact Factor ⁵ at least 0.5 -OR- Publication with at least 2 citations ⁷ -OR- A peer-reviewed publication in non-predatory venue	Publication with at least 20 citations ⁶
External ⁸ Grants or Contracts	Role in an awarded grant/contract for at least \$10k	PI/Co-PI on awarded grant of at least \$100k overall budget
Textbooks	Chapter published by a university press -OR- Publicly available textbook or textbook chapter with evidence of adoption outside of CSU Chico by an accredited university -OR- Letter of support from an external expert in the subject of the textbook who evaluates it as high-quality	Textbook published by a university press -OR- Significant adoption and use of textbook, as demonstrated by evidence provided by the candidate

Supplementary activities shall each be assessed as equivalent value to a fraction of a major primary outcome. Accordingly, multiple supplementary activities may accumulate to the equivalent value of major primary outcomes. However, no number of supplementary activities shall count as equivalent to rare primary outcomes. The following table summarizes the fractional value of each supplementary activity:

Supplementary Activity	Major Outcome Equivalency
Submitting an unfunded external grant proposal of at least \$10K	0.5
Role in an awarded external grant/contract for less than \$10k	0.5
Publicly available textbook or textbook chapter written	0.5
Patents, inventions, and other such developments of a significant scientific or engineering nature	0.5
Prestigious (inter)national award/recognition (e.g. ACM or IEEE Fellow)	0.5

⁵Scimago Journal and Country Rank: <http://www.scimagojr.com/>

⁶Citation count excludes "self-citations" (cited by the same faculty member in a different paper)

⁷Citation count excludes "self-citations" (cited by the same faculty member in a different paper)

⁸External grants/contracts include any with funding sources other than California State University, Chico

Supplementary Activity	Major Outcome Equivalency
Serving on a grant review panel	0.5
Delivering an invited talk at a conference or society meeting (e.g. keynote speaker, panel, etc)	0.5
Conference program committee member	0.5
Editor of a journal, conference proceedings, or book	0.5
Awarded internal grant(s)/contract(s)	0.3
Research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, and industry	0.2
Invited reviewer of journal articles, conference articles, chapters, or books	0.1
Mentoring a student's research that results in publication (that the faculty member did NOT co-author)	0.1

2.3.2 Evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement

When evaluating faculty members on professional growth and achievement, the preceding guidelines shall inform the ratings over the review period. Faculty members shall be rated accordingly:

Period of Evaluation	Meets Expectations	Exceed Expectations
2nd Year Probationary	At least 1 primary major outcome, that can be supplemental outcomes	At least 1 primary major outcome, not including supplemental outcomes
4th Year Probationary	At least 2 primary major outcomes, that can be supplemental outcomes	At least 2 primary major outcomes, not including supplemental outcomes
Tenure and/or Promotion for all levels	At least 4 primary major outcomes, of them, supplemental outcomes can only account for at most 2 equivalent primary major outcomes.	Equivalent to at least 6 primary outcomes where at least one of them is a rare outcome, and supplemental outcomes can only account for at most 2 equivalent primary major outcomes.

2.4 SERVICE

When assessing a faculty member's service, both quantity and quality shall be considered. Each service category shall be classified according to its quality:

- **Major:** These demonstrate standard activities
- **Rare:** These are rare activities that are non-standard that require extra effort or recognition.

Each service activity shall be classified according to the highest criteria it meets, as described in the following table:

Category	Major	Rare
Student Advising	Candidate is involved in mandatory advising and other academic advising duties.	The candidate receives an award in recognition of advising excellence
Student Recruitment, Retention, Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity efforts	Candidate is actively involved in student recruitment and retention efforts at the department level. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choose Chico Day • Sending students to Grace Hopper Celebration 	Candidate is actively involved in student recruitment and retention efforts beyond the department level. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College outreach programs
Advisor or Coach for a Student Club or Organization	Candidate serves as (1) advisor for a recognized student club or organization on campus; or (2) coach for a student competition team. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPE faculty advisor • ACM faculty advisor • USRO faculty advisor • ICPC coach • NCL coach 	N/A
Committee Membership	Candidate sustains membership on a college or department-level committee. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves multiple terms on the curriculum committee 	Candidates serves on a university or system-wide committee for at least one term or year.
Leadership in Committees	Candidate serves as a chair for a department-level committee.	The candidate serves as a chair for a university, college, or system-level committee.
Graduate Committee Involvement	Adviser or member of an MS committee.	Adviser or member of a Ph.D. committee for a candidate at another institution. -OR- Adviser of at least 3 MS thesis or project during the period of evaluation
Community Outreach	Candidate is actively doing work for regional, state, or local organizations.	The candidate is actively doing work for a national or international organization.

Category	Major	Rare
	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with ECC's McCloud Institute for Simulation Sciences. • Inspire HS Board • Boys & Girls Club • GirlsWhoCode 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Director member for NCWIT • Board of Director member for CRA • The executive committee for Boy Scouts of America
Reviewer for a Funding Agency	Candidate is a reviewer for a regional, local, or university-level conference or journal.	The candidate is a reviewer for a national or federal funding agency (e.g. NSF).
Reviewer for conference or journal proceedings	Candidate is a reviewer for a regional, local, or university-level funding unit.	The candidate is a reviewer for a national or international conference or journal with reasonable quality.
Editorial Work	Candidate serves as a member of the Editorial Board on a peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings	Candidate serves as Editor or Associate Editor on a peer-reviewed journal or conference with high quality.
Awards	<p>Candidate recognized with a university award for work as an advisor or for work in service organizations.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chico State Outstanding Faculty Service Award • Chico State Outstanding Academic Advisor Award 	<p>Candidate recognized with an external award for work in service organizations.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACM Distinguished Service Award • IEEE Outstanding Service Award
Participation in a Recognized National or International Professional Organization	<p>Candidate serves as a committee member in a recognized national or international professional organization.</p> <p>Examples such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACM • IEEE • ASEE 	Candidate (1) is an elected officer such as President, VP, Secretary, Board of Trustees; or (2) serving as chair of a committee in a recognized national or international professional organization.
Faculty Mentorship	Candidate is actively involved in mentoring junior faculty in their home college and/or their home department.	<p>The candidate is involved in mentoring faculty at the university level.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead in a campus Faculty Learning Community (FLC)

Category	Major	Rare
Leadership Role in the College	Candidate serves as Program Director or Department Vice-/Associate-Chair in the college.	The candidate previously served as Associate Dean or other university administrator. -OR- The candidate serves as a Department Chair in the college.

2.4.1 Evaluating Service

When evaluating faculty members on service, the preceding guidelines shall inform the ratings. Faculty members shall be rated accordingly:

Meets Expectations for tenure and/or promotion for all levels: At least 3 separate, independent documented Major service activities, over the review period.

Exceeds Expectations for tenure and/or promotion to Associate: Meets expectations and at least two rare activities over the review period.

Exceeds Expectations for tenure and/or promotion to Full: Meets expectations and at least three rare activities over the review period.

2.5 RATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Upon scheduled performance reviews, the department review committee shall rate the faculty member on their performance for each of the three primary criteria: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service.

It is expected that the faculty member shall maintain high technical, professional, and ethical standards in their interaction with students, colleagues, staff, administration, the community, and the profession. If this standard is not met, it needs to be addressed by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations along with any necessary support documentation.

In addition to a faculty member's responsibility to maintain high ethical standards, it is meaningful to recognize the importance of maintaining a demeanor of respect for, and cooperative interaction with colleagues, staff, and the administration in carrying out the mission of the university. Whether it is in connection with committee work, outreach activities, curriculum development, or program assessment, faculty are expected to function cooperatively with others to further the stature of the program, department, college, and university. If this standard is not met, it needs to be addressed by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations along with any necessary support documentation.

2.5.1 Rating Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full

To qualify for tenure and/or promotion, faculty members are expected to meet at least a rating of Meets Expectations in all three criteria: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service. These expectations are summarized in the table below:

Category	Minimum Expected Rating
Instruction	Meets Expectations
Professional Growth and Achievement	Meets Expectations

Category	Minimum Expected Rating
Service	Meets Expectations

2.5.2 Rating Expectations for Accelerated Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full

To qualify for accelerated tenure and/or promotion to full or associate, faculty members are expected to show exemplary performance, demonstrated by no ratings below Exceeds Expectations.

Category	Minimum Expected Rating
Instruction	Exceeds Expectations
Professional Growth and Achievement	Exceeds Expectations
Service	Exceeds Expectations

To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must: (1) have been rated Exceeds Expectations in a performance review in all three categories of evaluation, 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 the department's typical full-time assignment.

To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor, the candidate must: (1) be ranked Exceeds Expectations in all three categories of evaluation, and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.

3 DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR LECTURER FACULTY

Lecturers must meet all requirements for appointment and other requirements as described in the Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP).

3.1 Evaluation of Lecturers

In alignment with our campus Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP) documents, all lecturers working with the department will be evaluated based on the following rubric:

Category	Expectations for a Satisfactory Rating
Teaching evaluations	<p>The candidate provided evidence of careful analysis and evaluation of Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) results and student comments with documented plans to address student concerns. For a satisfactory rating evidence of all of these items needs to be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepares materials and resources that are factually correct and are at an appropriate level for the courses taught. • Demonstrates aptitude and skills that facilitate students' engagement and learning (e.g., approachability, enthusiasm, interactive skills). • Communicates concepts effectively. • Checks for students' understanding of the presented material

Category	Expectations for a Satisfactory Rating
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses common approaches for assessing student learning (e.g., tests, quizzes, projects). • Provides reasonable feedback to students in relation to a class size • Continuous improvement of assessment strategies based on SFOT and peer comments. • Helpful and available during office hours. • Reflection of peer reviews and teaching evaluations to improve teaching/learning process. • Updates to course materials reflect teaching evaluations and comments from peer evaluations of teaching.
Currency appropriate to appointment	<p>The candidate provided evidence of relevant activities they participated in that support and enhance currency appropriate to the candidate's appointment. These activities may include continued education, research, scholarship, and other creative and professional activities. Evidence for satisfactory evidence of the following needs to be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits content knowledge. • Uses textbook(s) or other relevant materials such as research papers, or trusted online resources to maintain subject knowledge. • Reflecting on local training, conferences, FLC, articles, equity-gap dashboards, etc. related to EDI
Contribution to strategic plans and goals	<p>The candidate provided evidence of other relevant activities or achievements related to the candidate's work assignment(s) that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the department, such as innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, civic engagement, and service to the North State.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates an inclusive learning environment where each student is encouraged to contribute to the learning process. • Participates in the department's program assessment process, if applicable.
Non-teaching work assignment(s)	<p>The candidate provided evidence that supports achievement related to non-teaching work assignment(s).</p>
Check here if applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

To qualify for retention, lecturers must maintain a Satisfactory rating on at least the **Teaching Evaluations** and **Non-teaching work assignment(s)** (if applicable) categories.

To qualify for a range elevation, in addition to the scheduled responsibilities indicated in the FPPP, lecturers must maintain a Satisfactory rating on the **Teaching Evaluations, Currency appropriate to the**

appointment, and Non-teaching work assignment(s) (if applicable) categories.



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: Tyson R. Henry Date: Aug 21, 2023

Dean Review: Bob Walters Date: Aug 21, 2023

OAPL Review: Mahalley D. Allen Date: Aug 21, 2023

Provost Approval:  Date: Aug 31, 2023
[Terence Lau \(Aug 31, 2023 23:32 GMT+7\)](#)