

HISTORY DEPARTMENT RTP STANDARDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION 2
- 2 PURPOSES..... 2
- 3 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2
- 4 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE PROCEDURES..... 3
- 5 THE REVIEW PROCESS 3
- 6 DOSSIER AND THE WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE 4
- 7 PEER EVALUATIONS 5
- 8 CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW: TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY..... 7
 - 8.1 INSTRUCTION 7
 - 8.2 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT 10
 - 8.3 SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY 14
- 9 RETENTION 16
- 10 TENURE 17
- 11 PROMOTION 17
 - 11.1 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR 17
 - 11.2 FULL PROFESSOR..... 17
- 12 ACCELERATED TENURE AND PROMOTION 17
- 13 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURED AND FERP FACULTY..... 18
- 14 PROCEDURES FOR FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME LECTURER REVIEWS 18
- 15 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME LECTURER FACULTY 19
- 16 SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR LECTURER FACULTY 21
- 17 RANGE ELEVATION FOR LECTURER FACULTY 21
- 18 APPENDIX 22
 - 18.1 ABBREVIATIONS 22
 - 18.2 LINKS..... 23

1 INTRODUCTION

The History Department Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Standards document has been developed in accordance with the University's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures ([FPPP](#)) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement ([CBA](#)). It outlines standards, policies, and procedures that take into consideration the unique qualities and needs of the History Department. In this context, the History Department will hereafter employ the following disciplinary-specific criteria, guidelines, and procedures in its decisions on retention, tenure, and promotion.

2 PURPOSES

The purposes of the History Department's RTP Standards are to delineate policies, procedures, and expectations related to the:

- Retention, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty
- Evaluation of part-time and full-time lecturer faculty
- Range elevations for part-time and full-time lecturer faculty

3 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Personnel Committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty elected by majority vote of the probationary and tenured members of the Department. Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement (FERP) Program are eligible for election and may serve on the Committee with the approval of the President or designee if employed during the entire portion of the review cycle. An election for Personnel Committee shall be held during the spring semester for a one-year term commencing the next fall semester. ([FPPP 4.1](#))

- a) Committee members must be tenured.
- b) No department member may serve on the Personnel Committee if their case will be reviewed that year by the Committee or if they are serving in the RTP process at another level. An exception to this may be made for faculty undergoing fifth-year reviews. They may serve on the Committee, but take a temporary leave from Committee business during their own review process.
- c) Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the Department Personnel Committee. A FERP faculty member may only serve if they are employed during the entire portion of the review cycle for which that Committee is responsible, and the Dean approves.
- d) The Committee may be augmented with faculty from other departments in closely related disciplines when necessary.
- e) The Department Chair may participate as a member of the Department Personnel Committee
- f) In promotion considerations, Personnel Committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion.
- g) The Personnel Committee shall elect one of its own members as Chair.
- h) The Chair of the Committee is responsible for:
 - Assigning classroom visitations for all probationary faculty and faculty under review
 - Convening and running the Personnel Committee meetings

- Assuring that the proper documents are filled out for each review, and that they are turned in according to the required procedures and timelines

4 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

The Personnel Committee shall elect its secretary each year from the membership of the Committee. ([FPPP 4.2](#))

- a) All Personnel Committee meetings shall be in executive session.
 - Confidentiality is a prerequisite for effective personnel procedure.
 - Any unauthorized discussion of personnel matters (exclusive of policy and procedures) with nonmembers of the Personnel Committee is considered a breach of confidentiality. Any breach of confidentiality will be considered as a violation of professional ethics. In particular, RECOMMENDATIONS from any faculty review process, including PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, PERIODIC EVALUATIONS, AND POST-TENURE REVIEWS shall be confidential.
 - Only the affected faculty member, appropriate administrators and staff, the Provost, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Success, and the Department and College Committee members shall have access to written recommendations.
 - Candidates may choose to share their reports or the recommendations with faculty mentors and other appropriate people on campus for help in meeting the recommendations or preparing future dossiers.
- b) Minutes must be taken at all Committee meetings.
 - Minutes shall include: time, place, and date of meeting; members present and absent; and action taken.
 - No minutes on details of the committee's discussion or deliberations shall be taken.
 - Written minutes of the interviews for faculty under review must be given to the College office to be placed in their PAF.
- c) Tenure-track and tenured faculty will be interviewed by the Personnel Committee prior to their final deliberation on personnel recommendations.
- d) Reports and recommendations must be submitted to faculty under review only in written form.
- e) Committee members who generally agree with the evaluations or recommendations, but who wish to submit an additional or alternative analysis and/or interpretation, may submit a concurring report.
- f) Abstentions and minority votes will be submitted in writing.
- g) A quorum consisting of a majority of the Committee, or a minimum of three members, whichever is greater, must be present to conduct business.
- h) No proxies are permitted.

5 THE REVIEW PROCESS

To assist in the progression towards retention, tenure, or promotion, the Committee will orient candidates under review to the evaluation process and dossier development, and provide developmental feedback to the candidate developmental in accordance with the FPPP ([8.0.1](#)).

- a) Tenure-track probationary faculty are subject to two different types of performance evaluations.
- b) The first, called PERIODIC EVALUATION, focuses on providing the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of improving and/or maintaining performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by both candidates and the Committee. Normally, periodic evaluations are done in the faculty member's first, third, and fifth years. Faculty who are hired with years of service credit may have a different cycle. The Dean's office will inform such candidates of where they are in their review cycle. ([FPPP 10.1.4](#))
- c) The second type of performance evaluation is called the PERFORMANCE REVIEW, wherein an evaluative assessment of the faculty member's performance is conducted and the probability of a successful tenure/promotion decision is estimated. Formal ratings of performance in each area of review are determined, and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member. Normally, performance reviews are conducted in the faculty member's second, fourth, and sixth years. Faculty who are hired with years of service credit may have a different cycle. The Dean's office will inform such candidates of where they are in their review cycle. ([FPPP 10.1.4](#))
- d) It is during the sixth-year performance evaluation that the decision is made to offer tenure and/or promotion to associate professor or release the faculty member from employment in accordance with the [FPPP 10.0.1.5](#).
- e) At each review (of both types), the Personnel Committee will provide written feedback on each category under review. In the next cycle of review, the candidate must provide evidence of having attended to the feedback from the previous review. Lack of attending to the feedback may be reason to lower a candidate's rating from the previous review cycle in a specific area.
- f) Lecturer faculty will undergo review in accordance with the FPPP ([9.0](#)), and the criteria used in their evaluations are addressed separately in section 14, below.

6 DOSSIER AND THE WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE

The candidate is to submit a dossier to provide evaluators with the information and materials needed to accurately judge the candidate's performance in the areas listed below. The department will help guide the candidate in making certain that the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) accurately reflects the full performance record. However, ultimately, it is the candidate's responsibility to see that all materials favorable to retention, tenure, and/or promotion are included in the WPAF.

- a) All candidates should refer to the relevant sections of the FPPP ([FPPP 8](#) for tenure-track faculty, and [FPPP 9](#) for lecturer faculty, and [FPPP 10](#) for tenured faculty), as well as the guidelines and templates from the Dean's Office, to assure that all required documents are submitted.
- b) For all candidates, this includes evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom ([FPPP 10.2.5.b](#))
 - Either: Evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, including one or more of the following: use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or

queer authors; incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy; creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment; or completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion. A candidate may make a case for another approach or activity undertaken to reduce equity gaps not listed here.

- Or: Data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses.
- c) For tenure-track candidates and candidates applying for promotion this includes a copy of the applicable Department Personnel Standards, a current curriculum vitae and the following sections of the dossier: Narrative, Data and Interpretation, Supplemental Materials, and an Index of any supplemental support material.
- The narrative should provide a context for the reviewers to understand and evaluate the activities and achievements contained in the dossier. The candidate should use the narrative to highlight the scope and quality of their performance, making the case that the performance under review has met or exceeded expectations as stated in the Department Standards described below, as well as in relevant sections of the FPPP.
 - A reflection on Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs) regarding student feedback on course design and syllabus, communication and interaction, engagement and learning, and the students' overall rating of courses. The reflection should include the candidate's ability to create a productive learning experience for students, identify areas for improvement, and provide a plan for improvement.
- d) When compiling materials in the dossier, the candidate should keep in mind that the quality of activities is more important than the quantity. Therefore, the materials included should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments. This should include the area of service, and where relevant the candidate may include information about the work performed and the time commitment involved.
- e) Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate how their work in the areas under review support the [University's Enduring Commitments and Strategic Priorities](#) and the [History Department's Mission Statement](#).

7 PEER EVALUATIONS

Peer Evaluations of teaching will be conducted and evaluated for tenure track, tenured, and lecturer faculty.

- a) It is the joint responsibility of the candidate and the Personnel Committee Chair to ensure that courses are evaluated when they should be, which is at least once per year for tenure-track faculty.
- b) A range of courses in the candidate's regular rotation should be evaluated over time. Additionally, over time class observations should cover the range of modes of instruction (MOIs) that a candidate normally teaches or will likely continue to teach, and this should be a factor in determining which courses to observe.

- c) In accordance with [CBA 15.14](#), the individual being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class.
- d) The observing faculty member will write a report (using a template below) and the report must be discussed with and signed by the candidate prior to its entry into the WPAF.
- e) The candidate may also request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on their instructional effectiveness. A candidate-initiated visit is optional and outside the required peer evaluation.
- f) In accordance with [FPPP 8.1.4.f](#), the evaluation of online classes should take place with the candidate present to give a narrative of online material. The scope of such evaluations shall be reasonably equivalent to the scope of one classroom visit. In order to assess the effectiveness of instruction in online courses, additional and/or substitute methods of data gathering likely will be necessary. For example, while some online courses include real-time instruction by the faculty member—allowing for the equivalent of a classroom visitation—other courses might consist of asynchronous content exclusively. The candidate, with the department’s assistance, is to provide a sufficient evidentiary basis for evaluation.
- g) Peer class observations of in-person or online synchronous courses shall use the following template.
- Name of Instructor Being Reviewed:
 - Course:
 - Date Observed:
 - Location:
 - Reviewer’s Name:
 - Description of the content and activities of the observed class session.
 - Preparation and organization. Comments:
 - Classroom time management. Comments:
 - Classroom atmosphere as conducive to learning. Comments:
 - Effectiveness of the plan for the class meeting. Comments:
 - Student engagement. Comments:
 - Reviewer’s Signature:
 - Date Submitted:
 - cc: Personnel File (5 days after submission)
- h) Peer class observations of online asynchronous courses shall use the following template.
- Name of Instructor Being Reviewed:
 - Course:
 - Date Observed:
 - Location:
 - Reviewer’s Name:
 - Description of the content and activities of the online course, as narrated by the instructor during the peer evaluation. Comments:
 - Reviewer’s Signature:
 - Candidate’s Signature:
 - Date Submitted:

- cc: Personnel File (5 days after submission)

8 CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW: TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

Candidates will be evaluated in the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service. During Performance Reviews, they will be given a rating by the Committee of EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS, MEETS EXPECTATIONS, or DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS. MEETS EXPECTATIONS shows strong performance by the candidate, and should be interpreted as such by the candidate and everyone involved in the process. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS means that the candidate has risen to a level of exceptional performance. DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS means that the candidate has not met the criteria to meet expectations in the area(s). Candidates in their first years toward tenure are not expected to meet all of the criteria listed in each category. Rather, they will be judged on whether, given their current performance, they are on track to reasonably meet those criteria by the time they go up for tenure and/or promotion. Thus, an achievement in one's first or second year may be the basis for a rating of "EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS," but the same achievement two or three years later, without additional achievements having been added, may result in a lower ranking than in the earlier review.

8.1 Instruction

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of teaching faculty. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) data shall be used, but will not weigh excessively, in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and shall not be used when determining a candidate's knowledge of their field. To this end, the candidate must diligently provide meaningful evidence, beyond SFOTs, of teaching performance. ([FPPP 10.2.5.a](#))

This data must include one course syllabus from every course taught during the review cycle. (duplicate syllabi are not required).

This data must include peer reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year. Colleagues should visit classes and provide developmental and evaluative feedback. The records of these visits should be included in the candidate's WPAF. Peer evaluation of instruction is not limited to departmental colleagues, of course; the candidate may request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on some aspect of instructional effectiveness. For example, one visitor may be well versed in classroom communication techniques, while another may focus on the content of the instructor's presentation. Classroom visitations can be initiated by the candidate or the department Personnel Committee. Normally, one classroom visitation per review period will suffice. However, under certain circumstances, the Personnel Committee may decide, by majority vote, that more than one classroom visitation is necessary during a review cycle. ([FPPP 10.2.5.b](#). See also Section 7 Peer Evaluations).

This data must also include evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom. ([FPPP 10.2.5.b](#))

- a) Either: Evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, including one or more of the following: use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors; incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy; creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment; or completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion. A candidate may make a case for another approach or activity undertaken to reduce equity gaps not listed here.
- b) Or: Data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses.

This data may also include ([FPPP 10.2.5.b](#)):

- a) Student letters supporting the faculty member.
- b) Peer review of course modules and structure.
- c) Evidence of revision and updating of course syllabi and materials, lesson plans.

All faculty are required to meet at a bare minimum the following standards for instruction:

- a) An understanding of faculty teaching responsibilities and one's professional role in and out of the classroom.
- b) Competence in the subject matter.
- c) Effective and professionally appropriate interaction with students in and out of class.
- d) Use of suitable course content, materials, and technology.
- e) Reasonable level of rigor for the class level in course content, process, and evaluation.
- f) Evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance.

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after written feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, or Department Chair, may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS, regardless of other criteria that may be met.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Candidates MEET EXPECTATIONS in by satisfying the minimum requirements (above), and Sections A and B. Failure to complete the following requirements of Section A and/or B is sufficient for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS.

SECTION A: Candidates who MEET EXPECTATIONS should show:

- a) Evidence of having incorporated peer and student feedback into their teaching.
- b) Evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom. ([FPPP 10.2.5.b](#))
 - Either: evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance (see above for possible evidence);
 - Or: data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses
- c) A reflection on SFOTs regarding student feedback on course design and syllabus, communication and interaction, engagement and learning, and the students' overall rating of courses. In addition to this, candidates should reflect on their ability to create a

productive learning experience for students, identify areas for improvement, and provide a plan for improvement.

SECTION B: In addition to SECTION A, candidates who MEET EXPECTATIONS must have done at least ONE of the following:

- a) Attended at least an average of 4 hours per year (or a total of 8 hours over a 2-year review period) of [FDEV](#) trainings, workshops, [TLP](#) consulting sessions, or presentations on improving teaching, using new or innovative technologies in the classroom, new pedagogies, and/or improving equity, diversity, and inclusion in classes.
- b) Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students.
- c) Participated in (or led) a semester- or year-long Faculty Learning Community focused on teaching or mentoring, or participated in (or led) an intensive summer learning program
- d) Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion
- e) A candidate may make a case for another type of activity.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

Candidates EXCEED EXPECTATIONS by satisfying the minimum requirements (above), and the following requirements of Sections A and B.

SECTION A: Candidates who EXCEED EXPECTATIONS should show:

- a) Evidence of having incorporated peer and student feedback into their teaching.
- b) Evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom ([FPPP 10.2.5.b](#))
 - Either: evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance (see above for possible evidence);
 - Or: data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses
- c) A reflection on SFOTs regarding student feedback on course design and syllabus, communication and interaction, engagement and learning, and the students' overall rating of courses. In addition to this, the candidate must demonstrate how they have created a productive learning experience for students, as well as demonstrate what they're doing that works, and provide further plans for improvement.

SECTION B: In addition to SECTION A, candidates who EXCEED EXPECTATIONS must have done at least FOUR of the following. (Candidates should indicate in the dossier whether evidence counts toward Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, or Service to the Department, College, and University. Evidence may not count towards more than one area)

- a) Attended at least an average of 4 hours per year (or a total of 8 hours over a 2-year review period) of [FDEV](#) trainings, workshops, [TLP](#) consulting sessions, or presentations on improving teaching, using new or innovative technologies in the classroom, new pedagogies, and/or improving equity, diversity, and inclusion in classes.

- b) Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students.
- c) Participated in (or led) a semester- or year-long Faculty Learning Community focused on teaching or mentoring, or participated in (or led) an intensive summer learning program.
- d) Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion.
- e) Advised or supervised honors or MA theses, student research projects, or independent study; or served as faculty mentor for public (non-class) student presentations on campus or in the CSU.
- f) Served as faculty mentor for students to present work at a regional or national academic conference.
- g) Created and taught a new course for the department that has not previously been in the catalog, including participation in getting the course approved by the university.
- h) Developed a faculty-led study abroad program.
- i) Taught a USAC or study abroad course.
- j) Integrated course(s) into the COIL Program.
- k) Served as resident director for an IP Program.
- l) Fulbright Appointment with teaching responsibilities.
- m) Served in an official role for other faculty as a trainer, facilitator, mentor, or evaluator in teaching. This includes being the mentor in a Faculty Learning Community, training other faculty in TLP-sponsored programs such as Go Virtual and Hyflex training, serving as a QLT mentor, serving as a fellow or evaluator for a teaching-related program through FDEV, or being assigned an official mentoring role within the Department or College.
- n) Served as a TA or SI mentor for a student.
- o) Included students in the faculty's own research process.
- p) Taught for adult or service-learning programs (OLLI, etc.).
- q) A candidate may make a case for another type of activity.

YEARS 2 AND 4 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

In years leading up to tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, the candidate will be evaluated using the same criteria as above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS.

In years leading up to tenure, the candidate will be evaluated as EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS when:

- a) they meet the same criteria as above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS for tenure; and
- b) that, in year 2 they participate in at least two or more of the additional activities listed in SECTION B for EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS; and in year 4 they participate in at least three or more (total) of the additional activities listed in SECTION B for EXCEEDS Expectations.

8.2 Professional Growth and Achievement

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Candidates MEET EXPECTATIONS in by completing the requirements of Sections A and B. Failure to complete Section A and/or B is sufficient for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS.

SECTION A: The candidate can MEET EXPECTATIONS for tenure and/or promotion with at least ONE of the following:

- a) Two pieces of scholarship from the list of **traditional scholarship** below.
- b) A combination of at least two pieces of scholarship listed in the section on **community engaged scholarship**.
- c) A combination of one item from each list (one from **traditional scholarship** and one from **community engaged scholarship**)
 - Traditional Scholarship (including co-authored scholarship)
 - i) Peer-reviewed journal articles.
 - ii) Chapters in anthologies and edited volumes.
 - iii) Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) articles or book chapters.
 - iv) Translations of works of scholarship or important source materials from other languages.
 - v) Documentary or critical editions and published collections of original historical documents gathered from appropriate archival sourced and edited with appropriate scholarly headnotes, footnotes, and introductory materials.
 - Community Engaged Scholarship
 - i) *Consulting Work*: providing expertise, advice, and consultation for local historical or preservation societies, governmental and nongovernmental agencies, and community groups. Contract research reports, administrative histories, interpretive plans or educational materials for historic sites, policy papers, expert testimony, and/or consulting reports.
 - ii) *Digital History Projects*: digital exhibits and publications offer multiple pathways for historians to collaborate, publish, and share their work with a wide variety of audiences. Projects using a variety of digital methods (i.e., mapping, network analysis, text analysis, visualization, etc.) in the production of digital exhibits and publications (online exhibitions, digital documentary editions, multimedia storytelling e-journals, digitized archives, online collection databases) all fit under this category. These projects are collaborative and may include co-authors.
 - iii) *Historic Preservation and Cultural Resource Management Projects*: including but not limited to, historic resource studies, historic structure reports, or nominations to the National Register of Historic Places.
 - iv) *Museum Exhibits*: curating exhibitions/installations, interpretive proposals, object research, exhibition scripts, catalogues, developing history-based public programming.
 - v) *Oral History Projects*: oral history projects take on different shapes and sizes based on the scholar's goals for the project. For example, while some scholars may opt for establishing an ongoing oral history project others may establish an oral history project with a set number of oral histories meant to capture a life history, or a community's experience with a singular event, moment, space, place, etc.

- vi) *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Projects*: engaging in the research and production of projects pertaining to pedagogy and classroom best practices. This work can take many forms, including obtaining grant funding, serving as a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (co-PI) on IRB-compliant research, writing assessments, conducting interviews and focus research, partnering with students in the classroom, collecting quantitative and qualitative data, analyzing and interpreting data, or undertaking other forms of systematic inquiry into student learning and pedagogy.

Recommendations for Community Engaged Scholarship: It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate that each item of Community Engaged Scholarship has been peer reviewed, and to explain how each item is the equivalent of an item of traditional scholarship (Section A).

- All historical work can be peer reviewed, whether before or after publication. There is no reason such work cannot be peer reviewed after publication as part of a promotion process. This principle would extend to any format that creates a product, whether written or preserved in other media. – From the [American Historical Association \(AHA\) Guidelines for Broadening the Definition of Historical Scholarship \(2023\)](#)
- “Review of public history products can and does take place within the scholarly journals to which departmental tenure and promotion committees turn for evaluation of the significance of scholarship. But it also takes place in other places and formats as well—local newspapers review museum exhibits; local community organizations and national professional associations recognize public history projects with awards and commendations; specialized online publications offer critical evaluations of museum exhibitions or the —gray literature of contract reports.” – From the [NCPH Engaged Historian White Paper \(2010\)](#)
- In explaining and evaluating peer review of Community Engaged Scholarship, Candidates are encouraged to follow the [AHA’s five categories of evaluation](#), to be used in various combinations and with varying emphases, depending on the form of scholarship under consideration.
 - i) Genre and Dissemination
 - ii) Argument and Documentation
 - iii) Impact and Influence
 - iv) Current and Future Trajectory of the Project
 - v) Collaboration

SECTION B: In addition to Section A, to meet expectations for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate must earn a minimum of 8 points to demonstrate active participation in the field (History or SoTL) with a combination of evidence from items listed below. In the dossier, candidates may make the case for other items to fit within a point category (grants, etc.), and it is up to the candidate to demonstrate the point equivalency. (Candidates should indicate in the dossier whether evidence counts toward Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, or

Service to the Department, College, and University. Evidence may not count towards more than one area)

a) ONE Point:

- Presentations or leadership of open forums with public groups or campus groups.
- Attendance at a scholarly meeting or professional conference.
- Peer reviewer of an article or chapter manuscript for a scholarly journal or academic press.
- Subject-expert in documentary films, television, and/or radio programs (e.g., interview, blog, or other commentary as historians in the popular media).
- An op-ed piece, magazine article or other forms of journalism.
- Contributions to textbooks, encyclopedias, reference books, books, and magazine articles and/or newsletters intended for broad audiences.

b) TWO Points:

- Peer reviewer of a book-length manuscript for a university press or equivalent press.
- Peer reviewer of community engaged scholarship project (see above).
- Book review (including film review, exhibit review, or other media projects essay on historiography and related subjects).
- Served as a member of a journal editorial board.
- Served on a community board or organization in a way that utilizes their Historical or SoTL skills and areas of expertise.
- Papers and lectures delivered at scholarly meetings or professional conferences.

c) THREE Points:

- An extended book review or historiography essay for a peer-reviewed journal or university press.
- Plenary and keynote addresses delivered to scholarly meetings or professional conferences.
- Honors and awards for research and scholarship.
- Archival administration projects such as the creation of finding aids based on the processing of a manuscript collection.
- Served as guest editor of an issue of a journal.

d) FOUR Points:

- Additional item from Section A (traditional or community engaged scholarship).
- Served as the editor of a journal.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

The candidate can EXCEED EXPECTATIONS for tenure and/or promotion with at least ONE of the following:

- a) An original, peer-reviewed, book published by an academic press of national or international stature. Because of the length of time it takes scholarly presses to produce a book, the Department of History defines a “published book” as the familiar bound volume, as well as a

book manuscript that has been accepted for publication and is in press in a form that can be read by colleagues and circulated to external reviewers.

- b) Three pieces of scholarship from the list of **traditional scholarship** below.
- c) A combination of at least three pieces of scholarship listed in the section on **community engaged scholarship**.
- d) A combination of three items from each list (one from **traditional scholarship** and one from **community engaged scholarship**)

Additionally, the candidate must have achieved at least 12 points (including the third item of traditional or community engaged scholarship) or more from Section B above.

YEARS 2 AND 4 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

In years leading up to tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, the candidate will be evaluated on professional growth and achievement as MEETS EXPECTATIONS when:

- a) They demonstrate evidence of sufficient progress toward meeting Section A requirements for MEETS EXPECTATIONS for tenure; and
- b) For section B, they achieved 2 points by year 2 performance evaluation and 4 points by year 4 performance evaluation for MEETS EXPECTATIONS for tenure.

In years leading up to tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, the candidate will be evaluated on professional growth and achievement as EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS when:

- a) They demonstrate evidence of sufficient progress toward meeting Section A for EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS for tenure; and
- b) For section B, they achieved 3 points by year 2 performance evaluation and 6 points by year 4 performance evaluation for EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS for tenure.

8.3 Service to the Department, College, University, and Community

Service is meant to contribute to the Strategic Priorities and Enduring Commitments of the University at the levels of the department, college, university and/or community. Evaluation in the area of service is based not just on the number of activities or committees, but on the work involved with and the achievements of those committees in the particular years served.

All faculty are required to meet at a bare minimum the following standards for service.

- a) Regularly attend faculty meetings in their entirety.
- b) Serve on and actively participate in departmental committees and the work of those committees (after the first year on the tenure track) commensurate with time in rank.
- c) Participate in other mandatory department meetings/events.
- d) Demonstrate a willingness to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues, including completing assignments in a timely fashion and responding to email.
- e) Participate on active department committees (number of committees or intensity of committee workload should be commensurate with rank and time in rank).

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after written feedback from peers, the Committee, or Department Chair may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS, regardless of other criteria that may be met.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Candidates MEET EXPECTATIONS in by satisfying the minimum requirements (above), and Sections A and B. Failure to complete the following requirements of Section A and/or B is sufficient for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS.

SECTION A: The candidate must demonstrate active participation in faculty meetings and on department committees, which could include:

- a) Working on projects.
- b) Developing or revising policies.
- c) Writing or revising reports.
- d) Staffing tables at various events such as Chico Preview Day or Choose Chico Day.
- e) Other activities that demonstrate engagement and active participation.

Beyond the department, the candidate must have also actively participated on College and/or University committees (number of committees or intensity of committee workload should be commensurate with rank and time in rank).

SECTION B: Furthermore, to receive a rating of MEETS EXPECTATIONS for tenure and/or promotion, candidates must also be able to demonstrate regular participation in a minimum of TWO of the following activities. (Candidates should indicate in the dossier whether evidence counts toward Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, or Service to the Department, College, and University. Evidence may not count towards more than one area).

- a) Served as Advisor to a student group.
- b) Served on a community board or organization in a way that utilizes their Historical or SoTL skills and areas of expertise.
- c) Participated in a committee, held an appointment or was an officer in a History- or SoTL-related organization.
- d) Provided multiple guest lectures to classes, or on-campus presentations to student groups.
- e) Provided multiple on-campus presentations or trainings to faculty or staff.
- f) Provided expertise to organizations, agencies, or community groups.
- g) Worked with students, staff and faculty to help others gain recognition for their exceptional work, achievements, honors, and contributions.
- h) Provided extraordinary advising and mentoring activities not included under the area of Instruction.
- i) Contributed to the Department or University beyond the classroom aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, or otherwise helping the Department, College or University to meet the needs of our underserved students.
- j) Participated in other activities that the candidate can demonstrate provide a service to students, the Department, the College, the University, and/or the community.

- k) Held leadership/officer positions in campus affinity groups that facilitate faculty professional development and diverse student success (e.g., Black Faculty Staff Association, Chicano/Latino Council, 1st Gen and Proud Faculty and Staff Association, LGBTQ Faculty and Staff Association, Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association).
- l) Participated in and/or presenting at diversity, equity and inclusion professional development opportunities (e.g., Faculty Learning Community on Inclusive Pedagogy, Diversity Academy and/or Certificate Program, Safe Zone Ally Training).
- m) Made contributions aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, HSI related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiative priorities, Basic Needs Initiative priorities, healing-centered campus priorities, etc.
- n) A candidate may make a case for another type of activity.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

The candidate must be able to demonstrate service contributions that are substantially above that which is expected for the MEETS EXPECTATIONS rating. “Substantially above” will normally mean significantly engaging in SIX or more activities in Section B, or an exceptionally heavy workload in a smaller number of those (e.g. Academic Senate). It is up to the candidate to explain the scope and extent of the work done, and to make a case for why it went beyond meeting expectations.

YEARS 2 AND 4 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

In years leading up to tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, the candidate will be evaluated as MEETS EXPECTATIONS when:

- a) They demonstrate evidence of sufficient progress toward the basic requirements for MEETS EXPECTATIONS above; and
- b) That, in year 2 they participate in at least ONE of the additional activities in Section B; and in year 4 they participate in at least TWO of the additional activities in Section B.

In years leading up to tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, the candidate will be evaluated as EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS when:

- a) They demonstrate evidence of sufficient progress toward the basic requirements for MEETS EXPECTATIONS above; and
- b) That, in year 2 they participate in at least TWO or more of the additional activities in Section B (or an exceptionally heavy workload in a smaller number of those); and in year 4 they participate in at least FOUR or more of the additional activities in Section B (or an exceptionally heavy workload in a smaller number of those).

9 RETENTION

Retention or non-retention of a probationary faculty member should be based on assessment of the candidate’s activities during the period under review.

- a) Persons in tenure-track positions must be making expected progress toward the achievement of tenure in order to merit retention as specified above.

- b) Retention shall be reviewed as a progression over the six-year cycle towards achieving the instructional skills, professional growth and development, and participation in university service needed to achieve tenure.
- c) In order to be recommended for retention faculty must be rated at least as MEETS EXPECTATIONS commensurate with their time in rank in all three areas; been actively striving to meet the Committee's recommendations in previous years; and have shown improvement as they progress toward tenure.

10 TENURE

For tenure, a candidate must, at a minimum, MEET EXPECTATIONS in all three areas.

- a) Time in rank, including credit for prior year(s) of service, should follow the guidelines of the [FPPP](#).

11 PROMOTION

Tenure usually, but not always, comes with the granting of a promotion. They are two separate votes at each level of review.

11.1 Associate Professor

In order to be promoted to Associate Professor, a candidate must, at a minimum, MEET EXPECTATIONS in all three areas.

11.2 Full Professor

In consideration of promotion, the period of review shall be the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank. In order to be promoted to Full Professor, a candidate must, at a minimum, MEET EXPECTATIONS in all three areas.

12 ACCELERATED TENURE AND PROMOTION

According to the [FPPP 10.5](#), probationary faculty can make a written request for consideration for accelerated ("early") tenure and/or promotion prior to meeting the required years of service.

- a) The candidate must provide substantial evidence of being truly exceptional for promotion and for a special case for tenure.
- b) They must have achieved a rating of EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in all three areas of evaluation.
- c) In considering the uniqueness of special case for accelerated tenure/promotion, the standard applied is at a much higher level than expectations for "on time" tenure and promotion. The greater the divergence from "normal time in service," the more evidence is required to determine exceptional performance in all three areas of review.
- d) To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must have exceeded expectations in all three areas of evaluation in a Performance Review, demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to the department's typical full-time assignment. Candidates may request accelerated tenure or promotion in

writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. See [FPPP 10.5](#) and Section 12 for more information.

- e) To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor, the candidate must have exceeded expectations in all three areas of evaluation in a Performance Review, demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. See FPPP 11.1.3 for more information.

13 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURED AND FERP FACULTY

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in [FPPP 11](#).

- a) Tenured professors will submit a dossier with evidence of their teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service at intervals no greater than five years.
- b) They must provide their curriculum vitae, reflections on SFOTs, materials showing efforts to reduce grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses, and other supporting evidence in the three areas of review. A narrative or interpretation is only required to provide evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, is optional for faculty who want to highlight recent achievements, and is encouraged for faculty who want to explain special circumstances.
- c) At least one classroom visitation should be conducted during the review period.
- d) Other responsibilities held by the faculty member that are identified in the [CBA](#) and deemed relevant to the position should also be evaluated.
- e) Evaluations of Full Professors and of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are not expected to be as comprehensive or rigorous as the evaluations normally conducted for faculty prior to promotion to Full Professor.
- f) Tenured and FERP faculty must participate in the SFOT process at the same level as other faculty.
- g) After assessing the data but prior to writing the report, the Committee shall interview candidates to clarify any unresolved questions. Minutes of the interview should be taken.
- h) The report from the History Department shall be completed and forwarded to the Dean in accordance with the RTP schedule.
- i) The Personnel Committee Chair and the Dean will meet with the faculty under review to discuss the Committee's report. The Dean has the option of writing a report.
- j) Additional evaluations of tenured faculty can be initiated by the Dean per [FPPP 8.6.c](#).

14 PROCEDURES FOR FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME LECTURER REVIEWS

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the [FPPP 9.1](#). The guidelines below are meant to augment those sections.

- a) Lecturer faculty are required to submit a dossier that at minimum includes a reflective narrative on teaching that discusses efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, a current curriculum vitae, syllabi, SFOTS, and Peer Evaluations.
- b) Lecturer faculty will be notified by the Dean's office and/or Personnel Chair if they will be having a review during a particular academic year, and of the due date for submission of their dossier.

- c) If the dossier is not submitted, it may be documented as UNSATISFACTORY in their Periodic Evaluation.
- d) Lecturer faculty who are not eligible for nor are currently holding a three-year appointment will undergo an annual review and classroom observation for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews ([FPPP 9.1.4.a](#)). The review shall consider the candidate's work performance since their initial date of appointment or since the last evaluation, whichever is more recent.
- e) Lecturer faculty eligible for an initial three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of the initial three-year appointment. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire six or more years of consecutive service on the same campus that make up the qualifying period for the initial three-year appointment ([FPPP 9.1.4.c](#)).
- f) Lecturer faculty holding three-year appointments who are eligible for subsequent reappointment shall be evaluated in the third year of their appointment, and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of either the employee or the Dean. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire preceding three-year period ([FPPP 9.1.4.d](#)).
- g) Reviews will normally not be conducted during a lecturer's first semester.
- h) All lecturer faculty will participate in the normal SFOT process for all classes taught.

15 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME LECTURER FACULTY

Lecturer faculty are required to provide evidence that they are SATISFACTORY in the area of Instruction, including their SFOTs, peer classroom observations, and other evidence. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) shall be used, but shall not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of teaching performance and shall not be used to determine a candidate's knowledge of their discipline. Consequently, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide supplemental evidence in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance. The candidate must diligently provide meaningful evidence of teaching performance consistent with the candidate's Range classification and teaching responsibilities. ([9.1.2.c.1](#))

This data must include one course syllabus from every course taught during the review cycle (duplicate syllabi are not required).

This data must include peer reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year. Colleagues should visit classes and provide developmental and evaluative feedback. The records of these visits should be included in the candidate's WPAF. Peer evaluation of instruction is not limited to departmental colleagues, of course; the candidate may request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on some aspect of instructional effectiveness. For example, one visitor may be well versed in classroom communication techniques, while another may focus on the content of the instructor's presentation. Classroom visitations can be initiated by the candidate or the department Personnel Committee. Normally, one classroom visitation per review period will suffice. However, under certain circumstances, the Personnel Committee

may decide, by majority vote, that more than one classroom visitation is necessary during a review cycle. ([FPPP 9.1.2.c.2](#). See also Section 7 Peer Evaluations)

This data must also include evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom. ([FPPP 9.1.2.c.2](#))

- a) Either: Evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, including one or more of the following: use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors; incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy; creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment; or completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion. A candidate may make a case for another approach or activity undertaken to reduce equity gaps not listed here;
- b) Or: Data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses.

This data may also include ([FPPP 9.1.2.c.2](#))

- a) Student letters supporting the faculty member
- b) Peer review of course modules and structure
- c) Evidence of revision and updating of course syllabi and materials, lesson plans

SATISFACTORY

All faculty are required to meet at a bare minimum the following standards.

- a) An understanding of faculty teaching responsibilities and one's professional role in and out of the classroom
- b) Competence in the subject matter
- c) Effective and professionally appropriate interaction with students in and out of class
- d) Use of suitable course content, materials, and technology
- e) Reasonable level of rigor in course content, process, and evaluation
- f) Evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after written feedback from students, peers, Personnel Committee, or Department Chair may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of UNSATISFACTORY, regardless of other criteria that may be met.

Additionally, candidates whose performance is SATISFACTORY should show:

- a) A reflection on SFOTs regarding student feedback on course design and syllabus, communication and interaction, engagement and learning, and the students' overall rating of the course. In addition to this, candidates should reflect on their ability to create a productive learning experience for students, identify areas for improvement, and provide a plan for improvement.

In accordance with [FPPP 9.1.3.d](#), lecturer faculty may talk about research, publications, or service that are not part of their work assignment, but which result in positive contributions to

the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University and/or to the Community. While these activities are not required, evidence of these contributions may be acknowledged in the Department's evaluation, though such activities will not directly affect the evaluation of the lecturer's teaching.

16 SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR LECTURER FACULTY

Lecturer faculty are permitted to undertake opportunities for research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement or professional currency as suitable for their own growth as teacher scholars ([CBA 27.1](#)).

- a) Full-time lecturer faculty are eligible to apply for sabbatical leave ([CBA 27.2](#))
- b) Lecturer faculty may receive university, college or departmental support for service on academic committees including department, college, and university committees.

17 RANGE ELEVATION FOR LECTURER FACULTY

When hired, lecturer faculty are assigned to a range (A, B, or C) based on their qualifications, experience, and course assignments. Range elevations are a promotion from one range to the next (for example, from Lecturer A to Lecturer B). They are significant promotions that come with at least a 5% salary increase. The elevations are considered comparable as moving from Assistant Professor to Associate, or from Associate to Full for those on the tenure-track. Lecturer faculty must apply for a range increase as a separate process than the RTP review process. For eligibility and details, refer to [FPPP 12](#). The Dean's Office will notify lecturer faculty when they are eligible for range elevations.

The FPPP stipulates that candidates "must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is most recent. Professional growth and development is defined as 'teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field,'" and requires each department to clearly define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field.

To this end, we define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field as the following:

In addition to meeting the bare minimum requirements for instruction (defined above in this document), the candidate who demonstrates teaching excellence will have:

- a) A reflection on SFOTs regarding student feedback on course design and syllabus, communication and interaction, engagement and learning, and the students' overall rating of courses. In addition to this, the candidate must demonstrate how they have created a productive learning experience for students, as well as demonstrate what they're doing that works, and provide further plans for improvement.

AND have done ONE of the following:

- a) Advised or supervised honors thesis, student research project, or independent study.

- b) Attended at least an average 4 hours per year, or a total of 12 hours over a 3-year contract period, of trainings, workshops, Technology and Learning Program (TLP) consulting sessions, or presentations on improving teaching, using new or innovative technologies in the classroom, new pedagogies, and/or improving equity, diversity, and inclusion in classes.
- c) Participated in a semester-long or year-long Faculty Learning Community (FLC) focused on teaching or mentoring, or in an intensive summer learning program.
- d) Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion
- e) Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students.
- f) Served in an official role for other faculty as a trainer, facilitator, mentor, or evaluator in teaching. This includes being the mentor in an FLC, training other faculty in TLP-sponsored programs such as Go Virtual and Hyflex training, serving as a QLT mentor, serving as a fellow or evaluator for a teaching-related program through FDEV, or being assigned an official mentoring role within the Department or College.
- g) Served as a mentor for the Teaching Apprenticeship, following the guidelines outlined in the Apprenticeship syllabus and contract.
- h) Created and taught a new course for the department that has not previously been in the catalog, including participation in getting the course approved by the university.
- i) Served on department, college, or university committees (see Section 16).
- j) Earned an external grant for research- or teaching-related activities, or for community projects related to their areas of teaching or expertise in History.
- k) Activities or achievements supporting currency in the discipline. ([FPPP 9.1.2.c.4](#))
- l) Activities or achievements that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College and University as well as the Community. ([FPPP 9.1.2.c.5](#))

18 APPENDIX

18.1 Abbreviations

- a) CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement)
- b) FDEV (Office of Faculty Development)
- c) FERP (Faculty Early Retirement Program)
- d) FPPP (Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures)
- e) HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution)
- f) FLC (Faculty Learning Community)
- g) MOI (Mode of Instruction)
- h) QLT (Quality Learning and Teaching)
- i) PAF (Personnel Action File)
- j) RTP (Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)
- k) SFOT (Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning)
- l) TLP (Technology and Learning Program)
- m) WPAF (Working Personnel Action File)

18.2 Links

- a) [CBA](#)
- b) [Department Mission Statement](#)
- c) [FPPP](#)
- d) [RTP Deadline Calendar](#)
- e) [University Strategic Priorities](#)



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 Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.
- c) Faculty Affairs and Success 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 Faculty Affairs and Success.
- e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee 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 Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

Chair/Director Approval: 
Robert Tinkler (Apr 22, 2024 15:27 PDT)

Date: Apr 22, 2024

Dean Review: 

Date: May 13, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval: 

Date: May 15, 2024