

Table of Contents

RETENTION, TENURE & PROMOTION EVALUATION CRITERIA

- I. Instruction
- II. Professional Growth and Achievement
- III. Other Contributions to the University
- IV. Competence Required for, and Willingness to Adjust to University-Approved Department/Unit Master Plan
- V. Evaluation Standards
- VI. Expectations for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR LECTURER FACULTY

- I. Appointment and Reappointment
- II. Evaluation Procedure

GLOSSARY OF TERMS/APPENDIX

Department of Journalism & Public Relations
RETENTION, TENURE & PROMOTION EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised August 2022)

Three areas of evaluation will be considered at all review levels in making recommendations on retention, tenure, and promotion with stated differences for full-time lecturers: 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.

The committee evaluation will be based upon the evidence presented in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF, CBA, Article 11), including the dossier. The evaluation should take into consideration the candidate's rank, workload, assigned time, and previous developmental feedback. Various aspects of documented activities should be considered, including the following: quality, quantity, originality, relative role of the faculty member (e.g., authorship, contributor, officer), rigor of external review, and prestige. Specific guidelines for evaluations follow.

I. INSTRUCTION: Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion for teaching faculty. By instruction shall be meant the teaching of regularly scheduled classes and teaching accomplished in related instructional activities.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness will be provided by the following:

1. Data obtained from Peer Evaluation Reports used in classroom visitations and observations by members of the Departmental RTP Committee.

Classroom observation reports shall contain all of the following:

- a. an enumeration of date, time, name of class taught
 - b. a descriptive narrative that enumerates the subject matter covered in the class, the activities of the class observed, the atmosphere in the class, etc.
 - c. an evaluative section that addresses issues such as competence demonstrated, organization, communicative efficacy, etc.
 - d. a final overall rating of the observed teaching utilizing the university categories of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations.
2. Data obtained from Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning forms ([SFOTs](#)), including student comments collected in the process. (SFOT "data shall be used, but will not weigh excessively, in the overall evaluation..." per FPPP 10.2.5.a)
 3. Reflective narratives and curricular revisions informed by pedagogical experiences, peer reviews, SFOT data and other relevant instructional phenomena.
 4. The evaluation of teaching shall include copies of examinations, syllabi, other classroom

handouts, workbooks, and examples of student work. Additional evidence of teaching shall be composed of examples of professional activities and achievement that yield currency in the discipline that informs instruction, following the teacher-scholar model of instruction.

5. The evaluation of teaching shall include an interview between the RTP committee and the faculty member being reviewed. It may also include signed statements from students, colleagues and any others attesting to teaching effectiveness or factual or documentary materials as available and relevant to the assessment of the faculty member's teaching.
6. Faculty course load, student enrollments in courses, and generation and contribution to department and college [FTES](#) may be considered.
7. Also to be considered is the faculty member's involvement in curriculum development committees and materials, service as course coordinator for multi-sectioned courses, student advising, supervision of internship programs, running faculty workshops, advising student clubs, participation in/presenting at diversity, equity and inclusion professional development opportunities.
8. Finally, teaching General Education classes, working to enhance instructional technology or involvement in the K-12 program in a pedagogical or advisory capacity will also be taken into consideration in assessing instruction.

II. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

1. Professional growth is evidenced by currency in the discipline that best represents the training and experience of the faculty member. Professional growth is also evidenced by active participation in the discipline. This active participation should have a connection to and benefit the instructional responsibilities of the individual faculty member. Evidence of such currency and active participation include but are not limited to: regular participation at the conferences of the major professional associations and societies representing the faculty member's discipline; serving as a referee, panel member or critic relative to the papers presented at such conferences; and attending workshops for the purpose of acquiring skills necessary for professional achievement and/or instruction.
2. Professional achievement refers to the faculty member's contribution to the theoretical and practical knowledge base of the field. Professional achievement is evidenced by tangible examples of expertise.
3. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to appropriately categorize information relevant to the RTP Committee's evaluation of professional growth and achievement and clearly document this information.
4. Peer-reviewed journal articles are the traditional hallmark of professional achievement. Because of the diverse nature of our profession as both a scholarly *and* creative endeavor, other contributions are also recognized as similarly important achievements. The quality as well as quantity and rate of accomplishment of the candidate's achievements will be assessed according to academic or industry standards, depending on which is most appropriate in respect to the nature of the content.

Though scholarly, professional, and creative content are not scaled as data, the quality of any given contribution is more clearly demonstrated by achievement in Area 1 (over Area 2 and 3) and in Area 2 (over Area 3). Area 1 contributions must be supported by evidence of quality: including but not limited to citations, acceptance rates, and the prestige of the publishing or judging organization. For example, journals and meetings sponsored by the

major academic communication organizations are deemed to have high quality. These organizations include but are not limited to AEJMC, ICA, NCA, AJHA, AAPOR, BEA, CMA, IAMCR. The evaluation of creative and professional endeavors within Journalism and Public Relations require different expertise than those that are traditionally academic, but with a similar goal—to differentiate more substantial achievements from those that are lesser. The range of non-academic professional growth and achievements that are essential to the J&PR professions is broad and varied, yet similar qualitative judgments can often be used. For example, a book-length work of non-fiction that is published by a high-prestige publishing company with low acceptance rates should be judged similarly to an academic work of the same kind. A literary essay similar in length and rigor to a peer-reviewed journal article should also be treated in kind to the academic work.

The items below are not an exhaustive list. Candidates may make a case for achievements that may qualify in the various categories. However, when evidence of quality and/or rigor is not supplied by the candidate, is not obviously evident, or the department does not possess personnel with the appropriate expertise, the department committee, in concert with the candidate, will seek external guidance from similar academic personnel and/or industry professionals to assist in accurately rating those achievements.

Area 1 (includes but is not limited to)

- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Highly competitive literary essays
- Books (e.g., textbook, anthology, scholarly book or book-length creative piece with a respected publisher)
- Chapters in edited scholarly books
- Editor of academic journals or scholarly books
- Internationally- and nationally-competitive external grants awarded
- High-visibility and/or high-impact content creation
 - Article-length essay (peer-reviewed and/or competitively selected)
 - Widely acclaimed digital storytelling (e.g., adjudicated photo gallery, screened documentary, popular serial podcast, etc.)
- Consultations and contracts (international and national)
 - Directing and/or managing contracts and/or grants provided by an external organization (government, foundation, etc.) and connected to academic or professional area of expertise.

Area 2

- Regionally- or state-competitive external and internal grants awarded
- Internationally- or nationally-competitive external grant submissions
- Presentations
 - Peer-Reviewed article (international, national, regional and state)
 - Invited (international, national, regional and state)
 - Workshops and Panels (international, national, regional and state)
- Articles
 - Peer-reviewed proceedings
 - Peer-reviewed practitioner journals or magazines
 - Technical reports

- Informal, lower-impact national publications (e.g., magazines, newsletters, newspapers, technical reports)
- Reviewer of journals or textbooks
- Reviewer for or respondent at conference research sessions
- Consultations and contracts (regional and state)

Area 3

- Presentations
 - Professional conferences (local)
 - Workshops (local)
- Publications for local or regional publications (e.g., magazines, newsletters, newspapers, technical reports)
- Local or internal grants or research contracts awarded
- Local grant proposals submitted
- Professional conference participation
- Consultations (local)

III. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY

All other contributions to the university will be measured in the context of their contribution to the university's [Strategic Plan](#). Consideration will be given to the faculty member's willingness and ability to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues. J&PR faculty should provide evidence of contributions to the department, college, the profession, and the community beyond the university.

1. Contributions to the department: Participation in committee work and other activity necessary for the normal functioning of the department is expected of all faculty.
2. Contributions to the School and the university: As with departmental contributions, contributions at these levels will be weighted according to the significance of the contributions.
3. Service with organizations external to the university will be weighted according to the significance of the contribution and its relevance to a faculty member's training and teaching responsibilities.
4. Service activities include but are not limited to the following:
 - Department committees and assignments (advising, accreditation, curriculum)
 - College committees and assignments
 - University committees and assignments
 - External or university award for service/advising
 - Officer or significant participation in professional societies (international, national, regional, state)
 - Official advisor/sponsor of student organizations or clubs
 - Community service

- Student recruitment
- Fundraising

IV. COMPETENCE REQUIRED FOR, AND WILLINGNESS TO ADJUST TO, UNIVERSITY-APPROVED DEPARTMENT/UNIT STRATEGIC PLAN

In accordance with the [Strategic Planning Document](#), faculty members will be evaluated in terms of their ability and willingness to assume both the currently defined duties of their position and other teaching assignments or instructionally related assignments, if the need arises.

V. EVALUATION STANDARDS

After the evaluation, the RTP committee must select the corresponding ratings (Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations) based on the descriptions in the [FPPP](#). Key adjectives and phrases from this section of the [FPPP](#) for each rating are in quotation marks, with typical examples below:

Exceeds Expectations

Instruction: “consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards.”

Consistently some of the highest peer, chair, and SFOT evaluations

Professional Growth and Achievement: “significant and highly regarded,” “consummate professionalism and significant, highly regarded scholarly achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community.”

Other Contributions to the University: “high level of involvement” and “key roles on significant university-, college-, and department-level committees”

Consistent leadership in university, college or department committees

Meets Expectations

Instruction: Substantial professionalism and competence.

Strong peer, chair, and SFOT evaluations and course materials

Professional Growth and Achievement: Substantial, significant scholarly and/or creative growth and achievement.

Other Contributions to the University: “consistent” and “occasional assumption of key roles”

Service with some leadership on department, college, or university committees

Does Not Meet Expectations: “less-than-satisfactory”

Instruction: “evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level”

Low peer, chair, and SFOT evaluations and course materials.

Professional Growth and Achievement: “does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly achievement”

Other Contributions to the University: “does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement”

Inconsistent or non-participation in department and committee meetings.

VI EXPECTATIONS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

In relation to recommendations on retention, tenure and promotion the committee should follow the guidelines of [FPPP](#). Normally, a faculty member will be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure according to the schedule in the FPPP. Specific guidelines for retention, tenure and promotion include:

· **Retention** – Candidate must be rated at least “Meets Expectations” in “Instruction” and one of the two remaining categories.

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations
Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent Peer Observations (6 or higher in most categories) ● Excellent course material/design according to RTP Committee ● Willingness to reflect and improve ● High SFOT ratings (4.5 or higher in most categories)* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good peer observations (5 or higher in most categories) ● Good course material/design, according to RTP Committee ● Good SFOT ratings (4 or higher in most categories)*
PG&A	At least one Area 1 achievement plus Area 2 or Area 3 achievements, OR several Area 2 achievement(s)	At least one Area 2 Achievement(s) and/or evidence of significant progress towards an Area 1 achievement (E.g., journal article under review)
Other Contributions	Substantial department, college and university Service. as well as extra-university activities specified	Department service plus either college or university service, OR substantial department service (E.g., several department committees)

* SFOT scores from traditionally low-scoring courses (including, but not limited to, controversial subjects) where it is clear the scores are a result of student responses to the subject matter and not poor instruction may still reach “Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” with quantitative SFOT scores lower than those listed above. However, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make a compelling evidence-based argument for why that is the case, and it will be the place of each level of review to give

Careful consideration to that argument.

Contract renewal two (End of 4th year) instruction must be at least “meets expectations” and either PGA OR Service must be at least “meets expectations”

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations
Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent Peer Observations (6 or higher in most categories) ● Excellent course material/design according to RTP Committee ● Willingness to reflect and improve ● High SFOT ratings (4.5 or higher in most categories)* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good peer observations (5 or higher in most categories) ● Good course material/design, according to RTP Committee ● Willingness to reflect and improve ● Good SFOT ratings (4 or higher in most categories)*
PG&A	At least one Area 1 and more than one Area 2 achievements.	More than one Area 2 achievement AND significant progress towards an Area 1 achievement/ OR more than one Area 3 achievements.
Other Contributions	Significant department, college and university Service as well as extra-university activities specified above.	At least some department AND college service.

* SFOT scores from traditionally low-scoring courses (including, but not limited to, controversial subjects) where it is clear the scores are a result of student responses to the subject matter and not poor instruction may still reach “Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” with quantitative SFOT scores lower than those listed above. However, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make a compelling evidence-based argument for why that is the case, and it will be the place of each level of review to give careful consideration to that argument.

- **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor** – Candidate must be minimally rated "Meets Expectations" in all three RTP categories below.

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations
Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent Peer Observations (6 or higher in most categories) ● Excellent course material/design according to RTP Committee ● Clear reflection on feedback plans for improved pedagogy ● High SFOT ratings (4.5 or higher in most categories)* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good peer observations (5 or higher in most categories) ● Good course material/design, according to RTP Committee ● Evidence of acceptable reflection and improvement where the need was previously indicated ● Good SFOT ratings (4 or higher in most categories)*
PG&A	More than two Area 1 achievements AND more than two Area 2 achievements.	At least two Area 1 achievements and at least two Area 2 achievements. Area 3 achievements contribute to the overall body of work and impact.
Other Contributions	Significant department, college and university service	At least significant department and college service.

* SFOT scores from traditionally low-scoring courses (including, but not limited to, controversial subjects or social identity) where it is clear the scores are a result of student responses to the subject matter and not poor instruction may still reach “Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” with quantitative SFOT scores lower than those listed above. However, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make a compelling evidence-based argument for why that is the case, and it will be the place of each level of review to give careful consideration to that argument.

- **Promotion to the rank of professor** will be based on the preceding measurements of “instruction” and “other contributions,” as well as two other factors: the faculty member must have a sustained record of research/scholarly/creative activity post-tenure, as well as a substantial recognition at/or beyond the university. Substantial recognition demands that a faculty member be widely known among his/her scholarly/creative peers as evidenced by examples of professional achievement; or by recognition of teaching excellence as evidenced by university-wide awards for such; or recognition for superior service far and above that evidenced by a majority of the university faculty. Candidate must provide evidence and a track record of continued Area 1 and/or Area 2 contributions in Professional Growth and Achievement.

- **Promotion to rank of Professor** – Candidate must be minimally rated "Exceeds

Expectations" in teaching or PG&A, and "Meets Expectations" in Other Contributions. Additionally, the candidate must be able to show evidence that they have obtained substantial recognition at/or beyond the university.

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations
Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent Peer Observations (6 or higher in most categories) ● Excellent course material/design according to RTP Committee ● Willingness to reflect and improve ● High SFOT ratings (4.5) or higher in most categories)* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good peer observations (5 or higher in most categories) ● Good course material/design, according to RTP Committee ● Evidence of reflection and improvement where the need was previously indicated ● Good SFOT ratings (4 or higher in most categories)*
PG&A	More than two Area 1 achievements AND more than two Area 2 achievements in the five-year period prior to review.	At least two Area 1 achievements and at least two Area 2 achievements within the five-year period prior to review. Area 3 achievements contribute to the overall body of work and impact.
Other Contributions	Significant department, college and university service	At least significant department and college service.

* SFOT scores from traditionally low-scoring courses (including, but not limited to, controversial subjects or social identity) where it is clear the scores are a result of student responses to the subject matter and not poor instruction may still reach "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations" with quantitative SFOT scores lower than those listed above. However, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make a compelling evidence-based argument for why that is the case, and it will be the place of each level of review to give careful consideration to that argument.

- **Accelerated (early) tenure and/or promotion** will be considered in cases (Per [FPPP 10.5.3](#)) where there is abundant and unequivocal evidence to support (1) a rating of "Exceed Expectations" in each category of evaluation, (2) must demonstrate the likelihood that this level of productivity will continue, and (3) must do so during a full academic year under what is considered the department's full workload.

Policies and Procedures for Lecturer Faculty, including Professionals-in-Residence (August 2022)

I. Appointment and Reappointment

1. Appointees shall be selected from a pool of applicants and nominees to the Department of Journalism & Public Relations, established in accord with approved university, college, and department [Affirmative Action Policy](#) guidelines. Appointees shall be selected primarily on the basis of their anticipated excellence as teacher, as indicated by previous relevant professional experience, experience in teaching and/or academic or practical preparation for the course or courses to be taught.

2. Lecturer faculty includes full-time and part-time appointees, normally appointed for a semester or academic year.

Lecturer appointees in Ranges L. and A will hold the bachelor's or master's degree and have a minimum of five years full-time equivalent professional and/or full-time equivalent teaching experience. Appointees in these ranges will have responsibility for conducting assigned classes and demonstrating professional activity appropriate to the teaching assignment.

Lecturer appointees in Range B will hold the master's and a minimum of seven years of full-time professional and/or full-time equivalent teaching experience. Those holding the doctoral degree must have teaching and professional experience appropriate to the demands of the instructional assignment.

Lecturer appointees in Ranges C and D will hold the doctoral degree and have a minimum of six years of full-time equivalent teaching experience at the university level. Those not holding the doctoral degree must have at least 10 years experience at a regional, national or international media/communication organization.

II. Evaluation Procedure (Review and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty)

Temporary and 15-unit base lecturers moving within ranges will normally be evaluated following the procedures and guidelines in this section. The only options for evaluation are satisfactory or unsatisfactory according to the [FPPP](#).

Criteria for Evaluation

A. The primary mission of this university is teaching which shall be the primary criterion for evaluating lecturer and 15-unit base faculty.

B. In evaluating teaching effectiveness the following shall be the main criteria for evaluation: Organization, scholarship/professional-knowledge in the field, and effective communication. Evidence of teaching effectiveness will be largely similar to the tenured/tenure-track, but will often diverge in respect to the teacher-scholar model, but focus instead on professional standards application and participation in the field rather than scholarship where professional skills are the primary reason for hire.

C. In addition to the primary criterion of teaching, lecturer faculty will be evaluated for:

1) Their engaging in professional activity in the field appropriate to their teaching field as determined by department criteria such as the following:

- a. receipt of awards such as Society of Professional Journalists, Public Relations Society of America or regional/national publication competitions
- b. fellowships and grants from professional organizations for activity appropriate to the discipline
- c. currency in the field as represented by articles published in general circulation and professional media publications, critical reviews or public campaigns reaching national, regional and/or local areas. The scope and influence of the publications/reviews/campaigns must be substantiated by the candidate
- d. publications in the form of journals, books, texts, (whole or part thereof), non-print media, curriculum materials or academically specialized form appropriate to the journalism/public relations field
- e. service on committees or boards of professional societies and organizations
- f. participation in seminars, conferences, meetings or other activity leading to growth in the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- g. presentation of papers, or oral contributions appropriate to their discipline, at professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes or special programs
- h. Consultancies and/or expert testimony, etc. as in document whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature that reflect the faculty member's areas of academic expertise.
- i. creative activities that relate to their teaching assignments or general expertise in their field

Of the above criteria, what is sufficient to warrant a positive recommendation will depend upon the nature of the teaching assignment and how it is best evaluated as determined by the department personnel committee. What is most important is that there is a clear demonstration of industry-standard knowledge, skills and abilities, which is achieved, among other things, by being involved in at least occasional professional growth and development.

2) Lecturer Faculty's duties as defined by their assignment

3) Their professional ethics and conduct

4) Other contributions that may not have been specified in the job description but

demonstrate positive assistance to the department, college, university or the profession.

Glossary of Terms or Appendix

[AAPOR](#) - American Association for Public Opinion Research

[AEJMC](#) - Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

[AJHA](#) - American Journalism Historians Association

[BEA](#) - Broadcast Education Association

[CBA](#) - Collective Bargaining Agreement

[CMA](#) - College Media Association

[FPPP](#) - Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures

[FTES](#) - Full Time Equivalent Students

[IAMCR](#) - International Association for Media and Communication Research

[ICA](#) - International Communication Association

[NCA](#) - National Communication Association

[RTP](#) - Retention, Tenure & Promotion

[SFOT](#) - Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning

WPAF - Working Personnel Action File



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: Janell Bauer Date: May 25, 2023

Dean Review: Angie Sutherland Date: May 25, 2023

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

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



MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2023
TO: Janell Bauer, Department Chair
CC: Angela Trethewey, Dean
FROM: Mahalley Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of Department RTP Standards

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

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

1. Only require ratings of "meets expectations" for tenure and promotion decisions and ratings of "exceeds expectations" for accelerated tenure and/or accelerated promotion decisions.
2. Provide complete requirements for accelerated promotion to full – see relevant sections of FPPP.
3. Address additional comments in document.

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

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

the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

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

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

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