College of Business

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

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

Preamble

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Retention*</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Accelerated Tenure‡</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Prof. †</th>
<th>Accelerated Promotion to Assoc. or Full Prof. §</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth and Achievement</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

‡ To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion, the candidate must: (1) have been rated “Exceeds Expectations” in a Performance Review as defined in 10.3.3 in all three categories of
evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment. See FPPP 10.5.3

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

**General Ratings and Definitions for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

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

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

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

**Meets Expectations**
The candidate has demonstrated competence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, and valued contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated. An
evaluation of “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Meets expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining).

**Does Not Meet Expectations**

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

**Ratings & Standards Applied to Instruction**

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of faculty. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, student feedback on teaching data (SFOTs) 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 his/her field (FPPP 10.2.5.a). Therefore, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide data in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance. Evidence should speak to the candidate’s: (1) currency of knowledge of the field(s) in which the faculty member instructs; (2) organization and level of development of course materials; and (3) effective communication.

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

- Student and peer evaluations of teaching
- A clear listing of all courses taught during the review period.
- Copies of most recent course syllabi for all courses taught during the review period.
- A summary and interpretation of SFOT data over the duration of the review period.
- Examples of current or relevant classroom materials such as presentation slides, lecture notes, or other course materials.
- Examples of course assessments including but not limited to examinations, quizzes, business case studies, assignments, papers, handouts and grading rubrics.
- Evidence of pedagogical innovations and/or use of instructional technologies.
- Evidence of Professional Growth and Achievements activities making impact in teaching
- Attendance at pedagogical conferences or workshops leading to improvements or innovations in pedagogy.
- Evidence of the candidate's role in course, curriculum, and program development.
- Letters from students or colleagues.
- Listing of teaching-related awards and/or recognitions.
As Equity, Diversity & Inclusion is one of the University Strategic Priorities, the implementation of inclusive teaching practices and the creation of equitable learning environments may be used by a candidate as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence may include: efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps in the candidate’s courses, the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning, the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors, the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, the creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment, and/or the completion of training and professional development opportunities that center around equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Exceeds Expectations
The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. Candidates that exceed expectations will have **positive curricular impact within and beyond** their classroom through innovation, creativity, and/or pedagogical scholarship.

Standards include, but are not limited to:
- Demonstrating superior teaching performance as evidenced by peer review.
- Demonstrating superior teaching performance as evidenced by student feedback.
- Demonstrating superior teaching across a variety of environments, courses, and student abilities.
- Developing curricula through designing new courses and teaching state-of-the-art content.
- Developing and disseminating innovative and creative instructional methods.
- Mentoring other faculty members on teaching.
- Receiving teaching-related awards and/or recognitions.

Meets Expectations
The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. An evaluation of “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. An evaluation of “Meet Expectations” corresponds to candidates having **positive curricular impact within their classroom** through innovation, creativity, and/or pedagogical scholarship.

Standards include, but are not limited to:
- Demonstrating effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer review.
- Demonstrating effective teaching performance as evidenced by student feedback on teaching.
- Demonstrating effective teaching across a variety of environments, courses, and student abilities.
• Adopting methodologies for teaching critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
• Adopting innovative and creative instructional methods.
• Contributing to curricula by teaching state-of-the-art content.
• Demonstrating assimilation of current and challenging content in the classroom.

**Does Not Meet Expectations**
The evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, in the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA.

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

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

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

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

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

Weighted Values of Publications. The college uses the Australian Business Dean’s Council (ABDC) list as a guideline to assign ratings of quality for journals containing faculty publications. For journals not appearing on the list, the department journal review committee determines whether the journal is of acceptable quality, and assigns a rating level (A, B, C or unacceptable) to the journal as appropriate, following procedures in COB Manual Appendix 5. Works in law reviews published by an ABA-accredited law school or ranked on the Washington and Lee list meet the quality criteria but will need to be rated. For candidates who include journal articles in their dossier that are not on the ABDC list and have not been approved by the department journal review committee prior to the candidate entering the RTP process, the department RTP committee will make this determination. In working towards the peer-reviewed journal publication requirements for the ratings below, “C” level publications will count as 1.0 research-related works, “B” level publications will count as 1.5 research-related works and “A” (or above) level publications will count as 2.0 research-related works.

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

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

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

**Exceeds Expectations**

The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s significant, highly-regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed above, in Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA).

For candidates applying for tenure and / promotion, exceeding expectations is attained by accumulating seven (7) or more unique research-related works during their review period. At least five (5) works must come from peer-reviewed journal articles published in outlets appearing on the College of Business Quality Journals list. In order to be rated “exceeds expectations” at least two (2) of the candidate’s five (5) publications must be rated as “B” level journals (or higher).

**Meets Expectations**

The evidence demonstrates appreciable scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA). The use of “appreciable” conveys the necessary trade off in producing influential scholarship and the quantity/types of scholarship produced. The definition of appreciable is “large or important enough to be noticed,” allowing evaluators to focus on the quality of the work (i.e., to be noticed) rather than the quantity. The quality of these activities is more important the quantity of activities (see FPPP 8.1.3e4 and Appendix A in FASP policy implementing RTP changes, 2022-2023).

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

**Does Not Meet Expectations**
The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA).

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

There are many ways by which a faculty member can contribute to the success of the Department, College, University, and the surrounding community. Faculty members should find appropriate means of documenting any such contributions. While the College of Business does not particularly value any one form of contribution over another, reviewers should consider the impact and quality of these efforts/outcomes as they relate to facilitating the achievement of Department/College/University strategic plans and goals.

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

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

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

**Exceeds Expectations**
The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s consistently high level of involvement in activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. “Exceeds Expectations” performance is evidenced by (1) assuming key roles in significant committees, (2) high levels of involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating significant
activities as well as demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to the University’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

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

**Meets Expectations**
The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s on-going involvement in activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. “Meets Expectations” performance is evidenced by (1) occasionally assuming roles in important committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities, as well as demonstrating on-going contributions to the University’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

Examples include:
- Maintain an involvement in Department, College, and/or University-wide committees and internal projects.
- Maintain an involvement in the academic or professional organizations and/or conferences in the faculty member's discipline.
- Serve as a manuscript reviewer for academic journals and conferences.
- Other service in the community.

**Does Not Meet Expectations**
The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. “Does Not Meet Expectations” performance is evidenced by a lack of the candidate’s (1) assuming roles on committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities as well as demonstrating limited contributions to the University’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.
Department Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

a) Department votes, if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review and approval;

b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean approved Word document to OAPL via email for review;

c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the dean, then forwards OAPL approved document to Provost for approval;

d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns approved document to OAPL.

e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission.

f) If approved, OAPL adds Provost Approved Date footnote to page 1 of the document:

   a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Standard 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.

Approvals:

Chair/Director: ____________________________ Date: ______________
Chair/Director: ____________________________ Date: ______________
Chair/Director: ____________________________ Date: ______________
Dean: _____________________________________ Date: ______________
OAPL: _____________________________________ Date: ______________
Provost: ____________________________________ Date: ______________
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 30, 2022
TO: Terence Lau, Dean
CC: Arash Negahban, Department Chair
     Damon Aiken, Department Chair
     Kim Hinrichs, Department Chair
FROM: Mahalley D. Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of BUS Departments RTP Standards

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

Provost Larson has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2022-2023 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:

- Repeat or move footnote content on promotion to full to also the criteria later in the document so that those applying to full do not miss this important information.
- Provide definitions/criteria to the ill-defined terminology of “superior, effective” and “adequate.”
- Resolve the question that promotion to full appears to have stronger standards (e.g. footnote) to achieve the ranking of “meet” than promotion to associate.
- Provide clearer information or definitions on what does not meet expectations for instruction and PGA.
- Finish the document — missing lecturer evaluation information.

Based on our review of recently submitted 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 Monday, January 23, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and Provost Larson have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2023-2024 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.