

POLICY 4

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

- A. The Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (the Personnel Committee) of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be organized--in terms of function, structure, eligibility, and internal operation--in a manner consistent with procedures and policies delineated in relevant sections of the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document (FPPP) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
- B. In all areas of the personnel process, the retention, tenure, and promotion policies of the Department shall be consistent with relevant sections and/or subsections of the FPPP and CBA.
- C. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning:
 - 1. Student feedback on teaching and learning procedures in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP.
 - 2. Student feedback on teaching and learning shall serve as one diagnostic device aimed at improvement of teaching effectiveness and as a means of evaluating the quality of teaching performance. Student feedback on teaching and learning data shall be used but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness.
 - 3. Consistent with the CBA written or electronic student feedback on teaching and learning shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes, including summer session classes, taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations as provided for in the FPPP and CBA. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.
 - 4. Consistent with the CBA, student feedback on teaching and learning collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student feedback shall be a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).
- D. Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty:
 - 1. Evaluation of lecturer faculty in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA.
 - 2. Lecturer faculty shall be evaluated with respect to their teaching and their duties as defined in their job description.
 - 3. Student feedback on teaching and learning will be conducted for all lecturer faculty, and the reports of these evaluations will become part of the personnel action file of the faculty member.
 - 4. Peer evaluations of lecturer faculty shall be sent to the College Dean, who shall establish a personnel action file for the faculty member involved. These files will be maintained by the College Office and are subject to the same rules and regulations governing personnel action files for tenure-line faculty. Appropriate support materials to be included in a personnel action file are outlined in the FPPP
- E. Performance Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion:

1. Performance review for retention, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA.
2. Three areas of evaluation shall be considered for each candidate eligible for retention, tenure, or promotion: instruction; professional growth and achievement; and service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community.
 - a. Instruction. Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion for teaching faculty. "Instruction" includes classroom and related instructional activities.
 - i. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be specific and appropriate to the mode of instruction (e.g., in person or online) and course classification (e.g., lecture, discussion, seminar, and supervision). In addition to the prescribed methods for the evaluation of teaching (where teaching evaluations will be analyzed), evaluation will also be made on other bases including (although not necessarily limited to) such factors as: teaching portfolios, supervision of interns or independent study, syllabi and reading lists, examinations and class assignments, grading policy, and similar types of evidence. The Personnel Committee may use its own evaluation instrument, properly approved, in lieu of, or in addition to, the standard University instrument. Class visitations will be made on the basis of mutual agreement and consent and at times mutually agreeable to the faculty member and evaluator, in order to assess, in writing, the faculty member's effectiveness. Classroom observations will be conducted in a manner consistent with the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document. Pursuant to the FPPP, classroom observations will take place at least once each RTP cycle.
 - ii. Teaching effectiveness may also be evaluated by an assessment of student work. Faculty may provide evidence of assessment strategies for their courses and discuss how these relate to departmental or program goals. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include:
 1. 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 University.
 2. student letters;
 3. academic peer review of course modules and structure;
 4. evidence of revision and updating of course syllabi and materials;

5. alternative student evaluation;
6. lesson plans;
7. extraordinary mentoring of students;
8. HSI related priorities;
9. Accessible Technology Initiatives;
10. efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps or a lack of equity gaps in the candidate's courses;
11. the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning;
12. the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors;
13. the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy;
14. the creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment;
15. the completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion.

b. Professional Growth and Achievement. Continued professional growth and achievement in the academic fields of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice is required of all faculty members. In all cases it is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to provide copies of publications, programs indicating participation, peer reviews where appropriate, references to one's work in the Citation Index (for example) or reviews by others, or other forms of documentation to the personnel committee.

i. The hallmark of professional growth and achievement in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice is scholarly and peer-reviewed or rigorously vetted publications (like law reviews) related to the academic fields of our department or scholarship of teaching and learning.

ii. In addition to professional growth and achievement through scholarly and peer-reviewed or rigorously vetted publications related to the academic fields of our department or scholarship of teaching and learning, additional professional growth and achievement may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, which, among others, include:

1. Publications in the form of contributions to professional journals, books, and texts (whole or part thereof), and including clear indication if the publication was peer reviewed so that the personnel committee may weight those appropriately;
2. An active program of scholarly work in progress appropriate to the discipline, to be evaluated in terms of professionally recognized benchmarks of progress achieved;
3. Publication of book chapters, including clear indication if the publication was peer reviewed so that the personnel committee may weigh those appropriately;

4. Presentation of papers or research, or oral contributions, at professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or special programs;
5. Receipt of awards, fellowships, prizes, commissions, or honors related to one's professional area(s) of expertise;
6. Awards of grants and contracts related to one's professional area(s) of expertise;
7. Critical review for national periodicals or magazines, national newspapers, or other communications media;
8. Consultantships and expert testimony, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature that reflects faculty members' areas of academic expertise;
9. Participation in seminars, conferences, meetings, or other activity leading to growth in the faculty members' area(s) of academic expertise;
10. Publication of book reviews and encyclopedia entries, including clear indication if the publication was peer reviewed so that the personnel committee may weigh those appropriately;
11. Other items of specific professional activity, such as editorial or review work, public lectures related to the appropriate discipline, and the holding of significant special appointments, such as visiting professorships, lectureships, or consultant assignments in other academic, professional, or governmental institutions.
12. While faculty under review will not have accomplishments under each heading above, they must demonstrate an active professional life.

c. Service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community. Faculty members are expected to establish and maintain professional relations with their colleagues. Faculty members are also expected to carry a reasonable share of committee work and other assignments that are a normal part of the life of the University. Such contributions may be illustrated by membership in the Academic Senate; service on University-wide committees; participation in a University-wide program or project; or any activity designed to further the aims and goals of the Department, the College, or the University strategic plan, priorities, and goals. In addition, contributions to the broader community and profession outside of the University shall also be considered. These may include such activities as service on a city or county board or commission, participation in community projects, consulting work for a government agency, participation in research authorized by a government agency, appointment or election to a public office, service at professional conferences, participation on relevant boards of directors and task forces, community engagement, or putting on events/activities that enrich the University and other similar activities. All service contributions should be considered in the context of "contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community."

3. The Department Chair and the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee will inform new faculty members of the need to maintain a dossier and the types of materials to be

included in it. The Department Chair will also provide a new member of the faculty with a copy of the Department's RTP Policy.

4. Data gathering on candidates for retention, tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA.
5. General procedures for evaluation and performance review in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA. In each area of evaluation (i.e. instruction; professional growth and achievement; and service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community), the ratings of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations will be assigned in a manner consistent with the FPPP.
6. Specific Evaluation and Review Procedures. Specific evaluation and review procedures of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP. The timeline for promotion from assistant to associate professor and associate to full professor is described in the CBA
7. Policies Relating Specifically to Retention, Tenure, and Promotion: The policies relating specifically to retention, tenure, and promotion of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP.
8. Expectations For Tenure And Promotion:
 - a. In consideration of tenure or promotion, the period of review shall be the entire *probationary* period (including years of prior service credit, if any). Consideration shall be given to the development and continuity of the candidate's total performance during the review period. Where prior credits have been granted, these credits plus performance rendered since being appointed to the faculty at California State University, Chico shall, together, constitute the data base for the review.
 - b. As tenure normally involves a long-term commitment by the University to the faculty member, tenure review shall be particularly rigorous in each of the evaluation areas.
 - c. The normal pattern shall be consideration for tenure in the sixth consecutive year of full-time *probationary* employment, including service credited toward tenure from employment at another post- secondary educational institution in accordance with conditions stipulated in writing at the time of *probationary* employment.
 - d. Evidence of performance while at California State University, Chico, shall be the primary consideration in all tenure decisions.
 - e. In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, the individual normally shall possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneously with promotion.
 - f. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements, which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.
 - g. Candidates for promotion to full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation. In

addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.

9. Expectations for Accelerated Tenure or Promotion: Tenure or promotion may be conferred earlier than the normal sixth year of employment.
 - a. Consideration of tenure or promotion before the beginning of the sixth consecutive fulltime *probationary* year shall be regarded as consideration of “accelerated tenure or promotion.” A decision on tenure before the sixth year is necessarily based on less evidence of performance within rank than tenure granted on a normal timeline. For this reason, decisions for accelerated tenure will require that faculty meet a higher standard than they would for tenure granted on a normal timeline. This higher standard is the definition of an “exceptional record” for accelerated tenure or promotion.
 - b. To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) be rated as exceeds expectation in all three categories of evaluation; *and* (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; *and* (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment.
 - c. Any faculty member wishing to apply for accelerated tenure or promotion must make a request in writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. In the request, the candidate should offer a brief description of how they meet the criteria for eligibility for accelerated tenure or promotion. This request shall be included in the candidate’s Personnel Action File and in the candidate’s Dossier prior to closure of each.
 - d. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated tenure or promotion is not the normal pattern, each level of review must address in its reports whether the candidate’s file meets the definition of exceptional record. As outlined in the FPPP, the faculty member under review has the right to submit a response or rebuttal at every level of review.
 - e. Prior to the forwarding of a candidate’s file to the President, the candidate may withdraw their application for accelerated tenure or promotion without prejudice. All relevant personnel reports (Department/Unit, Chair, College Dean, Provost) from that cycle will be expunged from the candidate’s records (WPAF and PAF).
 - f. Accelerated promotion to full professor: To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must: (1) be rated exceeds expectations in all three categories of evaluation; *and* (2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, *and* (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. 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.
 - g. A tenured faculty member wishing to apply for accelerated promotion to full professor must make a request in writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. In the request, the candidate shall offer a brief description of how they meet the criteria for eligibility for accelerated promotion. This request shall be included in the candidate’s Personnel Action File and in the candidate’s Dossier prior to closure of each.

- h. Prior to the final decision, the candidate may withdraw their application for promotion without prejudice. All relevant personnel reports (Department/Unit, Chair, College Dean, and Provost) from that cycle will be expunged from the candidate's records (WPAF and PAF).

10. Definitions of Ratings:

- a. In each written performance review report, the reviews of instruction, professional growth and achievement, and service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community will include a summary rating. The use of hyphenated ratings is not permissible.

- i. Exceed 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.
- ii. 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).
- iii. 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.

- b. More specifically, as applies to each area of performance:

- i. Instruction

- 1. 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 in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of the FPPP and the CBA.
- 2. Meets Expectations: The evidence demonstrates the candidate's substantial professionalism and competence as an

educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA. An evaluation of “Meets expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.

3. 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 in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA.

ii. Professional Growth and Achievement

1. 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 the *Department/Unit standards*, in other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA).
2. Meets Expectations: The evidence demonstrates appreciable and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA).
3. 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 the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA).

iii. Service That Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University s well as the Community (Service): As stated above, the third area of evaluation is Service that contributes to shared governance, to the strategic plans, priorities, and goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community. In each written performance review report, the evaluator(s) shall state whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to conform to University, College and Department/Unit plans, priorities, and goals and whether the candidate's performance generally facilitates the University's, College's and Department's/Unit's abilities to meet their strategic plans, priorities, and goals.

1. Exceeds Expectations: The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. “Exceeds expectations” performance is evidenced by (1) assuming key roles on 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.

2. Meets Expectations: The evidence demonstrates the candidate's on-going involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA and participating on committees and/or in the community. Meets expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) occasionally assumption assuming key roles on significant committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities, as well as the demonstrating on-going contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. "Does not meet expectations" performance is evidenced by a lack of (1) assuming of 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.

11. Equivalency: Normally, tenure will not be granted without possession of the Ph.D. degree or terminal degree relevant to the faculty member's academic field (i.e. Juris Doctorate degree).

F. Evaluation of Tenured Faculty:

1. Evaluation of tenured faculty in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice will occur every five years and will follow procedures consistent with the FPPP. Specific criteria to be considered shall include:
 - a. Teaching, which shall be evaluated in the same way it is evaluated in other performance reviews.
 - b. Currency in the field or fields of the faculty member, which shall be evaluated as follows: The writing of a self-assessment indicating areas of instruction and research interests and indicating how currency is being maintained. Indicators might include, but not necessarily be limited to, publications, grants, conferences attended, participation in faculty development programs, advanced work completed, and other relevant work activities.
2. The subcommittee shall meet with the faculty member to review the self-assessment and other items that have been presented to the subcommittee and to raise any concerns the subcommittee or chair might have. The Department Chair will participate as a member of the subcommittee.
3. The subcommittee shall submit a written evaluation for consideration to the full Personnel Committee.

4. The Department Chair and the Dean shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation.
5. The Department Personnel Committee shall submit the evaluation to the College Dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel action file.

G. Criteria for Lecturer Range Elevation

1. For elevation to the *range* of *Lecturer B* or above, the individual must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last *range* elevation, whichever is more recent.
2. The application for range elevation shall consist of a written letter or memorandum clearly stating the applicant's request, a complete up-to-date vita, and documentation of teaching excellence and currency in the field since the initial appointment or last *range* elevation, whichever is more recent. Although not required, the documentation may include a description of other activities or accomplishments that contribute to the instructional mission of the University.
3. Professional growth and development for *Lecturer range* elevation eligibility is defined as "*teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field*" unless the faculty member's work assignment includes duties besides instruction. Departments/Units shall clearly define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field in their personnel policy documents.
4. Teaching excellence: Teaching excellence is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for the range elevation of lecturers in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice.
 - a. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered "teaching excellence" sufficient for *range* elevation.
 - b. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the sources required for the Periodic Evaluation Process for Lecturers, e.g.: Course outlines and related guides; course content and types of evaluation of student work; peer classroom evaluations, Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT).
 - c. In evaluating teaching excellence, the following shall be the main criteria:
 - i. Knowledge of the academic field.
 - ii. Student-faculty relations.
 - iii. Peer evaluations.
 - iv. Student feedback on teaching and learning.
 - d. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps or a lack of equity gaps in the lecturer's courses.
5. Maintaining currency in the academic field is not a substitute for teaching excellence. A variety of means may be used to support currency in the field, including, but not limited to, continued education, research (broadly defined as related to the academic fields of the department, including applied research in education), scholarship, grants, conference attendance, participation in faculty development programs, and other relevant work and professional activities. Expectations for activities supporting currency shall be consistent with the candidate's *Range* classification and responsibilities. Evaluations of lecturer faculty may also include evaluation of any other activities or achievements related to the individual's work assignment(s) that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College and University as well as the Community. Such activities or

achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, and civic engagement, and service to the North State.



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: <u><i>Jennifer Wilking</i></u>	Date: <u>Sep 1, 2022</u>
Dean: <u><i>Eddie Vela</i></u>	Date: <u>Sep 1, 2022</u>
OAPL: <u><i>Mahalley D. Allen</i></u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Provost: <u><i>[Signature]</i></u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 26, 2022

TO: Jennifer Wilking, Department Chair

CC: Eddie Vela, Dean

FROM: Mahalley D. Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of POLS Department 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:

- Missing definitions for meet, exceeds, and not meeting.
- Miscellaneous comments offered for improvements.

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.