

Memo

To: Steering

Re: Final draft of Disciplinary Standards Policy 5 year Review

CFA was charged by Steering in Fall 2016 to review the Disciplinary Standards Policy as part of the 5 year review process of policies on campus. CFA met and discussed this document and made revisions during Fall 2016. The revisions were then reviewed by the academic leaders via an email solicitation. Small modifications were made to the document with feedback provided from this group and then the policy was reviewed by the entire campus (February 2017) via an email sent out by academic affairs. Feedback was received and then incorporated by CFA. The attached policy and file of modifications/changes are included with this memo. This policy, as submitted is the final recommendation from CFA.

Abby O'Connor and Matt Cathell (CFA – co-chairs)

Summary of major changes to the Disciplinary Standards Policy document

Changed dates to align with the PRD

Changed language to align with the PRD

Streamlined process for preparing disciplinary standards in accordance with the process conducted on campus

Summary of changes made since review by Academic Leaders and Campus

Provided details for the cover page

Included section on guidelines for drafting disciplinary standard documents

Additions and revisions	Rationale for changes
<p>Under the heading <i>General Principles for Disciplinary Standards</i>, 3rd paragraph</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● each Disciplinary Standards must identify distinctive criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor ● added “tenure with promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II,” 	<p>To be consistent with the new PRD</p>
<p>In category A. Alignment with Key Institutional Documents and Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● omitted point 5 “A relatively short tenure clock” 	<p>No longer a short tenure clock — typical for most colleges and universities</p>
<p>In category C. Criteria to Evaluate Different Types of Scholarly/Professional/Creative Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Removed “of service and teaching/librarianship integrated with a scholar’s research agenda (e.g., a faculty member from the School of Education serving on a local school board, a faculty 	<p>Make language more consistent with the review process that occurs in DS review to focus on non-traditional means of dissemination of one’s scholarly accomplishments to move away from “service and teaching” language, as this is removed in the review process</p>

<p>member from the School of Engineering providing written testimony to a legislative body).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Added “of a scholar’s research agenda disseminated in non-traditional formats” 	
<p>In the section <i>Establishing Consistent Quality of Disciplinary Standards Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Added “All departments and programs will review and revise the existing Disciplinary Standards according to the general principles every 5 years in a staggered multi-year pattern.” ● Changed “We suggest the following process to ensure that all Disciplinary Standards documents address the principles and criteria outlined above:” to “The following process must be followed to ensure that all Disciplinary Standards documents address the principles and criteria outlined above.” ● In process list, item 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Changed “During the Spring 2011 semester, all departments and programs will review and revise their previously developed Disciplinary Standards in accordance with the principles outlined in this document (see above).” to “During the Spring semester, departments or programs with a 5-year period review due in the next academic year will revise their previously developed Disciplinary Standards in accordance with the principles outline in this document. ● In process list, item 2: (requiring that departments have a cover sheet and that the Dean signature must appear on the coversheet, not in current policy) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Added “A cover sheet must be included with the Dean’s signature indicating approval 	<p>Streamline to the process to what is actually done, coordinate timing with the current PRD, ensure that Dean as seen and approved the DS for departments in her/his school, ensure that academic affairs is the only website on campus that can post the DS for each department</p>

<p>before it is submitted to the Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Moved process list item 4 to process item 3 to be in line with current review process, as CFA reviews the DS in fall semester <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA) will review the Disciplinary Standards by the end of the Fall semester. ● Moved 3 to process item 4 to be in line with current review process (council of deans and provost review after CFA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Changed language (minor) and made review date final for the end of the year rather than the Fall 2011 semester: The Council of Deans and the Provost will review the Disciplinary Standards to assure that they meet the criteria set forth in this document. This review will be completed by the end of the academic year. ● Minor language change at the start of process number 5 to reflect the chain of the review process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “The Dean, CFA, Council of Deans, and/or the Provost, and/or CFA” ● Addition of language to process number 6 so that there is only one place on campus that DS can be posted to avoid confusion for candidates (in case different DS are posted on school or departmental websites) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Disciplinary standards can only be posted on the Academic Affairs website and not on School or Departmental webpages.” 	
<p>Retitle next section Currently: “Review and Revision of Existing Disciplinary</p>	<p>Align with the PRD and review process</p>

<p>Standards”</p> <p><i>New proposed title: “Appropriate Disciplinary Standards for Use in Reappointment and Promotion”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Removed paragraph starting with “all departments will review...” and moved above to section titled “<i>Establishing Consistent Quality of Disciplinary Standards Documents</i>” ● Changed language in remaining paragraph to reflect changes to tenure and promotion document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “To avoid creating a moving target for candidates for reappointment, the Disciplinary Standards in effect by the end of a faculty member’s first year of employment will be used for reappointment and tenure applications in Years 1-5. Candidates for Promotion will use the Disciplinary Standards in effect in the year in which they apply for promotion.” 	
<p>A concern was brought up that the DS policy does not use strong enough language to explicitly state that the DS must include detailed guidelines for the post-tenure reviews. There is concern that the DS will be silent on post-tenure review and the PRCs, CPTC and administrators will be left to infer the level of expected productivity from the promotion expectations.</p>	<p>On page 2: “programs must define minimum expectations in the disciplinary standards” was added to ensure that all departments include minimum guideposts for promotion at all levels in addition to tenure.</p>
<p>On page 4 - step #3 clearly by-passes the dean on the return trip to CFA. It seems that if substantial changes are made, the dean should sign off again to avoid delays at the next level.</p>	<p>Item 3 on page 4 was modified to read (new text in red): “If revisions are needed, CFA will send the Disciplinary Standards back to the Department and copy the Dean. Upon approval by the Dean and then CFA, the Disciplinary Standards will be forwarded by CFA to Academic Affairs.”</p>
<p>On page 4 - step #7 seems unnecessary given the language of step #5. It is not clear to me in step #7 to what "this review" is referring - is it referring to any modification the department makes in the future?</p>	<p>Item 7 on page 4 was modified to read (new text in red): “If any future substantive changes are made to a Department’s/Program’s Disciplinary Standards, the revised Disciplinary Standards must</p>

	<p>undergo the process of review described here.” This clarifies the language of this seemingly unnecessary step.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS POLICY

Section:	II.3.61
Title:	Disciplinary Standards
Effective Date:	2017
Approved By:	
Responsible Unit:	Academic Affairs (609-771-3080, academic@tcnj.edu
History:	
Related Documents:	

I. INTRODUCTION

Disciplinary Standards are those standards by which individual departments and programs at The College of New Jersey evaluate the scholarly accomplishments of their faculty members. This policy sets out the principles and criteria are to be addressed in all Disciplinary Standards. It also describes the processes by which the standards of individual disciplines are to be approved.

II. DEFINITIONS

N/A

III. POLICY***General Principles for Disciplinary Standards***

Disciplinary Standards across the College should serve to maintain the high level of accomplishment and engagement that we expect from our faculty members and librarians as teacher-scholars and librarian-scholars, should be reasonable given TCNJ's workload and profile as a primarily undergraduate institution, and be flexible to provide maximum opportunity for faculty members' accomplishments to be evidence for normal progression through the academic ranks.

Moreover, Disciplinary Standards must address a common set of principles so that faculty from diverse departments and programs may receive similar guidance regarding the evaluation of their scholarly, professional, and creative activities. To that end, the lettered principles and numbered criteria listed below are required in all Disciplinary Standards; that is, each principle and criterion must be addressed in the Disciplinary Standards in some way. However, the expectations developed in response to each criterion will vary across departments/programs, and it is possible that some criteria will be deemed inapplicable by a given department or program. For example, each Disciplinary Standards document will outline expectations regarding involvement of students in faculty/librarian scholarship; however, the expectations outlined by individual departments/programs are likely to differ. Moreover, each criterion may be addressed in multiple ways. For example, regarding the evaluation of the quality of scholarly or creative products, one department may define appropriate outlets in terms of objective criteria such as impact factors, whereas another department may provide lists of preferred and acceptable outlets. This flexibility allows departments and programs to develop unique and appropriate Disciplinary Standards.

Disciplinary Standards are intended to (1) guide new faculty and librarians in their quest for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the teacher-scholar/librarian-scholar model; (2) to promote the development of tenured faculty and librarians as teacher-scholars/librarian-scholars; (3) guide the Promotion and Reappointment Committee (PRC) in evaluating candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review; and (4) foster an environment that supports faculty and librarians dedicated to the missions of TCNJ and their respective departments and programs.

Guiding Principles for Drafting Disciplinary Standards Documents

All Disciplinary Standards must include minimum expectations for scholarship for (a) reappointment during the probationary period, (b) tenure, and (c) promotion.

Since 2015, the reappointment of Assistant Professors or Librarians III to the 7th year (tenure) is awarded with promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II, respectively. Thus, departments and programs must define minimum expectations in the disciplinary standards for (1) reappointment, (2) tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II, and (3) promotion to Professor or Librarian I.

1. Expectations for reappointment are normally defined for Assistant Professors or Librarians III, although TCNJ also hires faculty at the Associate Professor/Librarian II and Professor or Librarian I levels. Expectations may be defined in general or for each of the years of the probationary period. Note that the Promotion and Reappointment Document also contemplates faculty applying for early promotion or tenure.
2. Expectations for tenure are normally defined for untenured Assistant Professors and Librarians III; in these cases tenure will be accompanied with promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II. An untenured Assistant Professor or Librarian III applying for tenure or an untenured Associate Professor or Librarian II applying for promotion must meet these same expectations; similarly, a tenured Assistant Professor or tenured Librarian III applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II must meet these same expectations.
3. Expectations for promotion to Professor/Librarian I must be met by any tenured or untenured faculty seeking promotion to Professor/Librarian I and by untenured Professors or Librarians I seeking tenure.

Required Elements for Disciplinary Standards

The following are the required elements for all department and program Disciplinary Standards.

A. Alignment with Key Institutional Documents and Values

All Disciplinary Standards must be consistent with:

1. The Mission of the College, School, and Department/Program
2. The identity of TCNJ as a primarily undergraduate institution with a select number of targeted masters programs
3. The expectation that faculty members are to be accomplished and engaged teacher-scholars and/or librarian-scholars and students are to be accomplished and engaged learners
4. The Promotion and Reappointment Document

B. Categories of Acceptable Scholarly/Professional/Creative Work

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clear articulation of the range of tangible scholarly outcomes recognized in the discipline (e.g. journal papers, books, conference proceedings, exhibits, performances, grants and grant proposals, conference presentations, invited lectures)
2. Clear articulation of the range of modes of scholarship (e.g. Boyer; scholarship of discovery, scholarship of application, scholarship of pedagogy)
3. Flexibility in support of diverse paths in scholarship/professional/creative activity
4. Recognition of discipline-specific challenges for scholarship in the given field (e.g. international travel for some fields)
5. Clarity and flexibility of criteria to evaluate the quality of the venue in which scholarship is disseminated; flexibility to allow for the establishment of new venues and genres (e.g. emerging online venues)
6. Recognition of interdisciplinary work, when it is offered as part of a promotion or reappointment application, and indication of how to evaluate it

C. Criteria to Evaluate Different Types of Scholarly/Professional/Creative Work

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clarity and flexibility of criteria to evaluate the quality of different scholarly/professional/creative products
2. Criteria to evaluate scholarship in the context of our College's value of teaching/librarianship
3. Clear articulation of criteria for assessing the contribution of a scholar's research agenda disseminated in non-traditional formats.

D. Scope, Quality, Importance, and Coherence of Scholarly/Professional/Creative Program

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clear articulation of how the department/program evaluates the scope (regional, national, international), quality, and importance of a scholarly/professional/creative project (e.g. not all disciplines have quantitative impact factors, but all disciplines can evaluate importance qualitatively)
2. Indication of the value of student involvement in, or the contribution to, scholarly/professional/creative work
3. Clear articulation of productivity expected (i.e. provide guidepost numbers, not hard and fast numbers)
4. Clarity for evaluating the quality and coherence of a sustained and ongoing program of scholarly/professional/creative work that matures over time

E. Authorship:

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clear articulation of the ways in which the department/program evaluates different authorship patterns (e.g. single author v. multiple author) in scholarly/professional/creative projects
2. Clear articulation of how the department/program evaluates scholarly/professional/creative work that results from smaller vs. larger scale projects

Establishing Consistent Quality of Disciplinary Standards Documents

All departments and programs will review and revise the existing Disciplinary Standards according to the general principles every 5 years in a staggered multi-year pattern.

The following process must be followed to ensure that all Disciplinary Standards documents address the principles and criteria outlined above.

1. During the Spring semester, departments or programs with a 5-year periodic review due in the next academic year will revise their previously developed Disciplinary Standards in accordance with the principles outlined in this document. This process will be initiated by the Dean and will involve consultative conversation among all faculty members in the department or program. The revised Disciplinary Standards will be approved by departmental/program faculty members via vote in accordance with departmental/program policy. The Department Chair will sign the approved document on a draft of the cover page.
2. The revised Disciplinary Standards will be submitted to the Dean of each School. The Deans will review the Disciplinary Standards submitted from the Departments of their own Schools, returning to Departments any Disciplinary Standards that need to be revised for resubmission because they do not meet the criteria set forth in this document. For instance, revision will be needed if the Disciplinary Standards fail to address each required criterion described above. A cover sheet must be included with the Dean's signature indicating approval before it is submitted to the Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA). Upon approval by the Dean, the Disciplinary Standards will be forwarded by the Dean to CFA.
3. If revisions are needed, CFA will send the Disciplinary Standards back to the Department and copy the Dean. Upon approval by the Dean and then CFA, the Disciplinary Standards will be forwarded by CFA to Academic Affairs.
4. The Council of Deans and the Provost will review the Disciplinary Standards to assure that they meet the criteria set forth in this document. Review will be completed by the end of the academic year.
5. The Dean, CFA, Council of Deans, and/or the Provost may indicate the need for further conversation and revision of Disciplinary Standards by departmental/program faculty. In such cases, the Disciplinary Standards will again go through steps 1–4 above.
6. The relevant Dean and the Provost will sign the cover page of final version of the Disciplinary Standards, confirming with their signatures that the Disciplinary Standards meet the criteria set forth in this document and therefore will be used in reviewing promotion and reappointment applications. Academic Affairs will post the signed Disciplinary Standards online, along with the date of the revision. Disciplinary standards can only be posted on the Academic Affairs website and not on School or Departmental webpages.
7. If any future substantive changes are made to a Department's/Program's Disciplinary Standards, the revised Disciplinary Standards must undergo the process of review described here.

Appropriate Disciplinary Standards for Use in Reappointment and Promotion

To avoid creating a moving target for candidates for reappointment, the Disciplinary Standards in effect by the end of a faculty member's first year of employment will be used for reappointment and tenure applications in Years 1–5. Candidates for Promotion will use the Disciplinary Standards in effect in the year in which they apply for promotion.

RELATED DOCUMENTS

N/A

HISTORY

N/A

Recommended by CFA 2017; approved by Provost: _____

I. INTRODUCTION

Disciplinary Standards are those standards by which individual departments and [disciplines/programs](#) at The College of New Jersey evaluate the scholarly accomplishments of their faculty members. This policy sets out the principles and criteria are to be addressed in all Disciplinary Standards. It also describes the processes by which the standards of individual disciplines are to be approved.

II. DEFINITIONS

N/A

III. POLICY

General Principles for Disciplinary Standards

Disciplinary Standards across the College should serve to maintain the high level of accomplishment and engagement that we expect from our faculty members and librarians as teacher-scholars and librarian-scholars, should be reasonable given TCNJ's workload and profile as a primarily undergraduate institution, and be flexible to provide maximum opportunity for faculty members' accomplishments to be evidence for normal progression through the academic ranks.

Moreover, Disciplinary Standards must address a common set of principles so that faculty from diverse departments and programs may receive similar guidance regarding the evaluation of their scholarly, professional, and creative activities. To that end, the lettered principles and numbered criteria listed below are required in all Disciplinary Standards; that is, each principle and criterion must be addressed in the Disciplinary Standards in some way. However, the expectations developed in response to each criterion will vary across departments/programs, and it is possible that some criteria will be deemed inapplicable by a given department or program. For example, each Disciplinary Standards document will outline expectations regarding involvement of students in faculty/librarian scholarship; however, the expectations outlined by individual departments/programs are likely to differ. Moreover, each criterion may be addressed in multiple ways. For example, regarding the evaluation of the quality of scholarly or creative products, one department may define appropriate outlets in terms of objective criteria such as impact factors, whereas another department may provide lists of preferred and acceptable outlets. This flexibility allows departments and programs to develop unique and appropriate Disciplinary Standards.

~~In addition Disciplinary Standards are intended to addressing each of the criteria listed below, each Disciplinary Standards must identify distinctive criteria~~ [\(1\) guide new faculty and librarians in their quest for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the teacher-scholar/librarian-scholar model; \(2\) to promote the development of tenured faculty and librarians as teacher-scholars/librarian-scholars; \(3\) guide the Promotion and Reappointment Committee \(PRC\) in evaluating candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review; and \(4\) foster an environment that supports faculty and librarians dedicated to the missions of TCNJ and their respective departments and programs.](#)

Guiding Principles for Drafting Disciplinary Standards Documents

[All Disciplinary Standards must include minimum expectations for scholarship for \(a\) reappointment during the probationary period, \(b\) tenure, and \(c\) promotion.](#)

[Since 2015, the reappointment of Assistant Professors or Librarians III to the 7th year \(tenure\) is awarded](#)

with promotion to Associate Professor and/or Librarian II, respectively. Thus, departments and programs must define minimum expectations in the disciplinary standards for (1) reappointment, (2) tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Librarian II, and (3) promotion to Professor or Librarian I, thus clearly recognizing the major stages of an academic career.

1. Expectations for reappointment are normally defined for Assistant Professors or Librarians III, although TCNJ also hires faculty at the Associate Professor/Librarian II and Professor or Librarian I levels. Expectations may be defined in general or for each of the years of the probationary period. Note that the Promotion and Reappointment Document also contemplates faculty applying for early promotion or tenure.
2. Expectations for tenure are normally defined for untenured Assistant Professors and Librarians III; in these cases tenure will be accompanied with promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II. An untenured Assistant Professor or Librarian III applying for tenure or an untenured Associate Professor or Librarian II applying for promotion must meet these same expectations; similarly, a tenured Assistant Professor or tenured Librarian III applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Librarian II must meet these same expectations.
3. Expectations for promotion to Professor/Librarian I must be met by any tenured or untenured faculty seeking promotion to Professor/Librarian I and by untenured Professors or Librarians I seeking tenure.

Required Elements for Disciplinary Standards

The following are the required elements for all department and program Disciplinary Standards.

A. Alignment with Key Institutional Documents and Values

All Disciplinary Standards must be consistent with:

1. The Mission of the College, School, and Department/Program
2. The identity of TCNJ as a primarily undergraduate institution with a select number of targeted masters programs;
3. The expectation that faculty members are to be accomplished and engaged teacher-scholars and/or librarian-scholars and students are to be accomplished and engaged learners;
4. The Promotion and Reappointment Document

A relatively "short tenure clock."

B. Categories of Acceptable Scholarly/Professional/Creative Work

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clear articulation of the range of tangible scholarly outcomes recognized in the discipline (e.g., journal papers, books, conference proceedings, exhibits, performances, grants and grant proposals, conference presentations, invited lectures)
2. Clear articulation of the range of modes of scholarship (e.g., Boyer; scholarship of discovery, scholarship of application, scholarship of pedagogy)
3. Flexibility in support of diverse paths in scholarship/professional/creative activity
4. Recognition of discipline-specific challenges for scholarship in the given field (e.g., international travel for some fields)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times, 12 pt

5. ~~5.~~ Clarity and flexibility of criteria to evaluate the quality of the venue in which scholarship is disseminated; flexibility to allow for the establishment of new venues and genres (e.g., emerging online venues)
6. ~~6.~~ Recognition of interdisciplinary work, when it is offered as part of a promotion or reappointment application, and indication of how to evaluate it

C. Criteria to Evaluate Different Types of Scholarly/Professional/Creative Work ~~All Disciplinary Standards must include:~~

~~4.~~ All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clarity and flexibility of criteria to evaluate the quality of different scholarly/professional/creative products
2. ~~2.~~ Criteria to evaluate scholarship in the context of our College's value of teaching/librarianship
3. ~~3.~~ Clear articulation of criteria for assessing the contribution of ~~service and teaching/librarianship integrated with~~ a scholar's research agenda (e.g., a faculty member from the School of Education serving on a local school board, a faculty member from the School of Engineering providing written testimony to a legislative body) ~~disseminated in non-traditional formats.~~

~~4. Distinctive criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion to Associate Professor and Professor or promotion to Librarian II and Librarian I, with expectations for productivity reflective of the major stages of an academic career~~

D. Scope, Quality, Importance, and Coherence of Scholarly/Professional/Creative Program

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clear articulation of how the department/program evaluates the scope (regional, national, international), quality, and importance of a scholarly/professional/creative project (e.g., not all disciplines have quantitative impact factors, but all disciplines can evaluate importance qualitatively)
2. Indication of the value of student involvement in, or the contribution to, scholarly/professional/creative work
3. Clear articulation of productivity expected (i.e., provide guidepost numbers, not hard and fast numbers)
4. Clarity for evaluating the quality and coherence of a sustained and ongoing program of scholarly/professional/creative work that matures over time

E. Authorship ~~:~~

All Disciplinary Standards must include:

1. Clear articulation of the ways in which the department/program evaluates different authorship patterns (e.g., single author ~~vs.~~ multiple author) in scholarly/professional/creative projects
2. Clear articulation of how the department/program evaluates scholarly/professional/creative work that results from smaller vs. larger scale projects

3. Clear identification of the role played by and value of student engagement in the scholarly/professional/creative work

Establishing Consistent Quality of Disciplinary Standards Documents

We suggest the following processAll departments and programs will review and revise the existing Disciplinary Standards according to the general principles every 5 years in a staggered multi-year pattern.

The following process must be followed to ensure that all Disciplinary Standards documents address the principles and criteria outlined above:

1. ~~1)~~ During the Spring ~~2011~~ semester, ~~all~~ departments ~~and/or~~ programs ~~will~~ with a 5-year periodic review ~~and due in the next academic year will~~ revise their previously developed Disciplinary Standards in accordance with the principles outlined in this document ~~(see above)~~. This process will be initiated by the Dean and will involve consultative conversation among all faculty members in the department or program. The revised Disciplinary Standards will be approved by ~~vote by~~ departmental/program faculty members via vote in accordance with departmental/program policy. The Department Chair will sign the approved document on a draft of the cover page.
2. ~~2)~~ The revised Disciplinary Standards will be submitted to the Dean of each School ~~by the end of the Spring 2011 semester~~. The Deans will review the Disciplinary Standards submitted from the Departments of their own Schools, returning to Departments any Disciplinary Standards that need to be revised for resubmission because they do not meet the criteria set forth in this document. For instance, revision will be needed if the Disciplinary Standards fail to address each required criterion described above. A cover sheet must be included with the Dean's signature indicating approval before it is submitted to the Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA). Upon approval by the Dean, the Disciplinary Standards will be forwarded by the Dean to CFA.
3. ~~3)~~ If revisions are needed, CFA will send the Disciplinary Standards back to the Department and copy the Dean. Upon approval by the Dean and then CFA, the Disciplinary Standards will be forwarded by CFA to Academic Affairs.
- ~~3.4~~ The Council of Deans and the Provost will review the Disciplinary Standards to assure that they meet the criteria set forth in this document. This review Review will be completed by the end of the ~~Fall 2011 semester~~ academic year.
- ~~4)~~ Concurrently, the Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA) will review the Disciplinary Standards by the end of the Fall 2011 semester.
- ~~4.5~~ ~~5)~~ The Dean, CFA, Council of Deans, and/or the Provost ~~and/or CFA~~ may indicate the need for further conversation and revision of Disciplinary Standards by departmental/program faculty. In such cases, the Disciplinary Standards will again go through steps 1–4 above.
- ~~5.6~~ ~~6)~~ The relevant Dean and the Provost will sign the cover page of final version of the Disciplinary Standards, confirming with their signatures that the Disciplinary Standards meet the criteria set forth in this document and therefore will be used in reviewing promotion and reappointment applications. ~~Once signed,~~ Academic Affairs will post the signed Disciplinary Standards online, including along with the date of the revision. Disciplinary standards can only be posted on the Academic Affairs website and not on School or Departmental webpages.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times, 12 pt

~~6.7.7) If, following this review, if any future~~ substantive changes are made to a Department's/Program's Disciplinary Standards, the revised Disciplinary Standards must undergo the process of review described here.

Review and Revision of Existing

Appropriate Disciplinary Standards

~~All departments and programs will review and revise the existing Disciplinary Standards according to the general principles and process outlined above. Disciplinary Standards will then be reviewed and revised, if necessary, for Use in a staggered multi-year pattern.~~ ***Reappointment and Promotion***

To avoid creating a moving target for candidates for reappointment, the Disciplinary Standards in effect ~~during~~ ***by the end of*** a faculty member's first year of employment will be used for reappointment and tenure applications in Years 1-~~4-5~~. Candidates for Promotion will use the Disciplinary Standards in effect in the year in which they apply for promotion.

RELATED DOCUMENTS

[N/A](#)

HISTORY

[N/A](#)

Recommended by CFA [2017](#); approved by Provost: [2010](#)
