Faculty Evaluation Plan, Communication Studies Department

PURPOSE: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Communication Studies.

APPLIES TO: Faculty within the Department of Communication Studies

I. Introduction

Faculty in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Kansas are expected to demonstrate a commitment to effective teaching in the classroom in addition to the advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students; engage in quality research activities; and provide professional service to the department, College, University and broader community. Tenure and promotion criteria are described in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations and University guidelines.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

A. Unit Expectations

Below are the general expectations for performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Expectations of research productivity and quality may vary depending on a number of factors including distribution of effort, rank, etc.

1. Teaching/Advising

The normal teaching load for a faculty member is two courses per semester. In some cases this load may be increased or decreased in consultation with the department chair and with the approval of the Dean’s office. Faculty members are expected to follow the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. Faculty members are expected to meet classes or make arrangements to have classes covered in the event of an absence. The department chair should be notified and approve of any absence not due to illness. Faculty should hold regular office hours, participate in advising, and in general, act in a professional manner. Allocation of effort for faculty members in teaching is 40%.

2. Research

All faculty members are expected to conduct research and/or disseminate scholarly findings. Every faculty member has a responsibility to participate in scholarly activities such as the publication of journal articles, books, and book chapters, the presentation of research at professional meetings and participation in grant activity. Allocation of effort for faculty members in research/scholarly findings is 40%.

3. Service

All faculty members are expected to carry out service duties to facilitate the efficient operation of the department and to participate in service to the College, the University, the profession, the community and the nation. Allocation of effort in service is 20%.
B. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

Overall Minimum Acceptable Performance

We recognize that faculty members have different strengths and goals and that these may vary at different points in their careers. In order to assess faculty performance the department carries out a mandatory annual review of every faculty member’s teaching/advising, research, and service. The policies governing the evaluation of faculty shall be examined according to Board of Regents’ and University policies every three-years. Faculty members must meet minimum standards (outlined below).

All evaluations are conducted by the chair and two elected members of the Advisory Committee. While the evaluations occur annually, a three-year period is covered, with a focus on the previous calendar year. The evaluation form for this process is included below in Appendix B. This method of assessment gives emphasis to the previous academic year, but accounts for major projects or accomplishments such as books or significant teaching awards over a longer period. On the basis of the materials submitted, each member of the advisory committee evaluates every faculty member on a scale of 0-40 for teaching/advising; 0-40 for research; and 0-20 for service following the general 40-40-20 formula outlined by the College and University. This formula may vary in some cases with prior approval (see section below on Differential Allocation of Effort). Evaluation in each category is determined by the following considerations:

1. Teaching/Advising

   Evaluation of teaching and advising is based on student evaluations, peer evaluations, course syllabi and related information including letters from students and peers, teaching awards, overload teaching, etc.

2. Research

   Research performance ratings derive from the quality and quantity of scholarly efforts. Excellence in research is indicated by, but not restricted to publications in refereed journals, books, book chapters, grant activity, citations of work, reviews, etc.

3. Service

   Faculty members are expected to participate in department, College and University service in addition to service to the profession and the public at large.

Minimum performance is operationalized based on scores on the evaluation form included in Appendix B. Failure to receive 40% of the available points in any given category in a given year will be defined as poor performance. A pattern of sub-par evaluations in any of the areas of teaching/advising, research, or service or overall, as defined by ratings of poor is the primary indicator of inadequate performance. When the annual evaluation documents this pattern of performance, the Chair and the faculty member will develop a plan to address the areas of difficulty. If the Chair and the faculty member agree on the plan, it is signed by both parties and maintained in the faculty member's personnel file. If they fail to agree this will also be put in writing and signed by both parties and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Three consecutive years of sustained failure to demonstrate progress following development of the intervention plan will result in initiation of a recommendation for dismissal by the Chair following consultation with the advisory committee.

C. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)
The Department of Communication Studies expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the university, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department’s mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the chair of the unit. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the College. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years.

For additional information, please see the University Policy on Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE).

### III. Annual Evaluation System

#### A. Overview

As described above, all faculty members are reviewed annually on a 40-40-20 teaching-research-service formula, unless this formula is revised based on the procedures described above. Each faculty member submits a portfolio early in the spring semester. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit all materials and prepare the portfolio.

The annual evaluation process in the Department of Communication Studies, which is conducted by the Chair and two elected members of the Advisory Committee, is structured and scheduled to allow sufficient time, prior to merit-salary recommendations, for discussions with faculty members concerning their performances in the past cycle and the expectations for their performances in the cycle ahead. Furthermore, the process also provides sufficient time for discussions of merit-salary recommendations themselves, though the data that drive such recommendations are only one of many outcomes of the evaluation process. The process functions on the basis of the calendar year as follows:

- **December**: The Chair issues to all faculty members a memorandum requesting that annual evaluation portfolios and an updated CV be submitted by the end of January.

- **February-March**: The Advisory Committee and the Chair review all materials in those portfolios and compile tentative evaluations for the annual-evaluation cycle (the previous three year period with emphasis on the previous calendar year).
April: The Chair issues to all faculty members tentative evaluations of their work during the previous year; consults with them as appropriate concerning questions about that evaluation and/or the goals and expectations for their work during the ensuing evaluation cycle; finalizes the tentative evaluations and any plans for the future projected from them in a formal written letter to the faculty member.

B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member’s portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

A portfolio is composed of teaching/advising, research and service materials. A copy of the Department Portfolio Evaluation Form is included in Appendix B. This portfolio specifies the required categories and multiple sources of data to be provided to document teaching/advising, scholarly, and service activities of the faculty member. The period of time for the portfolio review is the previous three calendar years, with emphasis on the previous calendar year. Since Communication Studies has voted to require faculty members to include a student comment form as part of the student evaluation process, all copies of student evaluations, including the comment form, should be included in each annual review portfolio.

C. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

As described above, the Advisory Committee, composed of two elected faculty members and the department chair, meets in early spring to review faculty evaluation materials. Materials for evaluations include mandatory student evaluations, peer reviews (voluntary), advising assessments, student letters, syllabi, assignments, other course materials, publications, convention papers and other research materials, and materials relating to service. These materials are independently rated by advisory committee members. The Advisory Committee then discusses each case and comes to a conclusion about individual ratings. The evaluation of the portfolio will typically involve the following:

1. Teaching/Advising

   Effective teaching refers to the faculty member’s dissemination of knowledge to enhance students’ skills, create understanding, and foster intellectual growth. Teaching will be judged based on the entire teaching portfolio of the faculty member in relation to departmental norms relating to the level of coursework and the type of course taught. Teaching excellence may be achieved in many ways including traditional classroom instruction and one on one teaching or coaching, and may be documented by several means, including the following.

   a. Student perceptions, with special emphasis on perceived strengths and weaknesses. Systematic student evaluations must be provided for each course taught by the candidate.
   b. Perceptions of advisees, recent alumni, peer reviews.
   c. Teaching awards and commendations.
   d. Service on M.A. and Ph.D. comprehensive examinations and advisory committees, and quality advising and mentoring of graduate students.
   e. Reported advising activities.

2. Research

   The expectation of the department is that the faculty member will publish written work in appropriate books and journals. Published works are those that have appeared in a journal or a book that has been
released. In press refers to work that has been written and accepted with no substantial revisions pending; a letter from the editor is needed to show that a work is in-press.

a. **Publications**

Publications must be sufficient in both quantity and quality. Criteria for evaluating publications include the following:

i. Books and Refereed articles. Evidence of a developed, important research program in the form of academic books and/or peer-reviewed journal articles is needed. Anonymous peer review, as a condition for publication, shall be regarded as a sign of acceptance by colleagues in the faculty member’s discipline when contribution to scholarship is the purpose of the journal and the criterion of the refereeing. Scholarly books and monographs will be considered important evidence of research capability.

ii. Invited articles in significant journals also can be important scholarly contributions. When the importance of an invited contribution is not established by the reputation of the editor who invites it or the publication in which it appears, other indices of peer acceptance may be cited.

iii. The quality of publications may be evaluated by colleagues outside the Department.

iv. The reputation of the journal(s) in which the faculty member publishes will be taken into account by Committee members in making their judgments. Publication in a prestigious journal is evidence of peer acceptability of the faculty’s work.

v. Published reviews of a faculty member’s book can be evidence of the importance of its contribution.

vi. Acceptance of a faculty member’s work may be measured to some extent by the frequency his or her work is cited by colleagues. Sometimes evaluations accompanying citation provide qualitative evidence of the impact of an article, book, or a research agenda developed by the candidate. The reprinting of articles or excerpts in anthologies is a related form of acknowledgment.

vii. Papers given at meetings. It is expected that faculty members will present papers at meetings of scholarly associations. Generally, unpublished papers will not be accorded the weight of published papers.

b. **Research funding**

The receipt of a research grant, especially from a funding source outside the University, is evidence that the faculty member’s scholarly abilities are acceptable to colleagues who have reviewed grant applications. Receipt of outside support for research is highly commendable.

c. **Record**

The portfolio must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity, external reviews of the faculty member’s work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the faculty member’s national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career. The following variables are also taken into consideration when evaluating research:

i. Evidence of a developed, important research program in the form of academic books and/or peer-reviewed journal articles. The research must be sufficient both in terms of quantity and quality.

ii. The favorable response of peers to the individual’s work as evidenced by 1) letters of recommendation, 2) awards, 3) reviews, 4) letters of commendation.

iii. Evidence that published expertise in a particular area has led to such professional activities as: guest lecturers; consultanthips; post-doctoral fellowships; requests to contribute to professional meetings, symposia, and scholarly collections, and national and international recognition and honors.

iv. The reprinting of portions of books and articles in the works of peers.
3. Service

Service can be provided to the department, College, University, community, and discipline. It can be expressed through local, state, national, and international avenues. A faculty member must be able to document his/her activities in public and professional service. Such documentation can be provided by indicating the specific types of activities including:

a. Membership and effective participation on departmental committees;
b. Membership and effective participation on College or University committees;
c. Election to and effective work in offices at the College or University level;
d. Consultation activity at the local, state, national, and international levels;
e. Effective work in the community in relation to the mission of the department;
f. Effective participation in positions with regional, national and international professional societies;
g. Journal editorships and editorial board memberships; and,
h. Effective administrative work in department, College or University offices.

D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

A written letter is sent to each faculty member in which the Advisory Committee outlines the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses and makes suggestions for improvements in teaching, research and service if the situation warrants, as well as any information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Naturally, faculty members are also praised for outstanding performance as well. Faculty members are informed in writing of their opportunity to discuss the evaluation with the chair and Advisory Committee. A follow-up face-to-face meeting is arranged for faculty members who desire to discuss issues and in some cases the advisory committee specifically requests face-to-face meetings if they perceive issues that need resolution. A written response is provided to the faculty member in every case. A copy of this response is retained in department files.

E. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The annual evaluation process yields multiple outcomes including the achievement of department and individual goals, differential allocation of effort, personnel decision (including promotion and tenure, non-reappointment, etc.), and merit salary decisions. The Advisory Committee will use the process to communicate to each faculty member an evaluation of his/her performance in relation to department goals and professional goals of the faculty member.

Frankly, we expect the vast majority of evaluations to be positive and beneficial. Efforts will be made to develop a faculty member’s abilities and to tailor performance plans individually. Efforts may include the reallocation of teaching, research and/or service loads, under the procedures described earlier, recognizing however that every faculty member has a responsibility to conduct research and to teach well. In the event that the faculty member is untenured the advisory committee will also make a reasonable effort to inform the candidate as to their perception of the candidate’s progress toward the attainment of promotion and/or tenure.

1. Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member’s performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member’s performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member
must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

2. Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

In the case where a faculty member disagrees with an evaluation he/she may appeal to the department Advisory Committee. The faculty member may present additional information not included in their portfolio to support their appeal or may provide contextual data for understanding the portfolio. The Advisory Committee will review this material and meet with the faculty member who initiated the appeal. Based on review of any additional material presented, the advisory committee will reconsider the evaluation of the faculty member and communicate to him/her any changes in the department evaluation of his/her performance.

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance still fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee’s decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member’s personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who fails within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.

3. Sustained failure to meet performance expectations

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

F. Faculty Development Initiatives

Several opportunities for faculty development exist in the department and at the University of Kansas, including the Center for Teaching Excellence, a number of programs to assist research development and grant writing, and other programs.

At the department level these development opportunities include the following:
• Faculty mentoring for new and non-tenured faculty members. Each non-tenured faculty member will be assigned a mentor who will meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her teaching/advising, research, and service activities.

• Faculty mentoring for associate professors. Associate professors receive feedback from the Department’s Advisory Committee regarding their career progress toward promotion to Full Professor.

• All faculty members receive departmental support in development efforts such as applying for research grants and grants for instructional improvement, preparing papers for conference presentation and publication, providing travel support to attend academic conferences and other research opportunities.

Faculty members should consult with the Chair to identify relevant opportunities.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member’s pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the Chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The Chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean’s Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

See Faculty Development Programs for information about additional faculty development opportunities.
IV. Appendices

Appendix A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument Used for Student Evaluation of Teaching: The Department of Communication Studies utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” for this purpose. In addition, the department utilizes student comments. The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.

Communication Studies Evaluations
Course Number:
Instructor:
Semester:
Year:
Student Comments:
Things the Instructor did well:
Suggested Improvements:
Appendix B. Departmental Evaluation Portfolio Form

Faculty Evaluation Portfolio Report Form

Name ________________________________________ Year __________________

General Guidelines:

I. Unless a differential allocation of effort with the Department Chair has been made, evaluation will be made on the following scale: 40% Teaching/Advising; 40% Research; 20% Service.

II. While the evaluation process covers a 3 year window, faculty only report the previous calendar year in every cycle. The advisory committee retains the previous two portfolio reports and reviews them, along with the current year, as part of the evaluation process.

III. While faculty should list the total number of directed studies and other individual projects, it isn't necessary to list each one on the form separately.

IV. Please note that NO work should be reported on more than the merit form for a single year. For example, if you claimed a publication as in press in 2008 you should not list it in 2009, even if the actual publication date is 2009.

V. Within research, faculty should list only works that have been published, are "in press" (that is accepted and at the publisher) or are currently under review. A number of people have listed works that are "in progress" or "forthcoming." Since it is difficult to tell if all faculty members mean the same things by those terms, we think it makes the most sense simply to not include works within research until they are at least under review.

VI. Include an updated copy of your vita with this form.

I. Teaching

A. Summary of teaching

   In 2-3 paragraphs provide a summary of the feedback you have received from student evaluations describing both areas of strength and those in need of improvement. Discuss how you have used that feedback to inform your teaching in subsequent semesters. Provide an example to illustrate your use of the student feedback. NOTE: Course evaluations for all courses that enrolled 5 or more students must be submitted as supplemental materials. Explanations for missing course evaluation data should be provided where indicated below.

   Insert summary and use of feedback from student evaluations here.

   Explanation for Missing Course Evaluation Data:

   Insert the reason for any missing course evaluations for courses of 5 or more students

B. Courses Taught

   Insert list of courses taught in the previous calendar year in chronological order under the headings below or insert a table with those headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th># Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Unusual circumstances connected with teaching assignments (new courses, etc.).

D. Committee Work

   1. Doctoral Student Committees Chair (list names of students and indicate type of chair: Program, Comprehensives, and/or Dissertation)
2. **Masters Student Committees Chaired** (list names of students and indicate type of chair: Program, Comprehensives, and/or Thesis)

3. **Undergraduate Honors Student Committees Chaired** (list names of students)

4. **Additional Graduate Student Committee Service** (list name of students)
   a. **Doctoral Committees** (both within and outside department)
   b. **Masters Committees** (both within and outside department)

**E. Description of undergraduate advising activity**

Please feature any advising beyond the normal departmental advising process

**F. Teaching Awards**
1. Awards Received
2. Nominations

**G. Possible Materials for Submission**
1. Course Materials
   a. Course Syllabi
   b. Assignments
   c. Exams
2. Student Evaluations

**II. Research**

Five categories are listed: publications, grants, presentations, awards, and manuscripts in submission. Publications and grants are considered major research activities and will receive higher weighting in the annual evaluation than the other three categories.

**A. Publications**

For all types of publications, lesser credit will normally be given when the faculty member is not the first author. Major publications rank above minor publications. In general, numbers within Major and Minor Classifications indicate relative ranking of publication types within those two categories.

1. **Major Publications**
   a. Scholarly Book
   b. Edited Scholarly Books
   c. Refereed Articles in Major National Journals
   d. Refereed Articles in Other National Journals; Refereed Book Chapters
   e. Refereed Articles in Regional Journals
   f. Non-refereed Scholarly Book Chapters
   g. National Distributed University Textbooks

2. **Minor Publications**
   a. Published Proceedings
   b. Non-refereed Articles in all Journals
   c. Chapters in Textbooks
   d. Textbooks Restricted to use at University of Kansas
   e. Published Book Reviews
   f. Published Abstracts

**B. Grants**

Outside grants are ranked higher than internal grants. Funded grants are ranked higher than submitted grants.

1. **Outside research grants**
   a. Grants funded
   b. Grants submitted

2. **Internal research grants**
   a. Grants funded
   b. Grants submitted
C. Presentations
   1. Invited Presentations
      a. Visiting Scholar at other University
      b. Conference Keynote Addresses
   2. Other Presentations
      a. National and International Conference Papers
      b. Regional Conference Papers
      
         Note: Presentations for other departments/units at KU and local and state organizations should be reported as university, local, or state service as appropriate. Chairing a panel at a conference should be reported as professional service at the appropriate level.

D. Research Awards
   1. Awards Received
   2. Nominations

E. Manuscripts in Submission

F. Possible Supporting Materials
   1. Copies of Publications
   2. Copies of Grants
   3. Award Letters

III. Service

A. Service to the University
   1. Department
   2. College
   3. University

B. Professional Service Outside the University (e.g., journal reviewing)
   1. Local, State, Regional
   2. National
   3. International

C. Honors or Awards for Professional Service
   1. Awards Received
   2. Nominations

APPROVED BY:
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

APPROVED ON:
Tuesday, May 20, 2014

EFFECTIVE ON:
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REVIEW CYCLE:
Every three years

**RELATED POLICIES:**
- Board of Regents requirements
- Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations
- Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty
- Faculty Code of Rights

**REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:**
09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

_**NOTE:** Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member’s portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines._
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