

**Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure  
(RPT), Tenure Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) and Lecturer  
Reappointment and Promotion  
Department of Biological Sciences  
Adopted in 1993 & Revised 2010; 2012; 2014, 2018 and January 2020**

The criteria listed below are intended to provide general guidelines to faculty, and to reflect what is expected *under typical circumstances*. However, Departmental evaluations may consider additional criteria if warranted by exceptional circumstances or mitigating factors. Ultimately, each candidate must be evaluated on an individual basis and in a holistic manner.

The Department of Biological Sciences recognizes that to gain promotion to associate professor and especially to full professor, faculty must achieve distinction in one of three traditional areas of academic endeavor: teaching, research, or service. Distinction is defined as having established and maintained a reputation at the national or international level and must be substantiated by appropriate external reviewers.

**I. Reappointment:**

A. Research:

- Independent research program established and functioning likely to ultimately enhance the university's reputation at the national/international level.
- At least one presentation at a national or international meeting.
- External funding is not required for reappointment, but submission of at least two major external grant proposals is expected. Receiving internal grants will be viewed positively only if there is demonstrated systematic effort to pursue external funds.
- Publications resulting from the candidate's current or previous post are anticipated and will be viewed positively for reappointment. Emphasis will be placed on publications for which the candidate is senior or lead author, and/or report data generated since joining the faculty of UNC Charlotte.
- The criteria listed above are typical expectations for research performance for reappointment. However, the Department recognizes that the level of research productivity may vary with research area, co-authorship arrangements, the funding environment, and opportunities for collaboration. **It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-typical levels of performance.**

B. Teaching:

The department values effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate (non-majors as well as majors) levels.

- Development of new and modification of existing courses. Attempts to introduce innovative teaching methods will be viewed positively.
- Effective direction of graduate and undergraduate student research.

- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for “Quality of the Instructor” and “Quality of the Course” that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e. required vs. elective), course level (i.e. lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. **It is the candidate’s responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Appropriate actions to improve identified teaching problems, if necessary.
- Funding from teaching-related grants will be viewed positively.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Teaching for research track faculty.

### C. Service:

Service should be as connected as possible to the research and teaching mission of the university. In general, the Department does not expect a large service commitment from new faculty. However, for the service expected the following will be considered:

- Performance on Departmental committees.
- Involvement in College and University level committees viewed positively unless it adversely affects teaching and research.
- Community service will be viewed positively if related to a person’s field or university position.

## II. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

### A. Research:

A candidate for promotion and tenure will be expected to have begun to establish a national reputation in the candidate’s area of research. Evidence for such a reputation will be based on publications, external funding, invited presentations and letters from external reviewers.

- **Publications:** A candidate is typically expected to generate a minimum of six papers in peer-reviewed journals during the five-year period considered for tenure. Papers should be published in journals with at least an average impact factor for the field of study. Publications should reflect that the candidate has established an independent line of investigation, normally indicated by senior or lead authorship on a majority of publications generated since joining the faculty at UNC-Charlotte. Candidates should explain their relative contributions to publications for which they are not senior or lead author, but which substantiate the independence of their research program. Emphasis will be placed on publications of significant or potentially significant original research.

Significance will be evaluated by external reviewers, citation rates, and reputation of the journal of publication (as indicated by impact factor, etc.). In evaluating the publication record, consideration will be made for impact factors in the various sub-disciplines of Biology. Candidates should provide a list of journal titles and impact factors appropriate for their field of

specialization, as well as citation rates for their individual articles, to facilitate assessment of the significance of the published work.

- **Funding:** Tenure and promotion will require generation of external funds in amounts appropriate for maintaining recognition at a national or international level. Typically, this will entail funding as PI on grants from federal or state agencies such as NIH, NSF, EPA, USDA, NOAA, DOD, or appropriate private agencies. Particular emphasis will be placed on evidence for the ability to maintain consistent funding adequate to support the faculty member's research program, including the support of graduate students working in the lab. Consideration will also be given for significant contributions as co-investigator as part of funded collaborations with other faculty. When possible, the candidate should report the level of funding for the agency or program to which proposals were submitted.
- **Letters from external reviewers:** Letters should be obtained from external reviewers knowledgeable in the candidate's research area that demonstrate that the candidate has established an independent line of investigations and has the potential to achieve research distinction. Particular emphasis will be placed on objective evaluations from external reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate.
- **At least one presentation per year at a national or international meeting.**
- **Invited presentations:** Invited presentations such as symposium speaker or session chair at major meetings or invited seminars at major universities or institutes will be regarded particularly highly.
- **A departmental presentation open to the University showcasing the highlights and broader impacts of the candidate's scholarly activities.**
- **Annual merit evaluations, near or above the Department's norm for research, for research track faculty.**

The criteria listed above are typical expectations for research performance. However, the Department recognizes that the level of research productivity may vary with research area, co-authorship arrangements, the funding environment, and opportunities for collaboration. **It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

#### B. Teaching:

The department values effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate (non-majors as well as majors) levels. Candidates for promotion and tenure in the Department of Biological Sciences should demonstrate excellence in teaching and engagement in the teaching activities of the department and university. Measures of excellence and engagement include:

- Effective direction of graduate and undergraduate student research.
- New courses developed, and modification of existing courses.
- Awards.

- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for “Quality of the Instructor” and “Quality of the Course” that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e. required vs. elective), course level (i.e. lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. **It is the candidate’s responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**
- Positive peer evaluations of teaching
- Demonstrated improvement in any identified teaching problems.
- Funding.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Teaching for research track faculty.

### C. Service:

Faculty members will not be favorably considered for promotion and tenure if their main area of emphasis is service. However, service is expected of all tenure/track faculty. Departmental consideration will include:

- Professional service that indicates the candidate’s reputation will be particularly highly regarded. This includes positions on editorial boards, ad hoc review of manuscripts, and service on grant review panels.
- Membership on Departmental, College and University committees.
- Performance on committees.
- Community involvement if related to the person’s university appointment.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above 1, the Department's norm for service.

## III. Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to full professor can be achieved through excellence in Research, Teaching or Service, or a combination of two or more areas, in keeping with College guidelines. Evaluation of excellence will be based on the stature of the candidate within his/her field, as reflected in external letters and the quality of productivity in research, teaching and/or service. The successful candidate for Promotion to Full Professor based on Research, Teaching and/Service is typically expected to have earned annual merit evaluations above “Proficient” for most of the years under consideration. **It is the candidate’s responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

### A. Promotion to Full Professor based on Research:

The department values successful research and Promotion to Professor may be based on achievement and demonstration of excellence in Research. Evidence of excellence may be indicated by:

- Publications: Consistent output of high quality, peer-reviewed publications (typically greater than or equal to 2 per year). In cases where the candidate’s contribution is not evident from authorship, the level of contribution should be explained. In addition to the impact factor of the journal of publication, emphasis will also be placed on the citation record of individual articles to determine impact on the field. Invited reviews in peer-reviewed journals, as well as books and

book chapters in the candidate's field will also be viewed positively. Candidates should provide a list of journal titles and impact factors appropriate for their field of specialization, as well as citation rates for their individual articles, to facilitate assessment of the significance of the published work. **It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

- Consistent generation of external funds in amounts appropriate for maintaining recognition at the national or international level.
- A record of research awards, and of presentations at National and International conferences, and/or at other Universities/Colleges or Research Institutions.
- A departmental presentation, open to the University, showcasing the highlights and broader impacts of the candidate's scholarly activities.
- Positive external evaluations. Particular emphasis will be placed on objective evaluations from external reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate.

#### B. Promotion to Full Professor based on Teaching:

The department values effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate (non-majors as well as majors) levels. Promotion to Professor may be based on achievement and demonstration of excellence in teaching. Evidence of excellence may be indicated by:

- **Publications:** Peer-reviewed articles in Teaching and Science Education are not required but will be viewed positively. The quality of the publications will be assessed through journal impact factor and citation record to determine impact on the field. Candidates should provide a list of journal titles and impact factors appropriate for their field of teaching specialization, as well as citation rates for their individual articles, to facilitate assessment of the significance of the published work.
- **Funding:** A record of generating external funds to develop teaching pedagogy and enhance education and training in STEM disciplines will be viewed positively.
- A record of teaching awards and presentations at National and International education conferences or research/teaching institutions.
- Development of new courses, and other advancements of curricula
- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for "Quality of the Instructor" and "Quality of the Course" that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e., required vs. elective), course level (i.e., lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. **It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**
- A record of "teaching beyond the classroom", as demonstrated by but not limited to community outreach (i.e., collaborations with Community Colleges), invited seminars, organizing and leading educational workshops, and participation in REU programs.
- Effective direction of graduate, post-graduate and undergraduate students.
- Positive external evaluations for teaching performance and contributions to education in the STEM disciplines.

#### C. Promotion to Full Professor based on Service:

The department values the importance of Service in the academic profession. Promotion to Professor may be based on achievement and demonstration of excellence in Service, as

evidenced by a strong record of demonstrated leadership and dedication to the Department, University, and or Field. Evidence of excellence in Service may be indicated by:

- Consistent leadership roles in service at the Departmental, College and University levels.
- Generation of external funds to enhance organizational structure and administrative goals
- Consistent involvement in professional service, including but not limited to Editorial Boards, Review panels for funding agencies, serving as officer or committee member in national or international professional societies, etc.
- Awards for university and/or professional service
- Community involvement related to the individual's area of expertise and university position.
- Positive external evaluations that highlight university and/or professional service contributions.

D. Promotion to Full Professor based on a combination of two or more areas:

The department acknowledges that Promotion to Full Professor may be based on a combination of achievements and demonstration of excellence in Research, Teaching and/or Service.

Evidence of cumulative excellence in Research, Teaching and/or Service may be indicated by:

- Candidates wishing to pursue this avenue for Promotion to Full Professor will be evaluated holistically based on a combination of factors listed above under the Research, Teaching and Service avenues deemed most appropriate for the individual's record.
- It is the candidates' responsibility to explain their intent to pursue a combination of Research, Teaching, and/or Service approach toward consideration for promotion.

#### **IV. Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR)**

Every 5 years, tenured faculty in the Department of Biological Sciences undergo a tenured faculty performance review (i.e., TFPR) per University policies (see UNC Charlotte Academic Procedure: Tenured Faculty Performance Review (<http://provost.uncc.edu/policies/tenured-faculty-performance-review>)). The Department Chairperson, in cooperation with the faculty member, shall generate a Tenured Faculty Performance Review [TFPR] folder.

The TFPR folder contains:

- a) copies of the faculty member's last five annual merit evaluations from the Department Chairperson;
- b) a current curriculum vitae;
- c) a current five-year plan and set of goals; and
- d) a statement describing his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service (including part-time administrative responsibilities) related to his or her five-year plan.

**It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

All post-tenure review evaluators, including all Department Review Committee members, Department Chairpersons, and Deans, are required to complete the UNC training module prior to review of a TFPR file.

Per UNCC policies, the tenured-faculty members of DRC shall review the files and report their recommendation to the Chairperson. The report shall include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. This report shall conclude with one of the following recommendations:

**“Exceeds Expectations:”** The faculty member exceeds expectations.

**“Meets Expectations:”** The faculty member has no substantial and chronic performance deficiencies.

**“Does Not Meet Expectations:”** The faculty member has substantial and chronic performance deficiencies. The DRC shall state the faculty member's primary responsibilities and describe the performance deficiencies in its report as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties and the goals established.

The Department of Biological Sciences DRC will recommend that a faculty member either

- *“Exceeds Expectations”* if, for all five years under review, annual merit scores are well above the midpoint overall score possible (typically 5 out of 10) for the candidate's workload expectations
- *“Meets Expectations”* if, for three or more years of the five years under review, annual merit scores are above the midpoint overall score possible (typically 5 out of 10) for the candidate's workload expectations
- *“Does Not Meet Expectations”* if, for three or more of the five years under review, annual merit scores are below the midpoint overall score possible (typically 5 out of 10) for the candidate's workload expectations.

Following the DRC recommendation, the Chairperson's review may include, respectively, the following for a faculty that

- *“Exceeds Expectations”*: recognition of exemplary faculty performance including but not limited to nomination and/or recognition with Department, College and/or University award(s) and/or salary adjustments.
- *“Exceeds Expectations”*: recognition of the faculty performance and suggestions to improve performance.
- *“Does Not Meet Expectations”* requirement that the Chairperson initiates further evaluation including discussions with the faculty, and the development of a plan to align the faculty performance (i.e., reassignment of duties, peer-review of teaching, training, etc...).

In the evaluation, the chairperson may also take into account previous TFPR (if any available).

For further details, candidates should become familiar with the Departmental TFPR guidelines. The candidates should review the College (<https://inside-clas.uncc.edu/handbook/faculty-evaluation/tenured-faculty-performance-review/>) and University TFPR policies (<https://provost.uncc.edu/policies-procedures/academic-policies-and-procedures/tenured-faculty-performance-review>).

In particular, the candidate should be aware that, following the monitoring and evaluation of the written development plan, IF the faculty member's performance continues to “Does not meet expectations”, the Chairperson may recommend the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Any decision to recommend imposition of serious sanctions should occur only after the widest consultation with the tenured faculty in the department. If the chairperson recommends sanctions, the recommendation will be accompanied with the result of a poll consultation of the tenured faculty.

- Upon receipt of the Chairperson’s recommendation, the Dean may agree
  - \*that no further action is necessary, the review process stops
  - \* with a recommendation for a workload adjustment, the adjustment is implemented and the review stops
  - \* with a departmental recommendation for the imposition of serious sanctions, the Dean forwards this recommendation to the Senior Associate Provost. Serious sanctions (demotion, salary reduction and, in the most serious cases, may include a recommendation for discharge) may be imposed only in accord with Section VI, of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina.
- If the Dean disagrees with the departmental decision, the departmental and Dean’s recommendation are forwarded to the Senior Associate Provost for review.

A faculty member retains full rights to seek a hearing if the decision is made to impose serious sanctions. Neither a negative review nor an insufficient improvement from a development plan will necessarily result in the imposition of sanctions; such sanctions may be imposed only upon grounds specified in Section VI of the Tenure Policies and Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. In the imposition of serious sanctions, the burden of proof is on the University to prove that the serious deficiencies on the development plan constitute incompetence or neglect of duty.

## **V. Lecturer Evaluation, Reappointment and Promotion**

Lecturer candidates for reappointment and evaluation should demonstrate excellence in teaching and engagement in the teaching activities of the department and University. **It is the candidate’s responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

### **A- Schedule:**

Per University and College policies, lecturers on multi-year contracts must receive preliminary evaluations, usually in the form of an annual evaluation. A comprehensive evaluation should occur in the final year of a lecturer’s contract, as the basis for renewing that contract. Normally, a lecturer’s initial appointment is a contract for three years; renewal of that contract results in a second three-year term. After six years of effective teaching, usually at UNC Charlotte, lecturers may receive a five-year contract.



### B- Evaluation Criteria for Lecturer Reappointment & Promotion:

Per University and College policies, the review of lecturers' contracts should be regular, systematic, and rigorous and should be conducted by a departmental review committee. The criteria for performance should align with the duties and responsibilities described in the contract letter and/or job description.

Measures of excellence and engagement of lecturers in the Department of Biological Sciences include:

- Development of existing and new courses. The incorporation of innovative teaching methods will be viewed positively.
- Effective direction of undergraduate and graduate teaching assistants.
- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for "Quality of the Instructor" and "Quality of the Course" that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e., required vs. elective), course level (i.e., lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Appropriate actions to address any problems in teaching identified through student evaluations and/or annual merit evaluations. Such actions should be discussed in the Personal Statement and their effectiveness should be reflected in improving student evaluations and annual merit evaluations.
- Continued professional development as demonstrated through course work, participation in workshops, and attendance at professional meetings
- Engaging in the scholarship of teaching (through publications, professional presentations, reviewing, etc.) will be viewed positively.
- Funding from teaching-related grants will be viewed positively.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Lecturers.

If the lecturer is responsible for duties in addition to teaching, criteria for performance will be outlined by the lecturer's supervisor and presented to the lecturer at the beginning of the contract or whenever the duties are assumed.

### C- Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Initiated by the lecturer with the Chairperson's support, a lecturer can seek a promotion to Senior Lecturer. Per University and College policies, the rank of Senior Lecturer is a unique (and not automatic) recognition for Lecturers who have distinguished themselves in their careers at UNC Charlotte.

Per University and College policies, to be eligible for Senior Lecturer, a candidate should have

- attained a Master's degree in her or his field of study with
- evidence of continued professional development,
- have a minimum of six years of full-time teaching experience (usually at UNC Charlotte), and
- have demonstrated consistently excellent performance in instruction and other assigned responsibilities, beyond that expected for reappointment at the rank of lecturer.

#### D- Teaching Professor Appointment

Per University & College guidelines, the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences “*may recognize an outstanding Lecturer or Senior Lecturer as “Teaching Professor” in recognition of extraordinary accomplishments in teaching and fundamental contributions to the university’s education mission* (see College website for further details, [https://inside-clas.uncc.edu/handbook/faculty-development/teaching/#Appointment\\_of\\_Teaching\\_Professor](https://inside-clas.uncc.edu/handbook/faculty-development/teaching/#Appointment_of_Teaching_Professor)). Because this title is reserved for only a few exceptional faculty members, criteria for this appointment reside at the **college level and not within departments**. Like lecturers and senior lecturers, teaching professors are not on the tenure track. They will continue to undergo periodic reviews for reappointment as stipulated in their original appointment contract as well as the rules and regulations of the College and the home Department pertaining to lecturers and senior lecturers. Please review the University & College website for more details including Criteria for the appointment of faculty to the title of “Teaching Professor, process and timeline.

#### **IV. Candidate Notifications**

Faculty members in professorial ranks applying for RPT shall be notified in writing according to University policies (<https://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.13#s6>): “*Each positive or negative determination and the rationale for such determination on reappointment, promotion, or conferral of Permanent Tenure made by a chair or a dean shall be provided in writing to the Faculty Member to whom it pertains simultaneously with its transmittal to the next administrative level. Each positive or negative decision of the Provost and the rationale for any negative decision on reappointment, promotion, or conferral of Permanent Tenure shall be provided in writing to the Faculty Member to whom it pertains simultaneously with its transmittal to the next administrative level. That Faculty Member shall have access to all documents that are part of the decision-making process.*”

Lecturers applying for reappointments and/or change in rank shall be similarly notified.

## Appendix I

### Tenure-Line Faculty Portfolio for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1. Current CV.
2. External letters (not required for Reappointment).
3. Reprints (pdf) of all published papers and preprints of all papers in press. Report journal impact factors.
4. Copies of grant proposal pages that indicate your relative contribution to the proposals.
5. Copies of reviews of all funded and unfunded grant proposals.
6. All teaching evaluations (student\* and peer).
7. Copies of all merit evaluation summary letters since last promotion.
8. Personal statement (self-assessment) (see Appendix II below).
9. Any other information the candidate wishes the Review Committee to consider.

\*For student numerical evaluations, please include the following summary table in your portfolio (add rows as necessary):

Course	Semester taught	Instructor score (lect Q7; lab Q4)	Department Mean		Course score (lect Q6; lab Q5)	Department Mean

### Lecturer-Line Faculty Portfolio for Reappointment, Evaluation and Promotion

1. A current CV.
2. A copy of the job description.
3. Personal statement (self-assessment) (see Appendix II below).
4. All student evaluations\* and written student comments since last reappointment or promotion.
5. Copies of peer teaching evaluations, if any.
6. Samples of course syllabi from each course taught since last reappointment or promotion.
7. Samples of class assignments and/or activities.
8. Copies of annual evaluation summary letters since last reappointment or promotion.
9. Any other information the candidate wishes the Review Committee to consider (publications; funding efforts; professional presentations; reviewing; departmental and University service; etc.).

\*For student numerical evaluations, please include the following summary table in your portfolio (add rows as necessary):

Course	Semester taught	Instructor score (lect Q7; lab Q4)	Department Mean	Course score (lect Q6; lab Q5)	Department Mean

## Appendix II: Personal Statement

The Department of Biological Sciences recommends that candidates incorporate the following format when preparing their personal statements to assist the Review Committee and Departmental Chairperson in evaluating performance. **Please Note:** this recommendation does not replace or supersede any components of the Personal Statement required by the College or University ([https://inside-clas.uncc.edu/handbook/faculty-evaluation/rpt/candidate-files/#Section\\_2\\_Personal\\_Statement](https://inside-clas.uncc.edu/handbook/faculty-evaluation/rpt/candidate-files/#Section_2_Personal_Statement)).

From the Departmental perspective, the purpose of the personal statement is for the candidate to provide a critical, objective self-assessment of his/her performance relative to departmental expectations and plans for continued growth and development. As such, for each of the areas of teaching, research and service, candidates should:

- State their general philosophy or approach
- Summarize their accomplishments and indicate the degree to which they meet departmental requirements
- Identify the main strengths and weakness of the performance
- Discuss plans for continued development and improvement, especially for any identified weaknesses

## Appendix III: RPT & TFPR Process Timelines\*

### 1- Approximate Timeline for the TT RPT Process\*\*

(Department Review Committee = DRC; eRPT = electronic RPT web application)

1. Candidate provides list with names of external reviewers to Chairperson (if required)	6 mo. + 1 wk. before due date
2. External review package to Chairperson (if required)	6 months before due date
3. Chairperson solicits external letters (if required)	6 months before due date
4. Candidate submits material to Chairperson (and eRPT if required)	8 weeks before due date
5. eRPT/RPT package including external letters to DRC	5 weeks before due date
6. DRC recommendation presented to and discussed by eligible Faculty in a scheduled faculty meeting	3 weeks before due date
7. Vote by the eligible Faculty, results to DRC	2 weeks before due date
8. DRC recommendation to Chairperson	2 weeks before due date
9. Chairperson & DRC recommendations to Dean	Due date in CLAS calendar

### 2- Typical dates\*\* (vary depending on specific RPT process) for TT promotions

6 months & 1 week before due date	First Tues. of April
6 months before due date	Second Tues. of April
6 months before due date	Second Tues. of April
8 weeks before due date	First Tues of August
5 weeks before due date	Last Tues of August
3 weeks before due date	First Tues of September
2 weeks before due date	Second Tues of September
2 weeks before due date	Second Tues. of September
Due date in CLAS calendar	Last Tues of September

\*Each candidate should inquire about specific deadlines pertaining to his/her RPT portfolio

### 3- Approximate Timeline for the TFPR Process\*\*

(Department Review Committee = DRC; eRPT = electronic RPT web application)

1. Chairperson notifies tenured Faculty of upcoming TFPR	Dec the prior year
2. Candidate upload materials for TFPR review	Mid-February
3. DRC recommendation to Chairperson	End of March
4. Chairperson's recommendation to the Dean	Mid-April

\*Lecturer' promotion documentation & timelines follow different deadlines and processes and specific inquiries should be directed to the Chairperson of the Department

\*\*Each candidate should inquire about specific deadlines pertaining to his/her RPT or TFPR portfolio