American University TPR Guidelines Updates, Resource 3: GENERAL THEMES, p. 1

R guidelines in 1.5 years offers a rare opportunity for faculty and administrators across campus to help each other develop greater intercultural competency and cross-disciplinary appreciation. Doing so requires concerted efforts to identify not only obvious, but also more subtle ways in which long-standing academic norms may systematically disadvantage whole areas of excellence and whole subsets of the faculty population.

Because TPR guidelines are such important expressions of collective standards, committees are encouraged to consult as many faculty colleagues as possible throughout the revision process.

Consulting with colleagues outside AU may also be helpful, especially regarding scholarship guidelines. Some fields and disciplines have made more progress than others in expanding criteria for excellence. Committees can benefit from models and examples offered by disciplinary associations and/or other universities.

Disciplinary imperatives, organizational styles, and philosophical emphases vary from unit to unit. Committees should tailor guidelines to the distinctive needs and priorities of the academic unit while honoring core values and principles. There is no template for TPR guidelines.

Unidimensional, summary-type measures often fail to capture the breadth of possible accomplishments. For example, SETs scores in the teaching sphere and journal impact factors or h-index scores in the scholarship sphere have significant blind spots. Multi-dimensional and mixed-methods criteria may do a better job of identifying excellence in all its forms. (See *Resource 9* on metrics for assessing the impact of scholarly outputs.)

Balancing specificity and expansiveness is a challenge in TPR guidelines. Committees may be tempted to set benchmarks (such as preferred journals or specific pedagogies, etc.) to make standards clearer, but doing so risks creating a narrow, one-size-fits-all definition of high-quality work. Narrow definitions tend to institutionalize historic biases.

One way to darify standards without ingraining biases is to accompany statements of priorities with illustrative, non-prescriptive examples of multiple ways faculty might meet the criteria. Examples can be used to emphasize a broad array of different pathways to career advancement.