Associate Vice President for Faculty
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS | THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

201 S. President's Circle, Room 120 Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
www.admin.utah.edu/office-for-faculty

TO: Richard B. Brown, Dean, College of Engineering

FROM: Amy Wildermuth, Associate Vice President for Faculty

DATE: July 26, 2012

RE: RPT Standards Clarification (REVISED)

The purpose of this memo is to clarify how those reviewing engineering tenure files should understand the College RPT standards and their relationship to University Policy.

The College of Engineering Standards provide as follows:

To be tenured or advanced in rank, a faculty member:

- *Must be an effective teacher;*
- *Must have established a research program that attracts and supports an acceptable number of top-caliber Ph.D. students, generates an acceptable number of quality scholarly publications, and shows evidence of sustainable funding; and*
- *Must be a willing and responsible participant in department, college and university service assignments, and must be active in external professional service.*

University Policy 6-303(III)(A)(2)(c)(i) provides that:

For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department. A department may select standards higher than these minimum requirements if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

The College of Engineering has opted to select standards that are higher than the University standards. The College of Engineering has also opted to use a five-point scale—unacceptable, fair, good, very good, excellent—to evaluate its candidates under its standards.

Although tenure decisions cannot and should not be made on the basis of a formula, it is important to understand how the College of Engineering applies its scale and how that scale fits in with the University standards. As such, in order to achieve tenure in the College of Engineering, there are three requirements. First, one must be at least an "effective teacher." In general, this translates to achieving roughly at least a rating of **very good** on the five-point scale. In addition, one must "have established a research program that attracts and supports an acceptable number of top-caliber Ph.D. students, generates an acceptable number of quality scholarly publications, and shows evidence of sustainable funding." This translates to a rating of roughly at least **very good** in research. Finally, one must "be a willing and responsible participant in department, college and university service assignments, and must be active in external professional service." This translates roughly to at least a rating of **very good** in service.

In order to be consistent with University Policy, in addition to requiring the above minimal ratings, a candidate must be rated **excellent** in either teaching or research, or the combined achievements in the two areas must constitute excellence.

As noted above, the information in this memo is only to serve as a rough guide as to how the College of Engineering applies its standards. It is important to understand that, when applying these standards on a case-by-case basis in tenure decisions, reviewers at all levels must consider the whole file—the sum of each of the three areas of research, teaching, and service—in making a final recommendation on tenure. In other words, no specific alignment of ratings will guarantee that tenure will be recommended. Candidates will ultimately be evaluated based on their overall demonstrated impact.