COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement for Tenure-line Faculty

Approved by Department of Educational Psychology Tenure-line Faculty: August 18, 2017

Approved by Dean: August 18, 2017

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on November 15, 2017 and the Senior Vice President on January 1, 2018, for implementation on January 1, 2018.

This document serves as the Department of Educational Psychology's Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures required by University Policy. This statement along with relevant University Policies, Policy 6-303, found at http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php, and Policy 6-311, found at http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php, govern the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

Mission of the Department:

The department's mission statement (ratified, 2017) is as follows: *"The Educational Psychology Department produces high-quality basic and applied scholarship while offering outstanding undergraduate and graduate education in the areas of Counseling/Counseling Psychology, Learning Sciences, Reading and Literacy, and School Psychology. We strive to foster collaboration and support diversity, equal access, and opportunity while serving our students, the University, and the community."*

Table of Contents

1. <u>Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty</u>

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of January 1, 2018. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Professor (see below), candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior RPT requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Department Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations.

Candidates who will be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor after the effective date of this Statement will be reviewed according to the statement and requirements in effect at the time review materials are sent to external evaluators.

2. <u>Informal and Formal Reviews</u>

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

a. <u>Timing.</u> To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the department will conduct either informal or formal reviews of its tenure-track candidates in each year of their probationary period as indicated in Table 1 below.

b. <u>Normal probationary period</u>. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of assistant professor is seven years. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is five years.

 Candidates with a seven-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year.

Table 1: Normal Review Schedule

Rank at Appointment	Year of Informal Review	Year of Formal Review
Assistant Professor	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th	4th, 7th

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be triggered by the Department RPT Advisory Committee or the Department Chair, according to University Policy (Policy 6-303-B-1-c).

c. <u>Shortening or extending the probationary period</u>. Candidates may request early tenure reviews (i.e., *shortening* the otherwise applicable probationary period) on the grounds described in and

by following the procedures provided for in University Policy. Because early review cases require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress, few requests are made and few are granted. Candidates are therefore encouraged to consult with the Department Chair and the Dean and senior colleagues before requesting an early tenure review.

If the candidate has had an authorized *extension* of the probationary period (e.g., for medical or parental leave), the years of the formal retention review and the mandatory review for tenure shall be adjusted accordingly. Extensions of the probationary period authorized by University Policies may postpone formal reviews, but informal reviews will occur in any year in which a formal review is not held.

2.2 Informal Reviews

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on RPT expectations to candidates. A primary function of the informal review is to provide advice in developing the file that will be made available for the formal review process, with due attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: research; teaching; and service to the profession, university, and public.

2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

If in the context of an informal review in which the candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the Department Chair or a majority of the Department RPT Advisory Committee members may vote to conduct a formal "triggered" review. The formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate. A triggered formal review shall include external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality of research is not at issue in the review.

2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor Rank Without Tenure

The department typically does not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at or promote current tenure-line faculty to the Associate Professor or Professor rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. Under appropriate exceptional circumstances, however, a new faculty member may be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or a current tenure-track faculty member may be promoted to Associate Professor without the immediate granting of tenure.

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when they have met the requirements for that rank. The department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. In general, however, such requests are not made until the time of one's first tenured

faculty review, which occurs five years after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*. Our department recognizes a fourth point on the scale; *distinguished* is above *excellent* on the scale and represents significant and sustained excellence over time, exceeding the criteria that would be required to achieve a rating of *excellent* for any criterion.

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period; tenure; promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate's research, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

University Policy allows a candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty to be taken into consideration during a review. As a result, one's failure to abide by the Faculty Code may be considered in determining whether one will be retained, promoted, or tenured.

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that they have *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure. Reasonable potential is indicated by ratings of at least *effective* in all three functions of research, teaching, and service.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of at least *excellent* in research, at least *excellent* in teaching, and at least *effective* in service (Policy 6-303 III A-2-c-i).

Associate Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank requires that one has developed a broad reputation for high-quality, *excellent* research; demonstrated *sustained excellence* in teaching; and performed *effective* service in some combination of university, public, and professional settings. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.

Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* to the point of being *distinguished* in research resulting in a national and international reputation in his or her field, at least *sustained excellence* in teaching, and at least *sustained excellence* in service. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

3.2 Evaluation of Research

Judgments about a candidate's research are based on both the quality and quantity of research and their relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive research, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality and quantity of contributions, and the professional context of the candidate.

a. Description of research

We expect candidates to contribute significantly and distinctly to the development and dissemination of new knowledge. In order to do so, we expect candidates to produce high quality scholarly work at an appropriate rate for the discipline. Quantity of research is not judged by simple publication counts or impact factors. A series of publications over time that represents sustained programmatic research in one or more topic areas is expected. We also expect the candidate to demonstrate that their research program is on a positive and productive trajectory over time and is sustainable. Publications that reflect a primary role or responsibility by the faculty member are valued more than those that reflect a secondary or tertiary role. This is usually, but not always, associated with order of authorship in publications.

b. Quality of Research/Creative Activity

Research is evaluated with respect to three facets of quality: purpose, significance of outlet, and impact. Although these facets are not independent of one another, each defines a different aspect of quality. The three facets are of equal importance and are applied to the variety of research areas represented by the department faculty (e.g., basic psychological processes, professional issues, assessment, interventions, legal and ethical issues, quantitative and qualitative methodologies, etc.). Distinction in research does not require that a candidate's research products always represent the highest levels within the three facets. Instead, successful evaluation in research can be achieved with a variety of products that differ with respect to these quality dimensions. However, judging the quality of research contributions is an essential part of evaluating faculty members in the area of research, and these three facets define the forms of research that generally signify greater quality and importance.

1) Nature and Purpose of the Contribution

The mission of the University, in part, is to create new knowledge. Consistent with this, research quality is in part evaluated by the degree to which the research contributes to new understanding. Five categories of research purpose are listed below, reflecting a general ordering from greater to lesser significance. This ordering does not imply that the later categories have no value. All categories represent traditional forms of research that have a place in the various discipline areas contained within Educational Psychology. However, some research purposes reflect to a higher degree the University mission of creating new knowledge, and the department recognizes the greater significance of these forms of research.

Creation of New Knowledge. This category includes research products that present new theory, methodology, or empirical evidence relevant to the field of education or psychology. New theory refers to an original proposal that explains a system of

behaviors or processes, not simply new hypotheses or models of isolated behaviors. New empirical evidence can be quantitative or qualitative, but the emphasis is on the development of new and original understanding from the data, not merely an empirical description of phenomena. New methodological contributions can take many forms (e.g., research-related methods or methods of professional practice), but to belong in this category, contributions must be novel rather than re-expressions of existing methods.

Novel Synthesis of Existing Knowledge. This category includes research that presents a new synthesis of existing knowledge with new implications for future research and theory. Examples include, but are not limited to, an integrative literature review that proposes new conceptualizations of existing evidence, or a comprehensive meta-analysis that produces a new understanding of existing empirical evidence.

New Descriptive Evidence. This category includes research products that report new empirical evidence, but with little or no development of new conceptual understanding. Empirical studies that describe phenomena (e.g., surveys and other descriptive methods) without testing, contrasting, or proposing theoretical explanations fall into this category.

Summary and/or Application of Existing Knowledge. This category includes research products that summarize existing knowledge (previously generated theory, concepts, methodology, and/or empirical findings), often with recommended applications for professional areas related to education or psychology.

Commentary on Existing Knowledge. This category includes research products of limited scope such as a published comment, editorial, or book review. The research in this category addresses a limited scope of existing research, theory, or practice.

2) Significance of the Research Outlet

The quality of research contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear. Four levels of significance are listed below with common examples. The examples are meant to serve only as general guidelines for assessing the significance of outlets. Each product is considered for its own unique merits relative to this facet of quality. In addition, some types of research are not listed as examples (e.g., software, psychological or educational tests, video productions, unfunded grants, etc.), because they vary considerably in their significance.

Exceptional. Examples of this category include authored scholarly books by respected publishers, articles in widely recognized and peer-reviewed journals that are general to fields of education and/or psychology, articles in top tier peer-reviewed journals in a specialty area, and major funded research grants..

Primary. Examples of this category include articles in respected peer-reviewed journals, book chapters in a high quality edited book, edited books, externally funded research seed grants, major funded training grants with significant research

components, and invited addresses to prominent national/international conferences. Published conference proceedings may be considered primary contributions if the candidate can demonstrate that the conference is recognized as top-tier in a broad field of science, attendance at the conference exceeds 300 people, the rejection rate exceeds 75%, the entire paper, not only the abstract, is peer-reviewed, and the paper exceeds 4,000 words in length.

Secondary. Examples of this category include authored books on professional topics for the general public, general textbooks, articles in lower tier peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed abstracts, presentations at national/international professional conferences, conference proceedings that do not meet all of the criteria expected for primary contributions, and funded training grants with minor research components.

3) Potential Impact of the Work

Judgments of impact (or predicted impact) range from minimal to exceptionally high. These judgments are based on individual assessments of the work, conclusions from qualified external evaluators, citation rates if the publications have existed for a sufficient period of time and the citations rates are available, and other forms of recognition such as awards and honors. Both the breadth—the degree to which contributions broadly affect different areas within the field—and the depth—the degree to which contributions have changed the way other scholars think about a topic area— of impact are considered.

Depth of impact. This is the degree to which contributions have changed (or are likely to change) the way other scholars think about a topic area or the way professionals practice in applied settings. Judgments about depth of impact take into account such things as the clarity with which important issues or questions are identified, the sophistication of methods used or proposed, the amount of evidence brought to bear on the issues, the depth of analysis and interpretation, and the degree to which conclusions and/or recommendations are unambiguous and likely to generalize.

Breadth of impact. This is the degree to which contributions broadly affect (or are likely to broadly affect) different areas within the fields of education and/or psychology, including one's own area of specialization. Research contributions that have far reaching impact are especially valued. Breadth of impact is not meant to reflect the size of a scholar's specialty area, but rather the degree to which research works have (or are predicted to have) broad influence within and across discipline and specialty areas.

c. Research Funding

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this department and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the university. To the extent that funding is necessary for the candidate's research program, all successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to

obtain such funding will be considered as appropriate to contributing positively toward one's research.

d. Summary Rating Scale for Research

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research as described above and give due consideration to the candidate's time in rank.

Distinguished: The candidate has made outstanding and sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda one or more topic areas of research. The contributions are programmatic, original, consistent over time, and establish the individual as a recognized scholar in at least one topic area.

Excellent: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research contributions reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research.

3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

Within the University system, the term teaching refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. There are therefore three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development and support, and (3) student advising and mentoring.

a.   Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics; and may include (e) practicum instruction, professional supervision, and management of internship or field practicum placements. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations, (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses. The department expects faculty to comply with the code of conduct related to faculty instruction and supervision described in the Faculty Code.

b.   Curriculum and program development and support

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new and novel courses, publication of textbooks (that have not been counted as part of the candidate's research) or other teaching materials, development and maintenance of practicum and field training sites, and development of professional training programs. Efforts to secure training and student support grants are valued contributions to teaching beyond the fundamental responsibilities of course instruction, program development, and student mentoring. Externally funded training grants and research grants that include support for students are valued contributions in this area. Grants such as those mentioned here are valued to some degree under both categories of research and teaching, proportional to the degree to which they contain research and student training elements.

c.   Student advising and mentoring

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring; (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees; and (3) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality. Indicators of quality are drawn from (a) SAC reports, (b) faculty observations from serving on committees with the candidate, (c) publication of thesis and dissertation projects, (d) student presentation of thesis and dissertation projects at professional conferences, and (e) professional awards and recognition of theses and dissertations chaired.

Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching described above.

Distinguished: The candidate has made important and sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising, mentoring, and supervision in research and professional development. Distinguished contributions are sustained, accumulate over years of service, and result in recognition by teaching awards or a history of outstanding peer reviews.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in teaching.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the strengths and interests of individual faculty members.

a.   Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a national or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward national professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); and presenting professional workshops. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals.

b.   University Service

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the Department, College, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces, or serving in administrative positions, at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.

c.   Public Service

This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and international public settings and can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines. Community agencies may include schools, and other educational organizations, state government agencies, and healthcare and mental health organizations. Public service includes course instruction that incorporates a community-engaged learning component.

d.   Summary Rating Scale for Service. Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above considering time in rank.

Distinguished: The candidate has made substantial, important, and sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. Distinguished contributions accumulate over years of service and result in recognition by awards, holding office in national or international professional organizations, or protracted service as the editor or an associate editor of highly regarded professional journals.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service.

4. RPT Procedures

4.1 Participants
The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

a. Candidate. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.

b. Department RPT Advisory Committee. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.

>Committee Structure for Retention Reviews. All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. (Policy 6-303-III-E-1).

>Committee Structure for Promotion Reviews. All tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. (Policy 6-303-III-E-1)

>Committee Structure for Tenure Reviews. All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. (Policy 6-303-III-E-1)

c. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. The Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the department faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election. The department chairperson is ineligible to serve as chairperson of the RPT advisory committee (Policy 6-303-III-E-1). If the elected chairperson is ineligible to serve on the RPT advisory committee for a promotion review, an eligible tenure-line member of the department faculty shall be elected to chair the RPT advisory committee for that promotion review.

d. Ad Hoc Subcommittee. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee prepares a report about an RPT candidate for consideration by the RPT Advisory Committee. Two members of the faculty are appointed as a subcommittee for a candidate's informal review, and two members of the faculty are appointed for a formal review. The members of the subcommittee are tenured and are qualified by rank to vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the candidate. They

are selected in consultation with the candidate by the Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee, who also designates a chairperson for the subcommittee to serve as the primary reviewer and the other member to serve as the secondary reviewer.

e. <u>Department Chairperson</u>. The administrative head of the department.

f. <u>Student Advisory Committee (SAC)</u>. A committee made up of students in the Department of Educational Psychology.

h. <u>Peer Teaching Reviewers</u>. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by RPT Advisory Committee. Peer teaching reviewers will be the members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee: the candidate's primary and secondary RPT reviewers.

i. <u>External Evaluators</u>.

These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator with the candidate. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators. In submitting a list of nominees, candidates must describe the qualifications of each potential reviewer (institution, rank or position, and demonstrated areas of expertise). The candidate also must describe any professional and/or personal relationship that exists between the candidate and each potential reviewer.

The Department Chair selects a minimum of three external reviewers. The chair may identify other reviewers if (a) the nominated reviewers do not represent senior or tenured scholars from appropriate institutions, (b) the nominated reviewers do not have expertise relevant to the candidate, or (c) the nominated reviewers have extensive prior professional or personal relationships with the candidate. The department chair makes the final selection, giving priority to appropriate reviewers from the candidate's nominees.

The Department Chair requests that each candidate sign the waiver/non-waiver form concerning the confidentiality of the external reviewers' recommendations (Policy 6-303-III-D-9).

4.2 Informal Review Procedures
Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted. The department's purpose for these informal reviews is to provide regular feedback and guidance for junior faculty working toward tenure and promotion.

a. <u>Informal Reviews after the First Year</u>. These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae and (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans, in research, teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 15.

In the case of a candidate having a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Department prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

Course evaluation results from the University of Utah are added to the file by the Department Chair. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the candidate.

The Student Advisory Committee is not asked to submit a report for, and external evaluators are not involved in, informal reviews (Policy 6-303-III-D-12).

The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will appoint the members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee (i.e., the primary and secondary reviewers) to review the candidate's file, meet with the candidate, and write an ad hoc informal review report that summarizes the candidate's progress. When a copy of the ad hoc report is drafted, the Ad Hoc Subcommittee will meet with the candidate to discuss it. It will then be provided to the candidate and added to the RPT file.

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the Ad Hoc Subcommittee report and its discussion with the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the Ad Hoc Subcommittee's report, and (ii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the chairperson of the department shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, department chairperson will meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the department chairperson or a majority of the RPT advisory committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accordance with University Policy (Policy 6-303-B-1-c).

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The Department Chair will review the candidate's research, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The Department Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format and will follow the process described above for informal reviews unless otherwise specified below.

a. Department Chairperson Responsibilities. By April 1, the Department Chairperson will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year. The Department Chairperson will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Department Chairperson by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Department Chairperson will also request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, the Department Chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written statements for the file of each candidate to be considered.

In the case of a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Department Chairperson shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress, which should be submitted to the Department prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Department Chairperson will notify the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform them that a separate report for each candidate shall be due to the Department Chairperson no later than September 15. The Department Chairperson must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than August 1. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint members to and select a chairperson for the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to oversee the candidate's file in the RPT process.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chair shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review. The Peer Teaching Reviewers will consist of the RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee, i.e., the candidate's primary and secondary reviewers.

d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee

Chairperson, after consulting with the Department Chair and the ad hoc subcommittee chairperson, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The Department Chairperson will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

e. <u>RPT File Contents and File Closing Date</u>. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, and (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans, for the relevant criteria (research, teaching, and service The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

2) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents*. The Department Chairperson shall ensure that the file includes: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (ii) available SAC reports, (iii) any written recommendations from department faculty and staff, (iv) any reports from joint/shared appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) peer teaching reviews, (vii) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (viii) all other required materials.

f. <u>Candidate's Rights to Comment on File</u>. A candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of his or her file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.

g. <u>Formal Review—Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps</u>.

1) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action*. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but no later than October 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy (Policy 6-303-III-E-5), the Department Chairperson may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate

(e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate).

Whenever possible, the Department Chair will advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes in advance of the meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

The minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes, others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Department Chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting (Policy 6-303-III-E-7).

The candidate is to be informed of the Committee recommendation by the Committee Chairperson as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chairperson about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

2) *Department Chairperson Action*. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Department Chairperson shall prepare their written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the Department Chairperson.

3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level*. Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy (Policy 6-303-III Sections G-J).

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

In order for the RPT process to operate effectively, and to ensure that all candidates receive the most accurate reviews possible, certain participants in the RPT process have responsibilities for placing certain materials in the file. All materials listed below are to be added by the file closing date, and are considered for the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. Additionally, the report of the RPT Advisory Committee meeting, recommendation of the Department Chairperson, and any candidate responses to either, are added subsequently.

Candidate's Responsibility

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the Department Chairperson for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:

   a. All research publications since the candidate began his/her professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on blind review, or other selection method.

   b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.

   c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.

   d. Honors received for research.

   e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.

   f. Individual student research supervised.

   g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.

   h. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.

2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in research, teaching, and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy.

3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.

4. Course syllabi for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the candidate chooses to include. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers (i.e., the RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee) and SAC to use this material for their reports.

5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research is unclear, the candidate may

include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.

6. <u>Candidate response(s)</u> to any other file contents, if desired.

Department Chairperson's Responsibility

It is the Department Chairperson's responsibility to include the following documentation in the candidate's RPT file, prior to the file closing date.

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.

2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.

3. SAC report(s) for the current formal review and all past formal reviews.

4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.

5. Copies of all prior years' RPT files.

6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.

7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Department Chairperson describing the candidate's service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.

8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her right to read)
   a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
   b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae
   c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate Department Chairperson, or Committee Chairperson)

9. Report of RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval

Review Committee Approval:

_____
Lincoln L. Davies, Chair

_____ 11/15/17
Date

Senior Vice President Approval:

_____
Amy J. Wildermuth, designee

_____ 1/23/18
Date