

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

Criteria and Standards For RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF REGULAR FACULTY

Revision 1: Removal of External Letters for Third Year Retention Review

Approved by Department Tenure-line Faculty: March 1, 2019

Approved by College Dean: March 12, 2019

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee: June 30, 2019

Approved by Senior Vice President Designee: July 31, 2019 effective, July 1, 2019

Revision 0: Original Submission

Adopted by Department of Geography, December, 2007

Approved by University RPT Standards Committee, February, 2008

I. Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation

Two basic assumptions underlie the criteria and standards set forth herein.

- (1) Adherence to the University regulations and criteria for promotion, retention, and tenure of regular faculty, as outlined in the University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual (www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/9/9-5.1.html). The purpose of these guidelines is to supplement the ideas implicit and explicit in the University documents.
- (2) Criteria and measurement of a faculty member's performance cannot be viewed in a categorically simplistic fashion.

A. Categories of RPT Administrative Actions

Retention

A decision to retain an untenured regular faculty member during a formal review in the probationary period will occur in cases where the candidate shows evidence of making adequate progress toward tenure commensurate with the number of years she or he completed. A decision to not retain a tenure-track faculty member could occur if at the time of any formal review during the probationary period the candidate offers very little or no evidence of sustained research activity, and/or fails to provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to associate professor and tenure require (a) a sustained record of high-quality research and scholarship, (b) effectiveness in teaching, and (c) evidence of departmental, University, and community service. Ordinarily, the final review for this promotion and granting of tenure takes place in the seventh year of employment.

Tenure of Associate Professor or Professor

In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of associate professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an associate professor. In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to

achieve the standards expected of a professor. The final tenure review for untenured associate and full professors will take place in the fifth year of employment.

Promotion to Professor

There are both quantitative and qualitative changes in expectations with respect to promotion at the level of Professor. With respect to scholarship, a Professor is expected to have achieved national and/or international recognition, high status and impact as a scholar, and an original and productive research program supported by sustained and high quality publications. With respect to teaching and service, promotion to Professor requires demonstration of continued quality and growth in these areas. Time in the rank of associate professor is not a factor in consideration for promotion to Professor.

In addition to the indicators listed above, the significant national recognition expected at the Professor level can be reflected in numerous and diverse activities/accomplishments. Examples may include: regular publications of important articles in major journals and/or research monographs; invited chapters in important scholarly books; citation frequencies; external grants; appointment to editorial boards of major journals; service on grant review and national evaluation panels; and/or other leadership contributions to the profession.

B. Evaluative Criteria for RPT Administrative Actions

Because of great diversity in University programs and in faculty talents and interests, variability in the criteria can be expected, and the application of criteria must reflect the varied duties of the faculty member under review. The standards and criteria for promotion, retention, and tenure are divided into three major areas: 1) research and scholarship 2) teaching, 3) University and community service. Each faculty member undergoing review will be evaluated in all three areas. However, while the weighting may vary with respect to the individual concerned, the emphasis for evaluation will be on research and scholarship and teaching. The Chair and the RPT committee of the Department of Geography will conduct a series of formal and informal reviews of each faculty member's performance. The process for each of these reviews is specified in forthcoming sections of this document. Formal and informal reviews will serve three purposes:

- 1) to evaluate the sustained record of research scholarship, teaching and university and community service compiled by the faculty member, especially during his/her time at the University of Utah.
- 2) to give the faculty member a clearer identification of his or her own professional goals and expectations within the Department, College, and University.
- 3) to give the Chair a clearer perspective of the faculty member's role in the Department by making apparent the balance or weighting between research, teaching and service activities..

Typically, the order of importance among areas will be (a) a sustained record or research scholarship and professionalism with evidence of high quality, (b) competence in teaching, (c) evidence of service to the Department, College, University, and the community.

Finally, whether or not a faculty member achieves an “acceptable” level of performance on these indicators is a judgment to be reached by the appropriate Departmental advisory committee for promotion, retention, and tenure and by the Chair. The above are the major categories to be used in making this judgment. The following are the specific factors to be considered within those categories.

Research and Scholarship

Evidence of research and scholarship will be assessed by the following criteria:

1. Evaluation by Departmental colleagues.
2. Opinion of colleagues and experts in the field outside of the Department, including scholars outside the University currently involved in the research areas of the candidate being evaluated.
 - a. Letters evaluating the faculty member’s research and other professional contributions.
 - b. Published reviews of the faculty member’s books and articles.
 - c. Citations of the faculty member’s work in literature.
3. Published works.
 - a. Both quality and quantity of published works, as well as a sustained record of scholarly work or research.
 - b. Quality of the journals in which published works appear.
4. Participation in professional organizations, meetings, and conferences; invited lectures and papers.
5. Research grants.

The extent to which an individual has been able to obtain research grant funds and thereby increase the probability of research and scholarly contributions, and student support. Consideration will be given to the number and quality of proposals submitted.
6. Awards, honors, and other recognition of contributions resulting from the person’s research or scholarship.

7. Significant professional activities, e.g., offices held, committee chairships and committee service in professional associations, editorships and service on editorial boards, and service in a peer review role.

Teaching

Teaching competence will be based on the person's openness and receptivity to students and their ideas, comprehensiveness in covering material considered basic to the course, fairness as an evaluator of students, willingness to participate in activities that fill Departmental teaching needs, and knowledge of recent developments in the field. Evidence of teaching proficiency may be assessed by the following criteria:

1. Observation and evaluations by the Department Chair, peers and the RPT Committee.
2. Student/course evaluations as determined by:
 - a. Use of the University's standard course evaluation process tailored by the department to unique departmental requirements, such as information assessing a student's learning experience.
 - b. Written reports from the Department of Geography Student Advisory Committee (SAC).
3. Evaluation of documents pertaining to course content, structure and delivery.
4. Special recognitions for teaching.
5. Contribution to the education, productivity, mentoring and progress of students.
6. Innovations in teaching, e.g., experimental courses, multi-media productions, new field experiences, and involvement of students in instruction.
7. Participation in activities concerning teaching in the University and other academic departments within the University, e.g., committees, lectures on teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, and course development.

University and Community Service

In most instances and especially during the pre-tenure probationary period, service will be subordinate to research and teaching in the evaluation process. In rare instances, as when candidates hold appointments involving major administrative duties or apply scholarship in a particularly rigorous and extensive manner, additional weight may be attached to service in the overall judgment of a candidate's profile of achievement. Nevertheless, all candidates are expected to demonstrate a moderate amount of service activities

Factors to be considered where applicable:

1. Service on Departmental, College, or University committees, task forces, or special assignments.
2. Chairship of Departmental, College or University committees.
3. Elected positions (e.g., University Senate, College Council) within the University.
4. Service as University representative to other universities and organizations.
5. Consultant to bureaus, commissions, agencies, or legislative bodies.
6. Participation in special community projects and studies.
7. Professionally related community positions and activities.
8. General community educational contributions, e.g., lectures, workshops, and community clinic work.
9. Participation in community activities concerning teaching, e.g., committees, lectures, teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, and course development.

Note: Service to organizations other than those reasonably associated with professional activities should not be considered as community service. Church, social club service, or positions, or commercial ventures generally would not be considered as professional service to the community.

II. Process of Formal and Informal Reviews

The Department of Geography will have sufficient review and evaluation of every faculty member's performance to meet the goals of the Department and provide full communication of performance expectations to the faculty member. The Chair of the Department will conduct annual informal reviews of all faculty members as specified in Section II-A of this document. In addition, the departmental RPT Committee and the Chair will conduct a more substantial informal review at the end of the first year of employment for every tenure-track faculty member. This process is specified in Section II-B.

There will be a formal performance and retention review in the third year of employment of every tenure-track faculty member. This process is specified in Section II-C.

Should the Chair, the RPT Committee, and/or an individual faculty member under review deem it appropriate, the Department will conduct a formal RPT review in other years. This is considered to be a discretionary formal review and is specified later in this document (Section II-D). There is a formal evaluation for tenure and promotion

conducted in the seventh year for faculty holding the rank of assistant professor, and in the fifth year for those holding the rank of associate or full professor, (or earlier if the candidate, department and University administration are in agreement with the request for an early review). This process is described in Section II-E of this document. Figure 1 provides an overview of the process.




Figure 1. Department of Geography timeline of RPT reviews (see Section III).

II-A. Guidelines for informal yearly reviews of tenure-track faculty members

The Chair of the Department of Geography will undertake an informal review of every tenure-track faculty member in each year in which a formal review is not held. This review is stipulated in the PPM 9-5.1 Rev. 18 Section 2 B. The review is to provide a yearly evaluation of the faculty member’s research, publication, classroom instruction, funding acquisition, research mentoring with students, professional service performance and departmental service and involvement.

The faculty member is to provide the chair (by a date specified) a current CV and course evaluations for the past year. The primary outcomes of this review are a meeting between the Chair and the faculty member, followed by a written report by the Chair made available to the faculty member and the permanent file. The written report emanating from these annual informal reviews is made available to the PRT advisory committee and the Dean of CSBS. Based on the PPM, the faculty member will have seven working days to provide a response to the report should she/he choose to do so.

II-B. Guidelines for first year informal review of untenured faculty

In coordination with the yearly informal review undertaken by the Chair, an informal review will be undertaken in the end (spring semester) of the first year of employment by the Departmental RPT Committee. This initial review is to provide a broad-based evaluation by the entire RPT Committee of the candidate’s research, publication, classroom instruction, funding acquisition, research mentoring with students, professional service performance and departmental service and involvement.

The goals of this first year review are to assess the performance of the candidate during their initial year at the University of Utah. The primary outcomes of this review are to provide an early career evaluation of the performance of the candidate, to begin the candidate's development of their performance file, especially their personal statements, and to suggest actions to further the success of the candidate at the University of Utah.

Since this is an informal assessment, the Departmental RPT Committee and the Departmental Chair will review the candidate's performance. No outside reviews will be solicited. The candidate will provide a CV, personal statement, copies of first semester instructional materials and evaluations, and any other materials indicative of her/his teaching, research and service.

The personal statement should discuss her/his accomplishments during the time at the University of Utah in teaching, research and service. Also, the statement should address, in detail, plans and realistic expectations for the future. The statement should be framed within the context of the RPT criteria as stated in the departmental criteria for RPT and PPM 9-5.1.

Upon closure of the file, the Departmental RPT Committee will meet and prepare a report synthesizing the results of the evaluation by the Committee. This report will be distributed to the candidate, the departmental chair and to the permanent file of the candidate. Based on the PPM, the candidate will have seven working days to provide a response to the report should she/he choose to do so.

II-C. Guidelines for the third year formal retention review of tenure-track faculty

The third year review is a formal evaluation required by the department and the University of Utah. The review is to be undertaken in the beginning of the third year of employment.. The goals of this third year review are to assess the candidate's research, publication, classroom instruction, funding acquisition, research mentoring with students, professional service performance and departmental service and involvement. While previous activities will be reviewed, the focus is primarily on performance since their initiation in the tenure-track process at the University of Utah. The most significant outcome of this review is to provide a full and objective determination as to whether the candidate should be retained at the University of Utah. Guidelines for formal retention reviews are also used for tenure and promotion reviews. If retention is recommended, the review report should suggest actions to further their successful completion of the tenure and promotion process.

~~Since this is a formal assessment, the Departmental RPT Committee, the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) and reviewers outside of the University of Utah, who are qualified experts knowledgeable of the candidate's research area and related fields, will review the candidate's performance. The departmental RPT committee will select the outside reviewers from a list compiled by the candidate and the committee. At least two referees will be selected from those suggested by the candidate. The committee will select at least two additional reviewers. A minimum of three external letters will be used~~

~~in the review. Each reviewer will be asked to state their relationship to the candidate and provide an evaluation of the candidate's research, publication, funding acquisition, research mentoring with graduate students and professional service performance. The reviewers will not be asked to evaluate classroom teaching.~~

The Department of Geography SAC will be asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and mentoring performance with both undergraduate and graduate students. The SAC will provide a report to the candidate for review and written response prior to the submission of the report to the Departmental RPT Committee

The candidate is requested to provide a CV, a personal statement, teaching and course evaluations, copies of their primary publications, course syllabi and other materials indicative of her/his research, teaching and service. The personal statement should discuss their performance and accomplishments during their time at the University of Utah. Also, the statement should address, in detail, plans and realistic expectations for the future. The statement should be framed within the context of the RPT criteria as stated in the departmental criteria for RPT and PPM 8-6 and 9-5.1.

Upon closure of the complete file, the Departmental RPT Committee will meet and record a vote on retention of the candidate. The Committee will prepare a report synthesizing the results of the evaluation by the SAC, the outside reviewers and the Committee. This report will be sent to the departmental chair and the chair provides a separate written evaluation. Based on the PPM, the candidate will have seven working days to provide a response to the report should she/he choose to do so. Then the file is sent to the Dean of CSBS. A copy of the entire report is maintained in the permanent file of the candidate.

II-D. Guidelines for discretionary formal review initiated by department, or early review requested by candidate

The Department of Geography maintains the right to initiate a discretionary, formal review of tenure-track faculty. If a yearly informal review or the formal third year review concluded that a tenure-track faculty member has not demonstrated adequate progress, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee may initiate a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable), but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.

In general, this review would be initiated to measure and document progress made by the candidate with regards to departmental and chair concerns and recommendations made during previous RPT reviews of the candidate's performance. The candidate would be requested to provide a current CV, all teaching evaluations and a statement of 1) current activities and goals for the future and 2) actions taken by the candidate to address recommendations and concerns indicated in previous RPT reviews. The candidate may include course syllabi and other materials indicative of her/his performance in research,

teaching and service. The statement should be framed within the context of the RPT criteria as stated in the departmental criteria for RPT and PPM 8-6, and 9-5.1.

Candidates may request an early review for tenure by following the procedures in PPM 8-6. These involve obtaining prior approval from higher levels of administration and should be discussed with departmental faculty and the chair in advance.

As these are formal reviews, the procedures for formal reviews specified for the third and seventh year reviews are to be used. The Department of Geography SAC will be asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and mentoring performance with both undergraduate and graduate students. The SAC will provide a report to the candidate for review and written response prior to the submission of the report to the Departmental RPT Committee.

Upon closure of the complete file, the Departmental RPT Committee will meet and vote on retention, tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. The Committee will prepare a report synthesizing the results of the evaluation by the SAC and the Committee. The report will be distributed to the candidate, the departmental chair and to the permanent file of the candidate. Based on the PPM, the candidate will have seven working days to provide a response to the report should she/he choose to do so. The file and decision report will be forwarded to the CSBS Dean.

II E. Guidelines for final year formal reviews for tenure and promotion

In the final probationary year, a final review is undertaken as a formal evaluation required by the department and the University of Utah. The review is to be undertaken in the beginning of the last year of the probationary process. For faculty holding the rank of assistant professor, the final year of the probationary period is the seventh year of employment. For faculty holding the rank of associate or full professor, without tenure, the final year is the fifth year of employment. The goals of the final review are to assess the candidate's research, publication, classroom instruction, funding acquisition, research mentoring with students, professional service performance and departmental service and involvement. While previous activities will be reviewed, the focus is primarily on performance since their initiation in the tenure-eligible process at the University of Utah. The most significant outcome of this review is to provide a full and objective determination as to whether the candidate should be granted tenure and (in applicable cases) promotion.

Since this is a formal assessment, the Departmental RPT Committee, the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) and reviewers outside of the University of Utah, who are qualified experts knowledgeable of the candidate's research area and related fields, will review the candidate's performance. The departmental RPT committee will select the outside reviewers from a list compiled by the candidate and the committee. At least two referees will be selected from those suggested by the candidate. The committee will select at least two additional reviewers. Each reviewer will be asked to state their relationship to the candidate and provide an evaluation of the candidate's research,

publication, funding acquisition, research mentoring with graduate students and professional service performance. The reviewers will not be asked to evaluate classroom teaching.

The Department of Geography SAC will be asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and mentoring performance with both undergraduate and graduate students. The SAC will provide a report to the candidate for review and written response prior to the submission of the report to the Departmental RPT Committee.

The candidate is requested to provide a CV, a personal statement, teaching and course evaluations, copies of their primary publications and course syllabi and other materials indicative of her/his research, teaching and service. The personal statement should discuss their performance and accomplishments during their time at the University of Utah. Also, the statement should address, in detail, plans and realistic expectations for the future. The statement should be framed within the context of the RPT criteria as stated in the departmental criteria for RPT and PPM 8-6 and 9-5.1.

Upon closure of the complete file, the Departmental RPT Committee will meet and record separately a vote on tenure and a vote on promotion of the candidate. The Committee will prepare a report synthesizing the results of the evaluation by the SAC, the outside reviewers and the Committee. This report will be sent to the departmental chair and the chair provides a separate written evaluation. Based on the PPM, the candidate will have seven working days to provide a response to the report should she/he choose to do so. After this opportunity for a response, the file and decisions of the Departmental Chair and RPT Committee are sent to the Dean of CSBS, whereupon it is reviewed. A copy of the entire report is maintained in the permanent file of the candidate.

II F. Guidelines for promotion of associate professor to full professor

An associate professor seeking promotion to professor must undergo a formal review consistent with the final probationary review process described in II-E. A professor is expected to have achieved national and/or international recognition, high status and impact as a scholar, and an original and productive research program supported by sustained and high quality publications. With respect to teaching and service, promotion to professor requires demonstration of continued quality and growth in these areas. Time in the rank of associate professor is not a factor in consideration for promotion to professor.

III. RPT Time Line

It is difficult to assign exact dates to the RPT time line because some elements of the review are outside of the department's control (e.g., an external reviewer may be late in sending his/her letter). Nevertheless, the Department of Geography will attempt to meet the following time line for all formal RPT reviews:

1. Elect the RPT Chair by a Spring faculty meeting.
2. In Spring of the preceding academic year, the department chair notifies the candidates (and RPT chair) in writing of the formal reviews that will occur in the fall.
3. Candidate submits five copies of their current *vita*, 3-4 primary publications and a list of suggested external reviewers to the RPT chair by the beginning of fall semester and signs a waiver/non-waiver form. The RPT committee generates a list of external reviewers from the candidate's list and their own selections.
4. RPT chair organizes the SAC to review the candidate's teaching materials and the SAC report is completed by the third week of the fall semester.
5. Candidate submits the research portion of the file and professional statement by August 15th.
6. Reviewers are contacted early in the fall term.
7. RPT Chair sends out materials for external review by the end of August. External reviewer letters are due back in the department by the end of September.
8. Candidate submits completed file by the first Tuesday in September.
9. File officially closes on the fourth Friday in September.
10. RPT committee reviews the file and submits the report to the chair by the end of October.
11. The RPT report is given to the candidate and the chair. Chair writes his/her letter. This letter is given to the candidate by the beginning of the second week in November.
12. The candidate has one week to provide a formal written response to the RPT report or the chair's letter (one response).
13. The entire file is forwarded to the college by the middle of November.



March 11, 2019

To: Trina Rich

From: Andrea Brunelle, Chair, Geography

Subject: Update of Geography RPT guidelines

Proposed Change: The Geography Department would like to remove the requirement of external letters for 3rd year formal reviews. This policy is not consistent with the college policy and also has resulted in some backlash from the Geographical Community regarding letter requests.

Effective Date: This change in guidelines should be effective for the 2019-2010 RPT cycle.

Approval Vote: The Geography Department faculty voted as follows: 12 – approval, 0 – non-approval, 0 – abstain, 3 – absent to approve the change in guidelines on March 1, 2019.

3/11/19

Andrea Brunelle
Professor and Chair

Date

Cynthia Berg
Dean, College of Social and Behavior Science

3-12-19

Date

Lincoln Davies
Chair, Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee

6/30/2019

Date

Harriet Hopf
Harriet W. Hopf, Designee

7/31/2019

Date