

Department of Metallurgical Engineering, Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures

Approved by Department Faculty September 17, 2014  
Date

Approved by Dean Fred H. Brown 23 September, 2014  
Date

Approved by University RPT Standards Committee for implementation as of \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Ravi Chandran	<u>Ravi Chandran</u>
Z. Zak Fang	<u>Z. Zak Fang</u>
Michael L. Free	<u>Michael L. Free</u>
Sivaraman Guruswamy	<u>Sivaraman Guruswamy</u>
Jan D. Miller	<u>Jan D. Miller</u>
Sanja Miskovic	<u>Sanja Miskovic</u>
Manoranjan Misra	<u>Manoranjan Misra</u>
Raj Rajamani	<u>Raj Rajamani</u>
Michael F. Simpson	<u>Michael F. Simpson</u>
Hong Yong Sohn	<u>Hong Yong Sohn</u>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- A. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies
    - 1. General statement
    - 2. General philosophy
    - 3. RPT Criteria and Standards
      - a. Overview
      - b. Retention
      - c. Tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
      - d. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
      - e. Award of tenure to candidate hired as Associate Professor
      - f. Appointment to ranks of Distinguished Professor, Presidential Professor, and University Professor
    - 4. Evidence for and evaluation of RPT Criteria
      - a. Teaching
        - 1) Overview
        - 2) Performance standards for teaching
          - a) Effectiveness standard
          - b) Meritorious standard
          - c) Excellence standard
      - b. Research and publication
        - 1) Overview
        - 2) Performance standards for research and publication
          - a) Effectiveness standard
          - b) Meritorious standard
          - c) Excellence standard
      - c. Institutional, Professional, and Public Service
        - 1) Overview
        - 2) Performance standards for service
          - a) Effectiveness standard
          - b) Meritorious standard
          - c) Excellence standard
      - d. Professional Reputation and Ability
    - 5. Triggering formal retention reviews
- B. RPT Procedures
  - 1. Participants
  - 2. Probationary period and reviews schedule
  - 3. Informal Reviews
  - 4. Formal Reviews—Candidate, Department Chair, Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and Ad Hoc Committee Responsibilities

5. Promotion to Full Professor
6. Action of the Department RPT Advisory Committee
7. Action of the department chair

C. Appendices

1. Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate
2. Appendix B. Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters
3. Appendix C. Official Announcement to all Metallurgical Engineering Faculty Members
4. Appendix D. Letter to the Program
5. Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC
6. Appendix F. Request for Assistance from Outside the University of Utah
7. Appendix G. Letter to the Reviewer

## A. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies

### 1. General statement

Criteria for retention, promotion and tenure reviews adopted by the Department of Metallurgical Engineering have been developed, consistent with University Policy governing these matters. Readers should consult the contents of the relevant University policies, which are neither repeated nor paraphrased here to obviate the possibility of misinterpretation. University regulations concerning retention, promotion, and tenure are contained in the University of Utah Policy 6-303, Rev. 20 (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html>) and the University of Utah Policy 6-311, Rev. 15 (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html>). It is the responsibility of each faculty member to be familiar with all RPT policies and procedures contained in the University of Utah Regulations (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu>).

There are no college-level rules for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions; criteria, standards, and evidence are those developed by the relevant department. In the College of Mines and Earth Sciences, the College Faculty Relations Committee reviews records of all candidates nominated for retention, promotion, or tenure. The College Faculty Relations Committee consists of two tenured faculty members elected by each department. Members of the College Faculty Relations Committee serve for a term of two years, and one-half of the members are elected annually. The committee meets annually or more frequently if necessary, without the Dean present, and all members of the committee have an equal vote, except that members of the department of the candidate in question do not vote on that candidate. The membership structures described below exclude any faculty member who would have an independent RPT recommendation at a different level of review (e.g., the department chair, and college dean, or university president, if a member of the department/college). Per Policy 6-303-III-A-3 & E-5, such officers may attend committee meetings (unless the committee moves to executive session), and upon invitation by the majority may also participate in discussion, but cannot vote as members of the committee. Results of the deliberations for each candidate are written up, approved by the committee, and submitted to the Dean along with a record of the vote on each candidate, and the Dean will review the recommendation.

### 2. General Philosophy

The Department of Metallurgical Engineering Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies and Procedures are intended to provide candidates for retention, promotion or tenure with the criteria and standards that will be applied in reviews of their performance, as well as the procedures to be followed in these reviews.

The Department of Metallurgical Engineering affirms the importance of a commitment to research, teaching and service, and in addition believes that its faculty should enjoy a high professional reputation. Departmental faculty should strive for excellence in each category, but an individual need not attain equal distinction in all three. Concerning retention, promotion and tenure, each member shall be judged on overall performance.

The department considers the adoption of a detailed set of inflexible standards concerning retention, promotion and tenure to be unnecessary and unwise. This document informs each faculty member in the department of the criteria by which performance shall be judged and progress determined.

Candidates for retention, promotion and tenure in the Department of Metallurgical Engineering must meet the minimum standards of teaching, research, and service set forth in this policy statement. Personal behavior detrimental to effective departmental or university performance (in keeping with the expectations of responsible faculty conduct per University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b) may be considered.

### 3. RPT Criteria and Standards

#### a. Overview

The performance of a faculty member being considered for retention, promotion, or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, service and professional reputation. Evidence of competence and a commitment to achievement in all areas is required. Indications of originality and leadership by the candidate in these areas are important. Teaching, research and scholarship, and service will each be evaluated as effective, meritorious, excellent, or deficient (as defined in Section 2, below).

Each candidate must be accorded due process, which in turn requires that criteria be considered, weighed carefully, and commented upon in any report by a review committee. Absolute judgment of the merits of an individual becomes extremely difficult to establish. The welfare of students, the university, and the individual all require consideration. Deficiency under one criterion may be balanced by exceptional merit under another.

Quantitative, objective assessment of a candidate under the above criteria is extremely difficult to establish. However, as a guide to review committees, the following schedule is suggested.

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Relative value, %</u>
1. Teaching ability	35
2. Research, scholarship, and publication	45
3. Institutional, professional and public service	20

The review committee must consider these four criteria, but may choose to not use the relative values suggested above. For example, in the evaluation of an individual who is truly outstanding as a teacher, a greater weight may be used for the teaching criterion, and likewise for the other criteria.

The appropriate review committee is required to draw upon letters of recommendation and documents of evaluation provided by students and colleagues; however, in addition, the chair of the department and the Department RPT Committee will solicit letters of reference from qualified peers outside the University of Utah who are knowledgeable about the candidate and his or her activities.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee is encouraged to solicit written comments regarding the candidate's teaching ability from alumni who have graduated within the last two to five years.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee is charged with the responsibility for assuring a fair, objective evaluation, free of prejudice. In addition, the committee is required to destroy all drafts of reports before the report is forwarded to the department chair and the candidate.

It is essential that all faculty members be made aware of the levels of achievement expected for tenure and promotion. Judgment of ability for tenure action ranks fully with expectation for promotion when the candidate is an assistant professor. The four basic criteria listed provide a basis for judgment.

Information regarding the beginning and ending of the pre-tenure probationary period, credit for prior service, waiver of pre-tenure probationary service, or extension of the pre-tenure probationary period can be found in the University's Policies and Regulations, and are covered in Section B, below.

#### **b. Retention**

Retention at this rank requires ratings of.

1. At least meritorious in teaching and at least effective in research and service, or
2. At least meritorious in research, and at least effective in teaching and service,

Evidence of achieving the required standards outlined above and their evaluation is outlined in section 4.

Candidates are expected to be making adequate progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion as described later. A candidate for retention should demonstrate good progress toward publication of refereed articles. The department expects that candidates for retention will begin to develop a larger scholarly profile, by presenting scholarly papers at national and international conferences and symposia, and being awarded grants for support of their scholarship. In teaching, the department expects candidates for retention to demonstrate commitment and progress towards meritorious or excellence in teaching in the classroom. In service, candidates for retention should be making a contribution to the department and in some larger context the university, profession, or community.

University policy requires that annual retention reviews be conducted during the untenured faculty member's probationary period (6-303 b). These may be formal or informal. Formal reviews are required in two instances: for recommendations of termination, and during the third probationary year for all untenured faculty members. For assistant professors, one additional formal review is required in either the fifth or the sixth year. Although it has been customary in the college to conduct the second formal review during the sixth probationary year, the choice is to be made by the faculty member in consultation with the department chair and members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee. A decision to retain a faculty member after his or her formal review conveys a message that the individual is performing well, is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for promotion or tenure, and is meeting the goals of the department, college and university. The individual should, however, seriously consider concerns, deficiencies, or suggestions for improvement noted by each level of review. The candidate should carefully review these with the department chair and identify what accomplishments are necessary prior to obtaining promotion or tenure. The nature of reporting requirements for informal and formal retention reviews are provided in the University of Utah Policy and Procedures 6-303b.

### **c. Tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

For granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate must provide evidence of a cumulative record demonstrating sustained achievement in one of the following combinations of standards:

1. Excellent in research, meritorious in teaching and at least effective in service, or
2. Meritorious in research, teaching, and service,
3. Excellent in teaching, meritorious in research and at least effective in service,
4. Exceptional in research and at least effective in others, For *Exceptional rating*, the candidate must clearly stand out as one of the most innovative, productive, and highly-regarded practitioners in their field/fields. This ranking is reserved for rare instances of truly superior work.

Evidence of achieving the required standards outlined above and their evaluation is outlined in section 4.

Tenure is recommended only for individuals of substantial past achievement and future promise. Tenure is not awarded at the rank of assistant professor except under extenuating circumstances as outlined (Policy 6-303). Awarding of tenure carries an obligation on the part of the candidate for continued excellent performance for which the university in turn offers a stable environment. Considerations for tenure prior normal timelines defined later in the document (early tenure) will be made only when unequivocal evidence is provided of the candidate's advanced professional development.



The candidate's file should state what has been done to address previously noted concerns, and tangible signs of progress must be apparent. It is the responsibility of the faculty member and the department chair to document this progress and these accomplishments.

**d. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

For promotion to professor, a candidate must demonstrate continued quality and growth in research, teaching, and service. A candidate's record since tenure and promotion to associate professor must, as a threshold, continue to satisfy the requirements for tenure, and additionally be: Excellent in one or more areas of research, teaching, or service, and meritorious in the others.

Evidence of achieving the required standards outlined above and their evaluation is outlined in section 4.

Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to demonstrate significant professional accomplishment beyond the level they had achieved for tenure in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service at the time of consideration for advancement. In scholarship, the emphasis at this level, even more than in tenure cases, must be on the quality and national or international recognition of published work. General expectations of the department will be that the candidate will have established an active sponsored research program; graduated a significant number of PhD and MS students; published a substantial number of articles while in the associate professor rank, that such publications will be of high quality and represent original contributions to knowledge, and that such work will be able to gain the wide and strong support of representative colleagues inside and outside the University of Utah.

For promotion to professor, an individual should be a widely recognized contributor in his or her own field of research and an accomplished teacher in the broadest sense, with a solid record of achievement and influence in the lives of students and colleagues. A faculty member must have established a niche in which he or she is making a major contribution to the department. Prior to advancement to the rank of professor, there should be persuasive evidence that the candidate's scholarship reputation has been established as demonstrated by activities such as publication of original papers in recognized technical publications, publication of monographs, patents and textbooks, development of publicly released software, establishment of a professional reputation through publications, invited lectures at significant meetings, publication of reports and papers in conference proceedings, and participation in the work of technical committees of professional societies.

In teaching, candidates for promotion to professor should have a sustained record of meritorious in teaching.

In service, candidates for promotion to professor should have demonstrated leadership in the department, the university, the profession, or the community.



The Department of Metallurgical Engineering considers five to seven years as the ordinary minimum time in the rank of associate professor before consideration for promotion to professor. Applicants for promotion before the fifth year must present an unusually strong case.

**e. Award of Tenure to Candidate Hired as Associate Professor or Professor**

For a person 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 and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of professor. The criteria for award of tenure to candidate hired at the level of Associate professor are at the minimum the same as the criteria for promotion and award of tenure to tenure-track faculty member. 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. Minimum criteria for award of tenure for candidate hired at the level of Professor are at the minimum the same as the criteria for promotion to Professor and the award of tenure to tenure-track faculty member.

Candidates for tenure who hold the rank of associate professor or professor are expected to have achieved scholarly excellence in their fields, especially through publication substantial refereed articles. The department expects that such candidates for tenure will also have developed a larger scholarly profile, as demonstrated, for example, by presenting papers at national and international conferences and symposia and having been awarded grants for support of their scholarship. In teaching, such candidates for tenure should have a demonstrated record of meritorious performance in the classroom. In service, these candidates should have made significant contributions at the department level and have a maturing service profile in the university, the profession, or the community. As provided in University Policy 6-303-III-a-1-c: "Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be awarded to faculty members prior to their advancement to the rank of associate professor."

**f. Appointment to ranks of Distinguished Professor, Presidential Professor, and University Professor**

Promotion to the ranks of distinguished professor, presidential professor, and university professor is reserved for selected individuals whose achievements exemplify the highest goals of scholarship. The definitions of these ranks and procedures for nomination of faculty members to these ranks are outlined in P&PM 9-2, Section 2, Para. 1-3.

#### 4. Evidence for and evaluation of criteria

##### a. Teaching

###### 1) Overview

Because education of undergraduate and graduate students is a primary function in a university, excellence in teaching at all levels should be ensured. Five major factors in good teaching are course content, depth of knowledge of subject, logical organization, originality, and presentation. The classroom is a place for transfer of information to the student, and the level of presentation should match the expected achievement level of the student at that point in the student's academic career. Teaching will be judged as effective, meritorious, or excellent, as defined below.

During all phases of the academic program, the student should be encouraged to think and apply his or her skills. Problem solving should be an important part of this activity. Familiarity with current research should be expected of those faculty members teaching senior undergraduates and graduate-level courses.

Formal classroom teaching is but part of the overall teaching function. Active participation in tutorials, thesis direction, group discussions, seminars, etc., should also be part of the teaching activities of a faculty member.

###### 2) Performance Standards for Teaching

###### a) *Effectiveness Standard in Teaching*

Effectiveness in teaching is the minimum acceptable performance standard for granting of tenure, and will be determined based on evaluations of course preparation and delivery, directing student research, and advising students in general.

Primary materials used in evaluating teaching performance consist of:

1. Student evaluation, departmental and university-wide, the latter obtained through the university's official course feedback report, (Policy 6-100-III-N)
2. Documented, written reports prepared by members of the Student Advisory Council.
3. Peer evaluation both on and off campus.
4. Receipt of outstanding teacher awards.
5. Number and quality of M.S. and Ph.D. theses supervised.
6. Demonstrated ability to provide a stimulating learning environment for students.

In addition, evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in course preparation and delivery may consist of exit interviews and alumni comments. All factors regarding effectiveness in course preparation and delivery should be considered by the review committee. This listing is not

intended to suggest priorities or equivalence of values of items.

Student course feedback scores in which more students agree than disagree that the course and instructor were effective are necessary to establish effectiveness in teaching.

Candidates are also expected to arrive for class promptly and to communicate and hold regularly scheduled advising times for students outside of class contact hours, and evidence on these matters will be obtained through the official student course feedback reports, and from student reporting to the department administration.

All candidates for tenure will have their teaching evaluated by a member of the Department RPT Advisory Committee through in-class evaluations at least twice during pre-tenure probationary period. The first evaluation must be conducted prior to the third-year formal review. The second evaluation must be conducted no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration for promotion to associate professor, with tenure. Candidates with a probationary period shortened so that having two or more evaluations is impractical must undergo at least one such evaluation no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration for promotion and tenure. The relevant Department RPT Advisory Committee chair will produce a peer observation report after each classroom visit and meet with the candidate in a timely fashion to discuss the substance of the report. Faculty peer observation reports will be submitted to the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair and included in the RPT file for each formal review.

Candidates for tenure are strongly encouraged to use the Center for Teaching Learning Excellence (CTLE) for additional classroom teaching evaluations and overall teaching advice. Candidates for tenure may include a section in the personal statement in their RPT files explaining how they are utilizing faculty peer observation reports and CTLE consultations.

Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in directing student research, and advising students may include:

1. Serving as student advisor for MS and PhD students
2. Serving on comprehensive exam, M.S., or Ph.D. committees.
3. Advising on M.E. reports.
4. Advising on Honors theses or other undergraduate research.

Contributions to thesis and dissertation committees are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality of advising committee service. The quality of the advising by the candidate will be determined by considering SAC reports, the evaluations of other faculty committee members, surveys of students or the departmental staff who serve them, and recognition received by student projects.

*b) Meritorious Standard in Teaching*

To be considered a meritorious teacher, a candidate must meet the above standards for effectiveness in teaching with respect to course preparation and delivery, directing student research, and advising students in general.

In addition, the candidate must consistently satisfy either one or a combination of the two criteria; namely, (i) the candidate must meet or exceed the department's average course feedback scores for teacher and course effectiveness and other teaching measures with respect to course preparation and delivery criterion, or (ii) the candidate must make significant contributions to curriculum or program development.

Evidence considered for evaluation of such significant contributions to curriculum or program development may consist of:

1. Receiving grants for new course development or interdisciplinary teaching.
2. Developing innovative teaching methods.
3. Publishing on pedagogical practices or other teaching-related topics.
4. Developing educational materials that have an impact within or beyond departmental instruction, for example, textbooks, software, assessment measures, etc.
5. Providing new on-line course development.
6. Creating and overseeing new student programs.
7. Offering service learning courses.
8. Serving as an Honors thesis adviser.
9. Serving as a faculty mentor accompanying students to professional meetings.
10. Giving talks or organizing colloquia or academic conferences about teaching or that systematically serve the educational needs of undergraduate and graduate students.
11. Publishing with graduate student co-authors.
12. Any similar activity that makes a significant contribution to teaching metallurgical engineering at the university.

*c) Excellence Standard in Teaching*

To be considered an excellent teacher, a candidate must have satisfied the standards of both effectiveness and merit in teaching as described above, and must also show evidence of significant and sustained impact in undergraduate or graduate education by:

1. Receiving a university, college, or department student teaching award or similar public acknowledgment for superior teaching or student advising.
2. Showing a record of sustained success in receiving teaching grants or other similar forms of financial support for teaching activities.
3. Showing other evidence of distinguished contributions to teaching and student mentoring.

4. Consistently exceed the department's average course feedback scores for teacher and course effectiveness and other teaching measures with respect to course preparation and delivery criterion

## **b. Research and Publication**

### **1) Overview**

Research and publication is closely connected to decisions regarding retention, promotion and tenure. Candidates for these attainments are expected to (i) produce scholarly articles, and (ii) establish an active research program, and (iii) obtain grants from federal, state and/or industry and support graduate student training and research. Candidates are expected to give evidence of a profile of scholarship that will indicate an active, ongoing, and substantive commitment to research and publication. Evidence of final acceptance of a manuscript by scholarly journal, (or a press) shall be deemed the equivalent of publication. Publications must represent significant contributions to knowledge and demonstrate professional skills of a high order.

Because a university is defined as a community of scholars, every faculty member is expected to engage in scholarly activities related, at least in substantial part, to his or her field of major interest. Scholarly activity may be expressed by the writing of papers in specific areas of endeavor; by the writing of textbooks wherein broad syntheses are made or where original ideas and concepts are displayed; by the presentation of papers at symposia, meetings of professional societies, and other venues; and by other means. Quality is more important than quantity at all levels. While no numerical statement regarding quantity replaces the emphasis on quality, publication of one to two peer-reviewed articles per year in scholarly journals would generally be considered a minimum for the standard of effectiveness in research. A higher publication rate, higher quality of publication outlet, and higher impact are needed to elevate a candidate's research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent that is needed for tenure and the rank of associate professor. Reviewed publications in society proceedings, or chapters in an edited book may be considered if the committee judges them to have been rigorously reviewed, are of high quality, and the articles have been widely cited.

The merit of the scholarly activities of those involved in research may be judged by the quality and quantity of published research articles, and by the significance and editorial standards of the publications in which they appear. Review committees should study the field of major interest, the complexities of problems attacked, and the publications in which articles are published, rather than study solely the number of articles published.

The Department of Metallurgical Engineering recognizes that candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure may make significant scholarly contributions through electronic publication. The department will accept electronic articles as part of a candidate's retention, promotion, and tenure file, but the candidate must demonstrate that those publications have been



subjected to peer review.

The department employs the standards of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in research, and at a minimum requires research at the standard of meritorious in a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Assessment of research includes five criteria: quantity, independence and contribution, purpose, quality of the publication outlet, and impact.

*a) Quantity*

The minimum quantity of publications during the probationary period needed for the standard of effectiveness in research is eight peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals. Publications in society proceedings, or chapters in an edited book may be considered if the RPT committee judges them to have been subjected to rigorous independent review and the articles have been widely cited.. A larger number of publications, higher quality of publication outlet, and higher impact are needed to elevate a candidate's research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent that is needed for tenure and the rank of associate professor. The department may take into consideration unusually long or unusually short publications in assessing quantity.

*b) Independence and Contribution*

To qualify for tenure and the rank of associate professor, candidates must demonstrate the ability to conceptualize, design, and conduct research independently. If many of a candidate's publications are co-authored, the department will consider the candidate's role in the conceptual development and contributions to the actual research and writing of the body of academic work. Similarly, if a candidate's role in research projects is a co-principal investigator, the relative contribution to the acquisition and completion of the projects will be considered.

In assessing independence and contribution, the department may solicit letters from one or more co-authors describing the candidate's contribution. This is especially likely if co-authors have been mentors of the candidate. Candidates may also solicit such letters from co-authors for the file themselves. Because of the important value of mentoring students, publications with students as co-authors will be recognized them as a contribution to teaching as well as research.

*c) Purpose:*

The mission of the university, in part, is to create new knowledge. Consistent with this, scholarship is in part evaluated by the degree to which the work contributes to new understanding. Five categories of scholarship purpose are listed below, ordered generally from greater to lesser significance. All categories represent traditional forms of scholarship, but some scholarship purposes reflect to a higher degree the university mission of creating new knowledge, and the



department recognizes the greater significance of these categories of scholarship.

Scholarly contributions that develop significant new theories or methodologies relevant to the field of metallurgical engineering are highly valued. New theory refers to the elaboration of an original set of interconnected hypotheses with explanatory power, or the development of a new conceptual framework with interpretive significance. New theory provides novel ways of explaining, understanding, or critically appraising phenomena of significance to metallurgy. New methodological contributions can take many forms but, to belong in this category, contributions must be novel and provide new insights into phenomena associated with metallurgical engineering. Theoretical contributions are highly valued.

Without rigorous testing of theories through experimental results, the theories may be of little value. Thus, scholarship that advances knowledge in metallurgical engineering through the testing, application, or elaboration of existing theories with implications for future research, theory, or practice is also highly valued.

A third form of research of substantial significance to metallurgical engineering is the production of new evidence concerning phenomena associated with this field. Therefore publications that report significant new empirical evidence, but provide little or no development of new conceptual understanding, are still valuable, but less so than new theories or testing of those theories. These are empirical, analytic, or qualitative studies that describe phenomena without providing new theoretical ways of understanding the phenomena.

Literature reviews are also valuable scholarly contributions that summarize and analyze existing knowledge, methods, and significance of a particular field or branch of metallurgical engineering, such as textbooks, and state-of-the-field summaries. These are principally of pedagogical importance, but may also suggest directions for future research or practical application.

Comments, editorials, and book reviews, while valid publications, are considered to be of limited scope. These are viewed by the department as less important to the growth of a faculty member than are publications described in the first three categories above (theory, testing, new observations). Hence publications of this sort are given less weight in RPT decisions

#### *d) Quality of Publication Outlet*

Quality is the extent to which the research is consistent with the methods and goals of the field, shaped by knowledge that is current and appropriate to the topic, and well written. Quality is best judged by experts in the field, including peer reviewers for publications, external reviewers solicited for the RPT review, and University of Utah colleagues who have personally read the publications. The department recognizes the following distinctions among publication outlets, ranked from highest quality to lowest.

Reviewed scholarly books in highly regarded presses, reviewed articles in journals in the discipline, and reviewed chapters published in reviewed scholarly books are of highest value. These may include Peer-reviewed articles in professional conference proceedings and transactions that the RPT committee judges to have been subjected to rigorous independent review and have had or likely to have significant impact.

Of lower rank are articles and chapters in journals and books that appear without peer review, abstracts, and books on metallurgical topics for the general public.

Articles that appear without peer review and technical reports to governmental agencies or private business are of less value for RPT decisions.

Candidates are expected to cite evidence to support claims about the quality of publication outlets. Electronic publications count the same as traditional print publications if these indicators of quality are comparable.

#### *e) Impact*

Impact is assessed after publication and is the degree to which research has changed the way other scholars, other professionals, or the public thinks about a topic. The department recognizes that valuable scholarly work may be controversial.

Examples of measures of impact include:

1. Citations
2. Reviews
3. Conclusions from qualified external reviewers
4. Recognition such as awards and honors
5. Publicity in the general media
6. Invitations to give addresses or participate in symposia and workshops at prominent national/international conferences
7. Reprints of articles and subsequent editions of books
8. Consulting (within limits of University Policy 5-204)

#### *f) Research Grants and Fellowships*

The extent to which a candidate has been able to obtain research grant funds and fellowships, thereby increasing the probability of research and scholarly publications, will contribute to moving a candidate's research record from effectiveness toward excellence. The department expects that successful faculty members will seek and obtain sufficient external research funding to sustain graduate students and necessary research expenses.

*g) Patents and licenses*

Development of new technology and dissemination of this technology for the betterment of humanity are important evidence for creativity of a faculty member. Licenses are evidence of the degree to which this creativity is put to use.

**2) Performance Standards for Research**

*a) Effective Standard in Research*

Effectiveness in research means that a candidate has met the minimum quantity of publications; has mentored and trained PhD and MS students; has demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; the scholarship is primarily in categories testing and observational reports; publication outlets are generally below the top rank; and there is evidence in support of scholarly impact.

Ineffectiveness in research means that a faculty member has not met these minimum standards for quantity or quality.

*b) Meritorious Standard in Research*

Meritorious research (for tenure and promotion to associate professor) means that a candidate has substantially exceeded the minimum quantity of publications; has mentored, supported, trained and graduated significant number of PhD and MS students; has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; has produced publications that are of theoretical, testing, or observational results, in peer-reviewed media; has received significant competitive external grants from federal and state funding agencies, and industry in support of graduate student training and research; and shown clear evidence of scholarly impact.

*c) Excellence Standard in Research*

Excellence in research (for tenure and promotion to associate professor) means that a candidate has far exceeded the minimum quantity of publications; has mentored, supported, trained and graduated a large number of PhD and MS students; has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; the publications describe theoretical, testing, or observational results well; that most publications are in peer-reviewed journals - or in books, and that there is strong evidence of scholarly impact; has received large competitive external grants in support of graduate student training and research; established a strong and sustainable research program with national and international visibility.

### c. Institutional, Professional, and Public Service

#### 1) Overview

Each faculty member is expected to participate in the governance of the university. In addition, each faculty member is expected to respond appropriately to requests for his or her time by civic, state, federal, and service agencies. Adequate recognition of contributions in these activities is important to any university and is accordingly a factor in retention, tenure, and promotion deliberations. Service to scientific and professional societies, service in editorial functions, and related activities are also an important part of this criterion. The department employs the standards of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in university, professional, and public service. Public and professional service may include contributions to the nation, state, community, and profession. Activities included within institutional service are:

1. Service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc., beyond the minimum typical assignments of regular faculty.
2. Service as a committee chair.
3. Service on hiring committees.
4. Elected positions, such as senate, college council, etc.
5. Service as a university representative to other universities, organizations, etc.
6. Administrative service to the department, college, or university.

Activities included within professional service are:

1. Service as editor of a journal or book series for a press.
  2. Service on editorial boards.
  3. Conference participation as a section chair or program committee member.
  4. Conference participation as a panel chair or discussant.
  5. Service on grant review boards, such as the National Science Foundation.
  6. Offices in professional associations.
  7. Participation in professional associations.
  8. Invited addresses.
  9. Refereeing articles for journals or book manuscripts for presses in the discipline.
- Professional contributions to the print and electronic media.

Activities included within public service are:

1. Providing consulting services to bureaus, commissions, agencies, legislative bodies, industry, businesses and as an expert witness etc., within limits established by University Policy 5-204.
2. Participation in special community projects and studies.
3. Service in professionally related community positions, such as school board memberships, participation in educational groups, professional advising to various

- groups, public service agencies, etc.
4. Contribution to the general educational community through lectures, workshops, etc.

The Department of Metallurgical Engineering considers service as an integral part of professional growth, and it urges members to seek and accept opportunities to serve the department, the university, the community, and the metallurgical engineering profession. The following guidelines shall be used to evaluate service as it relates to retention, promotion and tenure:

Routine service on departmental, college and university committees and other support activities such as student advising is expected of every faculty member. It is hoped that members will render service above and beyond routine committee assignments. Performance of a variety of services in several areas of departmental and university administration shall be given due consideration in matters of retention, promotion and tenure.

As professional engineers, faculty members are expected to perform duties essential to the growth of their profession such as participating in conferences and conventions, rendering advisory or editorial services to journals, rendering advisory services to governmental agencies, and holding office in professional organizations.

Although service alone shall not be sufficient to warrant retention, promotion or tenure, it shall be considered as an important dimension of the candidate's composite record.

## **2) Performance Standards for Service**

### *a) Effective Standard in Service*

Effective service means that the candidate has:

1. Regularly attended faculty meetings,
2. Regularly attended faculty recruitment candidate presentations, and
3. Been conscientious in fulfillment of any departmental, college or university service assignments.

### *b) Meritorious Standard in Service*

Meritorious service means that the candidate has fulfilled the above requirements for effective service, and has also engaged in activities described above in the areas of professional and public service.

### *c) Excellence Standard in Service*

For retention, for promotion to associate professor and granting of tenure, and for promotion to professor excellent service means that the candidate has fulfilled the requirements for both effective and meritorious service as described above, and has also conscientiously fulfilled additional institutional and professional service.

### **d. Professional Reputation and Ability**

A candidate's professional reputation and abilities as a professional are also important criteria. As an example, consulting activities may be judged by the stature of the client for whom the consulting is performed. Letters of reference from peers frequently make reference to a candidate's professional reputation or ability. Special awards should be considered in this context. Relevant industrial experience may also offer evidence for an individual's professional reputation and abilities.

## **5. Triggering Formal Retention Reviews**

"If a tenure eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or Department RPT Advisory Committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger 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." (Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c). If the department chair or a majority of the Department RPT Advisory Committee members present at an informal review votes to conduct a formal review, the review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the committee votes again to proceed with the review in the current academic year. A triggered formal review shall include external review letters unless a majority of the committee votes that quality of research is not an issue in the review.

## **B. RPT Procedures**

### **1. Participants**

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews conducted by the Department of Metallurgical Engineering:

#### *a) Candidate*

The candidate is the faculty member under review for retention, promotion, or tenure.



*b) Department RPT Advisory Committee*

Membership in the Department RPT Advisory Committee as a voting member is determined by University Policy 6-303-III-A-3. Only members of the RPT Committee may attend and participate in its meetings. Because the department comprises only about ten faculty members, the RPT Committee membership will include all tenured faculty members. The membership structures described below exclude any faculty member who would have an independent RPT recommendation at a different level of review (e.g., the department chair, and college dean, or university president, if a member of the department/college). Per Policy 6-303-III-A-3 & E-5, such officers may attend committee meetings (unless the committee moves to executive session), and upon invitation by the majority may also participate in discussion, but cannot vote as members of the committee.

**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.

**Committee Structure for Promotion Reviews:** All tenured 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.

**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.

In the event that there are fewer than three faculty eligible to vote on a recommendation for a particular candidate, the chair will, pursuant to University Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a-iv, recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from emeritus faculty. In advance of the chair's contacting such faculty members, the chair shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the Dean.

*c) Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair*

The chair of the RPT Committee shall be elected annually during the Spring Semester from the ranks of the tenured professors of the department.

In this election all regular faculty shall be entitled to vote. In the event that the elected chair is ineligible for some committee decisions (e.g., an Associate Professor is not eligible to vote in reviews for promotion to Professor), then a second chair will be elected for those reviews.

*d) Department Chair*

The department chair is the administrative head of the Department of Metallurgical Engineering.

*e) Student Committee*

A Committee made up of representatives of undergraduate and graduate students in the Department of Metallurgical Engineering.

*f) External Reviewers*

Scholars selected by the department chair and the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, to provide reviews of the candidate's scholarly work Selection will be made from a list of nominees from the candidate, tenured faculty members, the chair and the RPT committee Chair. At least half of the reviewers providing reviews would have been selected without the candidate's input.

## **2. Probationary Period and Review Schedule**

All non-tenured tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed for retention annually, either by a formal or an informal review. In the third, fifth or sixth, and seventh years, formal review is mandatory. Tenure review must be held in the seventh year of service for an assistant professor, or the fifth year of service for an associate professor. There is no automatic conferral of tenure in cases of promotion to the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor or professor. Whenever a candidate is being considered for both promotion and tenure, separate votes are taken on each action, with the vote for promotion preceding that for tenure. To be considered for promotion, all candidates must apply to the chair of the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

According to university policy, "The probationary period may be shortened under those unusual circumstances in which the university determines that it can assess the individual's qualifications in a shorter period of time" (University Policy 6-311-4-B). Such a situation can occur when the candidate has demonstrated relevant accomplishments through prior service elsewhere, or when the candidate demonstrates the required achievements in less time than the normal review period. In either case, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the pertinent RPT criteria. Candidates shall serve a minimum of one year before being considered for tenure unless granted tenure at the time of appointment. Detailed information about shortening the probationary period is contained in University Policy 6-311.

The probationary period may be lengthened in conformity with relevant university policies (See Policies 6-311, 6-314, 6-315).

### **3. Informal Reviews**

Informal reviews of tenure-eligible faculty shall normally take place in the first, second, fourth, and fifth or sixth year, in whichever year a formal review is not conducted, of the probationary period (except in the case of a request for early tenure).

The file for an informal review shall ordinarily consist of an up-to-date vita and a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas. These should be submitted by the candidate to the Department chair prior to the close of files on October 30, and should reflect progress as of the date of submission. The candidate may also submit relevant supplementary material at that time.

In the case of joint appointments, program directors shall be notified in writing of the informal review by April 10 and invited to submit a letter from the director or a program report on the candidate's progress toward tenure. Program materials should also be submitted to the department prior to the close of files on October 30.

After studying the candidate's file, the department chair shall prepare his or her written recommendation to be included in the file. The department chair shall meet with each candidate under informal review prior to December 1 to discuss the candidate's progress and the chair's letter.

The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his or her informal review file in response to the chair's letter. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chair's evaluation. If the candidate chooses to respond, that statement must be submitted to the department chair within seven business days of the date upon which the chair's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chair within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chair.

The informal review materials shall be delivered to the dean no later than January 31. The informal review concludes at this point.

### **4. Formal Reviews – Candidate, Department Chair, Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and Department RPT Advisory Committee Responsibilities**

#### *a) Procedures and Schedule*

Procedures to be followed for third-year, fifth or sixth-year formal reviews, tenure, and promotion (both to associate professor and professor) reviews will follow the same format, except that in a

third-year review the evaluation of the candidate's performance and work will be done in-house and will not involve solicitation by the ad hoc committee or department chair of external reviews. External evaluations may be solicited by the candidate. These evaluations, however, will be selected and solicited solely by the candidate, and will not be considered confidential.

By April 1, the department chair shall determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and shall notify, by letter, faculty required to be reviewed. The chair shall also request nominations for internal and external reviewers from the faculty being reviewed and the Department RPT Committee as appropriate and request that they sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of evaluation letters. (See Appendix A and B).

By May 1, the department chair shall notify the faculty, by letter, of the upcoming RPT reviews and invite tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the department chair by March 7. (See Appendix C)  
If a faculty member who is being reviewed holds a joint appointment in another academic program the department chair shall notify said program in writing no later than April 10. (See Appendix D)

Prior to the end of spring semester the chair of the Department RPT Advisory Committee shall call a meeting of the department chair, heads of the ad hoc committees, and the candidates for formal review and promotion. This meeting will clarify procedures to be followed, the responsibilities of the candidates and of the committees, and to assure that all committees will act in a uniform manner.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee shall meet with the candidate at least twice, once before the end of spring semester at the beginning of their review, and once at the end. At the first meeting the candidate and the committee will discuss the list of outside reviewers in his or her field generated according to the procedures outlined below. The committee will be responsible for providing a statement describing the qualifications of the reviewers, their relationship to the candidate and methods of selection. A second meeting between the ad hoc committee and the candidate is required no sooner than two days after the committee report has been drafted and shown to the candidate and at least two working days prior to the closing of the file. At this meeting, the ad hoc committee will discuss the report with the candidate. The Department RPT Advisory Committee may consider changes to the report at this time, but is under no obligation to alter the report prior to its being placed in the file.

*b) External Reviewer*

The department chair and Department RPT Advisory Committee chair shall generate a list of potential reviewers of the candidate's work from a list of nominees suggested by the candidate, tenured faculty members, the chair and the RPT committee Chair. At least half of the reviewers providing reviews would have been selected without the candidate's input. Some of the reviewers selected should be persons who have no direct association with the candidate. All reviewers shall

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 if faculty members at universities. If not a member of University, the person must be of high standing in the profession with equivalent or higher stature and familiar with university academic environment. The reviews solicited by the committee shall be limited to names from that list. All letters evaluating the candidate's work shall be solicited by the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair or by the department chair using a standard solicitation letter. All evaluators will be supplied with a standard form on which the evaluation is to be written (see Appendices F, G, and H). External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than October 1.

If one or more prospective reviewers decline to evaluate the candidate's file, the committee chair will proceed down the list of potential reviewers. If the entire list is exhausted before the specified number of reviewers (see guidelines below) has agreed to serve, the ad hoc committee, the candidate, the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, and the department chair will reconvene to expand the list as necessary.

The basic and ultimate evaluation of the candidate is made in-house, but these external evaluations provide necessary supplemental information upon which the Department RPT Advisory Committee will, in part, base its decision.

The following guidelines apply:

1. There are no external reviewers used in third-year reviews.
2. During the fifth or sixth year review the list shall include names of nine individuals who are prospective reviewers.
3. During the tenure review the list shall consist of 12 such individuals, four or more of whom will be asked to submit reviews.
4. For promotion to professor, the list shall include names of 15 such individuals, five or more of whom will be asked to review the candidate's file.



*c) Teaching evaluation*

The staff of the Department of Metallurgical Engineering will provide the Department RPT Advisory Committee with a statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee report shall include the statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review, a summary of written comments from student evaluations generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review, and a peer classroom visit report prepared by a member of the Metallurgical Engineering faculty.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee shall gather all pertinent data on the candidate's teaching performance, including any materials the candidate wishes to submit, the statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review, a summary of written comments from student evaluations generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review, and a peer classroom visit report prepared by a member of the RPT committee.

*d) Candidate Responsibilities*

Prior to the end of spring semester, the candidate is obliged to supply the Department RPT Advisory Committee with a current vita, copies of publications and papers, reviews of published work, and any additional relevant material. The candidate's vita should list all courses taught with course numbers, titles, and credit hours. Prior to the preparation of the ad hoc committee report, the candidate shall submit a personal statement for inclusion in the file that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas.

*e) RPT File Contents*

University requirements for the structure and contents of a candidate's file are detailed in University Policy 6-303. In addition to the contents therein specified, each candidate's file must contain a personal statement prepared by the candidate, and a summary report on the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service prepared by the RPT committee.

*f) Department RPT Advisory Committee Report*

The Department RPT Advisory Committee will make a report summarizing its findings. The report will summarize the candidate's record in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and professional reputation, and will include a report of a peer classroom visit by a member of the RPT committee. The report will be fact-finding in nature only. It should be neither advocatory nor



adversarial. This report and all other data pertinent to the formal review shall be placed in the file before the closing date set by university regulations.

*g) Joint Appointments*

When a candidate is jointly appointed in an academic program, the department chair, prior to the convening of the Department RPT Advisory Committee, shall notify the chair or director of the academic program of the action to be considered. Academic program faculty as defined by procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation that shall be sent to the department chair, along with any candidate response, prior to the closing date of the file set by university regulations.

The recommendation of the academic program will be included in the candidate's file, which will then be reviewed by the department according to its established procedures. In accordance with University Policy 6-303, the Department RPT Advisory Committee shall discuss and consider the program report as part of its deliberations.

*h) Candidate's Rights to Comment on File*

The candidate is entitled to see his or her review file, including the RPT committee's report, upon request, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department. The chair of the RPT committee is to convey to the candidate the sense of the outside evaluations. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or take exception to, any item in his or her initial formal file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the file is officially closed.

It is the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair's responsibility to consult with the candidate about the completeness of the file prior to the closure of the file.

*i) File Closing Date*

The file shall be completed for review by the Department RPT Advisory Committee no later than October 30. No additional materials may be added after that time, except in accordance with university policies.

## **5. Promotion to Full Professor**

Procedures for promotion to professor shall follow the procedures as described above.

## **6. Action of the Department RPT Advisory Committee**

The full RPT Committee will meet no later than November 15, hear the report of the ad hoc committee, debate, and vote to determine its decision. Each member of the committee is responsible for reviewing the files before the meeting.

Wherever possible, the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, acting on behalf of the department chair, shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

The summary of the discussions will be recorded with no indication of the individual identities. The votes will be recorded, through secret ballot, with no indication of the individual voters' identities.

Only eligible members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee, in conformity with University Policy 6-303-III-A-3, may participate in the discussion. The department chair may attend, but should abstain from participation unless upon invitation by a majority vote of the committee. The department chair cannot vote. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which non-voting participants may be excluded.

After due consideration, a vote of all eligible members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion or tenure. The secretary, who is to be designated by the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare minutes of the meeting reflecting the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion that explains affirmative and negative votes without identifying participants and not just a summary or the conclusions. In cases of joint appointments with academic programs, in accordance with University Policy 6-303, the minutes shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the program's report and recommendation. The minutes, signed by the secretary and approved by the committee chair, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of two to five 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.

The candidate is to be informed of the results by the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair as soon as possible. Members of the RPT Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with university policy and state and federal law.

## **7. Action of the Department Chair**

After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chair shall prepare his or her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.

In conformity with University Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, and as provided for above, “if a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate adequate progress... in an informal review, the Department Chair or the Department RPT Committee... may trigger 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 academic year or as soon as the file is completed (including 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.”

Prior to forwarding the file, the department chair shall send an exact copy of the chair’s evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member.

The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his or her formal review file in response to the summary report of the Department RPT Advisory Committee or the evaluation of the department chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chair’s evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chair within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chair’s evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chair within this time limit, the candidate’s statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chair.

The department chair shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.

## **8. Actions and Appeals Procedures beyond the Department Level**

Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G, H, and J (action by dean and College Advisory Committee, action by cognizant vice president and University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, final action by president).

### **C. Appendices**

- Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate
- Appendix B. Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters
- Appendix C. Official Announcement to all Metallurgical Engineering Faculty Members
- Appendix D. Letter to the Program

- Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC
- Appendix F. Request for Assistance from Outside the University of Utah
- Appendix G. Letter to the Reviewer

## Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Professor \_\_\_\_\_

Department of Metallurgical Engineering

University of Utah

Campus \_\_\_\_\_

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The coming academic year will mark your \_\_\_\_\_ year of service to the University. By University and Department regulations you are scheduled for a \_\_\_\_\_. This process is described in the University Policy 6-303. I have enclosed a copy for your information, as well as a copy of the department procedures and set of criteria. Pertinent University Policies may be accessed at the Regulations Library website.

So that we may begin the process before the end of spring semester, I ask that you consult with Professor \_\_\_\_\_, chair of the Department RPT Advisory Committee for \_\_\_\_\_, by \_\_\_\_\_, about the formation of an ad hoc committee. You should also begin assembling material for a file, as described in University Policy 6-30.

You are required to provide us a current copy of your curriculum vitae. You may also provide a personal statement of your goals and accomplishments in relation to the department criteria for retention.

At your earliest convenience, and no later than \_\_\_\_\_, you should also supply me with the names of \_\_\_\_\_ individuals from outside the University who you believe would be able to judge your professional accomplishments and progress. Please indicate what professional relationship, if any, you have had with them in the past (thesis advisor, co-author, etc.). Other department members and I will also nominate individuals, and from these lists, a final list of \_\_\_\_\_ potential reviewers will be compiled. The chair of your Department RPT Advisory Committee and the department chair will then select \_\_\_\_\_ individuals from that list who will be asked to provide review letters, as described in our departmental procedures.

Also included is a statement which you must sign and return to me indicating whether or not you wish the review letters to be confidential or not. This is entirely your decision. Please return this statement along with your list of potential reviewers to me no later than \_\_\_\_\_, so that the process may begin in a timely manner. The file will be closed on October 30, \_\_\_\_\_, and no materials may be added after that time. If you wish to take exception to any part of the file contents, such a statement should be added by that time. Please also be advised that you have the privilege to inspect your entire file, minus any confidential review letters, at any time during the review process. Indeed, it is your responsibility to make certain that the correct materials are in the files as it proceeds through the review process. Further privileges and rights are spelled out in the accompanying section of the

University Regulations, which I alluded to before and which is enclosed.

Please feel free to consult with me at any time during the review process.

Sincerely,

---

Chair  
Department of Metallurgical Engineering



**Appendix B. Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters**

University of Utah

Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters

I waive my right to see the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/ promotion/tenure review.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

OR:

I retain my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/ tenure review.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C. Official Announcement to all Metallurgical Engineering Faculty Members

Memorandum to: Metallurgical Engineering Faculty Members

From: \_\_\_\_\_, Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject: RPT Review Process for \_\_\_\_\_

This memorandum serves as the official announcement that in the coming academic year we will be conducting RPT Reviews for the following faculty as indicated below.

Please notify me immediately if there are any discrepancies in this list.

Informal Retention Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Third-year Formal Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Fifth-year Formal Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Final Tenure Review: \_\_\_\_\_

I would appreciate receiving from you the names of appropriate outside reviewers for Professors \_\_\_\_\_ (Fifth-year Formal Review) and \_\_\_\_\_ (Final Tenure Review). If you wish to nominate potential reviewers, please give me their names no later than \_\_\_\_\_ so that a final list of prospective reviewers can be developed according to our departmental guidelines.

University Regulations note that comments from all faculty members are specifically invited, whether or not you are qualified to vote. Please provide any such comments to me for inclusion in the file no later than \_\_\_\_\_.

Any individuals wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion or tenure (other than those above) should let me know as soon as possible. A brief memo indicating your desire to be reviewed for either promotion or tenure will suffice.

Thank you.

## Appendix D. Letter to the Program

Dr. Director Program

Program Name

Campus

Dear Dr. Program:

\_\_\_\_\_ will be formally reviewed in the next academic year for retention in our department. According to University Regulations 6-303 III.B.C.4. (attached), you have the privilege to review the faculty member, using your program criteria.

We must have the report at the department no later than September 30, at which time the file will be closed and available for eligible department faculty to read in preparation for the Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting.

Thank you for your timely response to this request.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_

Chair

Department of Metallurgical Engineering

**Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC**

15 September 1999

\_\_\_\_\_, President, Student Advisory Committee  
Department of Metallurgical Engineering  
University of Utah  
Campus

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

This academic year marks the third year of service to the University for Professor \_\_\_\_\_. By University and department regulations this is the obligatory year to have a formal retention review of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments in our department. This process is described in the University Regulations 6-303. I have enclosed a copy for your information, as well as a copy of the department procedures and set of criteria.

Also enclosed is a description the University of Utah's approved "Guiding Principles for Student Advisory Committee Evaluations of Faculty Members."

The Student Advisory Committee is asked to evaluate Professor \_\_\_\_\_. Enclosed is the standard form, which must be filled out. It asks that certain information be collected and included in the RPT review file of Professor \_\_\_\_\_. This information is:

1. A summary recommendation as to whether, in the students' opinion, Professor \_\_\_\_\_ should be retained as a member of the faculty.
2. A description of the sources and methods used to collect your student information.
3. A narrative evaluation of Dr. Member's teaching performance.
4. The reasons for the specific recommendation to retain or not to retain Professor \_\_\_\_\_ on the faculty.
5. Names of the SAC officers.
6. A tally of the actual vote: \_\_\_\_\_ For \_\_\_\_\_ Against \_\_\_\_\_ Abstaining.

This information is not only required for the RPT file, it is also extremely important information that will be used at all levels of review, including that of the President. I urge you to conduct this review in as expeditious way as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation. If I can be of any help in the process, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

Department of Metallurgical Engineering

**Appendix F. Request for Assistance from Outside the University of Utah**

Date

Professor

Department

University

City

Dear Professor:

\_\_\_\_\_, in our department, is currently undergoing a formal \_\_\_\_\_ review. Our review procedures involve obtaining written critiques of his or her scholarly work by authorities in his or her field outside the University of Utah community.

My purpose in writing is to request your assistance by evaluating a body of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s work, specifically \_\_\_\_\_. Your critique need not be elaborate, but we would appreciate your candid assessment of the strengths and weakness of each piece as well as your impression of \_\_\_\_\_ scholarly promise derived from your reading of the material.

If applicable: [Your critique will be confidential. \_\_\_\_\_ will be apprised of the substance of the external reviews, but has signed a waiver relinquishing his right to see the reviews or to know the names of the reviewers.]

In order for the department to complete its review in a timely fashion, we will need to have your review no later than September 1, \_\_\_\_\_. Upon receipt of the review, the department will send you a modest honorarium of \$ in appreciation for your assistance.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience as to your ability to review \_\_\_\_\_'s written work.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_

Chair

Department of Metallurgical Engineering

## Appendix G. Letter to the Reviewer

Date

Professor

Department

University

City

Dear Professor:

Thank you for indicating your willingness to assist us in our formal review of \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ (promotion) to \_\_\_\_\_. We are most interested in your opinion of the enclosed works by the candidate--your evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of each piece and your impression of the quality of the author's scholarship derived from a reading of this material. A recent vita is also enclosed so that you may see how the items you are reading fit within his total professional contribution to date. Your critique need not be elaborate (a special form is enclosed although you are not required to use it), but we would appreciate any reactions you might have.

It would be especially helpful to our committee if your review were to reach us no later than September 1st. Although the candidate will be permitted to examine the substance of the review, the candidate has waived the right to know the reviewers' identities.

A copy of University of Utah and Department of Metallurgical Engineering policies regarding faculty reviews is enclosed.

Our University Procedures ask that external reviewers provide a brief statement of their credentials and indicate how they know the candidate. If you prefer, a copy of your curriculum vitae would suffice.

Thank you for your assistance in this important work.

Sincerely,

---

Chair

Department of Metallurgical Engineering