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DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

University of Utah

GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

The objective of this document is to provide uniform guidelines for faculty decisions related to retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) actions. The document outlines department-specific procedures for RPT reviews and defines the criteria used in Department RPT decisions.

I. UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES

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 University of Utah Policy 6-311, Rev. 15 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html). The department has developed its RPT procedures and criteria in accord with these regulations. 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).

II. OVERVIEW OF THE RPT PROCESS

Each non-tenured Instructor or Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually, except during the faculty member’s first year. On the fourth year there will be a formal review, with informal reviews in the second, third, fifth, and sixth years. A formal review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor typically occurs in the seventh year. Associate Professors may request that a formal review for promotion to Full Professor be conducted during any year. This request should be addressed to the Department Chair during the Spring Semester of the year prior to that of the formal review.

Candidates in a regular faculty appointment may have accomplishments achieved prior to their probationary period at the University of Utah be considered as relevant to the demonstration of their achievement of the RPT criteria (this results in a shortening of the typical probationary period and an early tenure review). The details concerning credit for prior service are spelled out in University of Utah Policy 6-311, Section 4 C (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html). Prior accomplishments, such as research publications or teaching experience, shall not substitute for a continuing record of accomplishments during the probationary period at the University of Utah. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the RPT criteria. (Policy 6-303, III A 2 c; http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html) (For evaluation process, see Policy 6-311-III Section 4 C 1; http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html).

Candidates may also request a shortening of the probationary period, and therefore an early tenure review, due to extraordinary progress toward tenure during their time at the University of Utah. The details concerning early tenure review due to extraordinary progress are spelled out in University of Utah Policy 6-311, Section 4 C 1 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html).

It is also possible for a non-tenured faculty member to have the probationary period extended under certain circumstances (e.g., a medical or family leave, a serious health condition, certain administrative assignments, or certain other extraordinary circumstances). The details concerning extension of the probationary period, and the lengths of such extensions, are spelled out in University of Utah Policy 6-311, Section 4 C 2 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html). Also relevant to extensions of the probationary period is University of Utah Policy 5-200 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/humanResources/5-200.html) which specifies University policy on leaves of absence.

Informal retention reviews for non-tenured regular faculty members occur every year that does not have a formal review, beginning in the second year. Informal reviews are conducted entirely within the department. Informal reviews include: (1) a face to face meeting between the candidate and the Department Chair (or a designee) to discuss the candidate’s progress based on the file at the conclusion of the Department and Chair’s informal action (but prior to the end of that academic year); (2) involvement from the RPT Advisory Committee, which involves discussing the candidate’s file and progress, including a vote on retention; and (3) a written report to be made available to the candidate, the members of the RPT Advisory Committee, and the Department Chair. The Department’s purpose for these informal reviews is to provide regular feedback and guidance for junior faculty working toward tenure and promotion. However, an informal review that results in a decision of non-retention by either the Department RPT Advisory Committee or the Chair will have the result of triggering a formal review of the candidate. The triggered review may occur in the same year or in the subsequent year (See Policy 6-303, Rev. 20).
Formal decisions for retention, promotion, and tenure involve multiple levels of RPT review. There are three independent RPT recommendations at the department level: (1) the department RPT Advisory Committee whose membership is described below, (2) the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) which consists of graduate students from the various departmental graduate programs, and (3) the Department Chair. There are two independent RPT recommendations at the college level (1) the College RPT Committee, and (2) the Dean. At the university level, there are two and sometimes three recommendations. The cognizant Senior Vice President and the President always review the candidate’s file. The University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (UPTAC) provides an additional review if there are negative recommendations from any review level in the department or college. Final decisions regarding retention, promotion, and tenure are made by the President of the University.

Evaluation decisions about the performance of faculty members must be in harmony with the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure contained in this document. All decisions with respect to retention, promotion, and tenure must not discriminate on the basis of race, national origin, sex or gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, or status as a physically challenged individual.

III. DEPARTMENT STRUCTURE AND MISSION

The Department of Educational Psychology, a unit in the College of Education, is characterized by an emphasis on the application of behavioral sciences to educational and psychological processes. The department offers doctoral degrees in counseling psychology, school psychology, and learning sciences (learning and cognition), as well as master’s degrees in school psychology, school and licensed professional counseling, statistics, and instructional design and educational technology. The degree programs in school and counseling psychology prepare students for professional licensure in these areas.

The Department’s Mission Statement (ratified, 1991) is as follows: “The basic mission of the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Utah is service grounded in research and disseminated through teaching. The inquiry function of the Department is the generation of knowledge through research. First, this knowledge serves to translate a range of research-validated practices into functional educational services for individuals from early childhood through late adulthood. Second, research forms the knowledge core for effective instruction and training of licensed and credentialed students. The creation of a research knowledge base and the training of students are designed to serve the educational needs of the university, community, and state. The students trained by the Department of Educational Psychology will be the leadership professionals of tomorrow.” From the Department’s Mission Statement, it is clear that the Department: (1) is committed to training students to serve the educational and psychological needs of the state and the larger national community; and (2) is committed to the generation of new knowledge in education and psychology, broadly defined, through research and scholarship.

To achieve the mission of the Department of Educational Psychology it is necessary for the Department to recruit, retain, promote, and tenure the highest quality faculty possible. The research function serves to advance knowledge in the fields of education and psychology, and it forms the basis for the effective instruction and training of graduate students, whether they are preparing for research or professional careers. The creation of a research knowledge base and the training of graduate students are designed to serve the educational needs of the university, community, and state.
DEPARTMENT RPT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

During each academic year there is one Department RPT Advisory Committee. However, membership on this committee can vary for different actions taken during the year depending on the candidate(s) under review. The membership structures described below exclude the Department Chair and any other faculty member who would have an independent RPT vote at a different level of review (e.g., if the College Dean or University President were a member of the Department). The Chairperson of the committee shall be elected annually from tenured members. In this election all regular faculty through the instructor rank 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 a member of the Department RPT Advisory Committee for reviews for promotion to Professor), then a second Chair will be elected for those reviews.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the Department does not have at least three eligible members, the Chair must 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 appropriate 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.

Committee Structure for Retention Reviews. All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, shall constitute the Department Retention Advisory Committee for this type of review.

Committee Structure for Promotion Reviews. All regular faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion shall constitute the Department Promotions Advisory Committee.

Committee Structure for Tenure Reviews. All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, shall constitute the Department Tenure Advisory committee.

DEPARTMENT RPT PROCEDURES AND TIMELINE

The department procedures described here are listed in chronological order. However, the timing of some steps can vary from year to year. Most procedures listed here are dictated by university RPT policies, but some are specific to the department.

A. Spring Semester Prior to Anticipated RPT Reviews
The Department Chair notifies faculty members with obligatory RPT reviews in the upcoming year. The Chair sends a letter to each candidate detailing what is required. Copies of University of Utah Policy 6-303, Rev. 20 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html) and the Department RPT criteria are included.

The Department Chair notifies appropriate tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty asking if they wish to request a formal review for promotion or tenure in the upcoming year.

The Department Chair requests that each formal review candidate nominate five established scholars from other universities or research institutions that have expertise related to the candidate’s areas of research. During tenure and promotion reviews, at least three of these nominations must be from Doctoral/Research-Extensive Universities according to the Carnegie Foundation 2000 classification system. No external reviewers are used during informal review years. In submitting a list of nominees, candidates must describe the qualifications of each potential reviewer (institution, rank or position, and demonstrated areas of expertise). The candidate must also describe any professional and/or personal relationship that exists between the candidate and each potential reviewer. The Department Chair selects a minimum of three external reviewers. During tenure or promotion reviews, at least two of the reviewers must be from Doctoral/Research-Extensive universities. In selecting reviewers, the Department Chair gives priority to the candidate’s nominees, but has the option of identifying three additional reviewers from which to choose if (a) during a tenure or promotion review the nominated reviewers do not represent senior or tenured scholars from appropriate institutions, (b) the nominated reviewers do not have expertise relevant to the candidate, or (c) the nominated reviewers have extensive prior professional or personal relationships with the candidate. While it is often impossible to identify qualified and appropriate reviewers that have no prior professional relationship with the candidate, the Chair may opt to identify additional reviewers if these relationships are too extensive (e.g., advisor during graduate school or co-author on many of the candidate’s published works). If the Department Chair identifies additional potential reviewers under any of these circumstances, the candidate is informed and given the opportunity to respond regarding their appropriateness. If the list of additional potential reviewers is revised based on this feedback, the candidate is again informed and given the opportunity to respond. When all potential reviewers are identified, the Department Chair makes the final selection. In the final selection, the Chair gives priority to appropriate reviewers from the candidate’s nominees, and selects from the list of additional reviewers when needed to meet the criteria for reviewer appropriateness described above.
The Department Chair requests that each candidate sign the waiver/non-waiver form concerning the confidentiality of the external reviewers’ recommendations.

B. Summer Semester Prior to Anticipated RPT Reviews
Each candidate should begin to compile an RPT file. For formal reviews, the department administrative staff provides copies of course evaluation summary sheets for all courses taught by the candidate, copies of past RPT reviews and recommendations, evidence of faculty responsibility, other written statements (by the candidate, faculty members, administrators, staff, or other interested individuals), and the formal evaluations of the SAC. The candidate is responsible for the remaining file contents listed here.

1) An updated vita which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings
2) Copies of all publications cited on the candidate's vita. If some are unavailable, this fact should be noted and the reasons should be explained. Publications listed as "accepted" or "in press" should be verified by copies of letters from publishers, formal contracts, etc.
3) A personal statement that explains the materials in the file, highlights achievements of special note, describes work in progress and sets forth professional objectives.
4) Other professionally relevant material that the candidate wishes to include (e.g., published reviews or commentary on something published by the candidate, course materials, letters acknowledging public or professional service, etc.).

The past reviews and recommendations in a file for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate's vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.

For informal reviews, the department administrative staff provides copies of course evaluation summary sheets for all courses taught by the candidate, copies of past RPT reviews and recommendations, evidence of faculty responsibility, and other written statements (by the candidate, faculty members, administrators, staff, or other interested individuals). The candidate is responsible for providing an updated vita which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings, and copies of all publications cited on the candidate’s vita. If some are unavailable, this fact should be noted and the reasons should be explained. Publications listed as "accepted" or "in press" should be verified by copies of letters from publishers, formal contracts, etc.

For formal reviews, the Department Chair contacts the selected external reviewers requesting that they serve as reviewers. Upon acceptance of the responsibility, the chair sends each reviewer a letter that includes a description of the reviewer’s role, the Department’s RPT Guidelines and Standards, the candidate’s vita, selected publications (3-5) provided by the candidate, and a statement about the candidate’s choice regarding confidentiality of the reviewer’s comments (as per the waiver/non-waiver decision of the candidate described in Section V-A).

C. Fall Semester of the RPT Review Year
At the beginning of the semester (at least 3 weeks prior to the Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting), the Department Chairperson sends a letter to the Department Student Advisory Committee (SAC) requesting them to evaluate (in writing) the teaching effectiveness and prepare recommendations on the faculty members being reviewed. The SAC chair is provided with University of Utah Policy 6-303, Rev. 20 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html), Department RPT criteria, the University’s SAC Faculty Evaluation Report Form, and the University’s Guiding Principles for SAC Evaluations of Faculty Members. The Department SAC should conduct its review in accord with the principles described in the latter document. The Department Chairperson also notifies the College’s representative to the Student Senate of the upcoming reviews at the same time.

The Department Chair invites all interested faculty and staff members to submit written, signed recommendations to the candidate’s file stating as specifically as possible the reasons for the recommendations.

The RPT file of each candidate should be closed by September 30 (or an alternative date specified by the Department Chair). It should contain all materials supplied by the candidate, external review letters (formal reviews only), the SAC report, and additional letters submitted by other faculty, staff, students, or other interested individuals. The candidate has the right to examine the contents of the file at any time, except for external review letters if the candidate waived his or her right to see them. The candidate can also add responses to the contents of the file at various times specified below (except to the external review letters if the waiver was signed). The RPT files are kept in a secure location by the department administrative assistant, and the files are checked out to members of the RPT Advisory Committee upon request.
The Department RPT Advisory Committee holds an initial meeting to determine primary and secondary reviewers for each candidate. All committee members are expected to examine each candidate’s file, but the two designated reviewers of a candidate are charged with thoroughly reviewing all materials in the RPT file. The primary reviewer will coordinate this effort and the secondary reviewer will assist.

The Chair of the Department RPT Advisory Committee calls the RPT review meeting(s), preferably by October 15. The Chairperson of the Department committee chooses a secretary for the meeting, who need not be a member of the faculty. Alternatively, the Chairperson can assign the secondary reviewer of each candidate to serve as secretary for that discussion. The secretary records minutes of the meeting. Minutes for each candidate should be extensive enough to cover all essential elements of the discussion, but participants in the discussion should not be named or identified in any way.

For each candidate, the department committee votes on summary ratings in research, teaching, and service described later in this document. In addition, separate votes are taken for each action under consideration (retention, promotion, and/or tenure). The committee can decide by a simple majority to utilize secret ballots. Results of each vote are recorded in the formal minutes of the meeting. At least two thirds of the committee must be present to form a quorum, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum. Absent members are notified of the nature of the formal reviews and their votes should be solicited. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting, and are recorded in the minutes in the same way as non-absentee votes.

Department Chairpersons, Deans, and other administrative officials who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity may attend and, upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. Department Chairpersons, Deans, and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacities shall not vote at the department level.

The secretary prepares for each candidate a written summary of the discussion of the committee and the result of all votes taken. The committee Chairperson adds an additional statement that, in his/her judgment, the minutes of the meeting adequately covers the discussion and bears his/her formal approval. In formal reviews, a brief summary of the contents of the external review letters should be included as part of the Advisory Committee minutes. The summary of external review letters must be made without identifying the reviewers, if the candidate waived the right to see external review letters. The minutes are then shared with all committee members. The committee is given up to five working days to recommend modifications. Copies of the final report are forwarded to the Department Chair and the candidate.

All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.

Subsequent to the Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting, the Department Chair prepares his or her written recommendations with respect to the candidate, stating specifically the reasons for the recommendations. The Chair provides a copy of this letter to the candidate along with notification that the candidate can respond to the Department RPT Advisory Committee letter, the Department Chair’s letter, or both. In formal reviews, the candidate has seven business days following receipt of the notice to add responses to the file if he or she wishes to do so. If the candidate submits a written statement to the Department Chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the Chairperson.

In formal reviews, the Department Chair forwards the complete file, including the Advisory Committee’s letter, the Chair’s letter, and any responses from the candidate to the Dean.
VI. DEPARTMENT CRITERIA AND EVALUATION GUIDELINES

A. Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure

A faculty member's stature is based on three functions: (1) research and other scholarly activities; (2) teaching; and (3) professional, university, and public service. Summary ratings of these three functions serve as the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure. Possible ratings for each function are distinguished, excellent, satisfactory, and not satisfactory. A rating of excellent would equate to the standard of excellent in Policy 6-303, Rev. 20 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html), while a rating of satisfactory would equate to the standard of effective in that same policy. A rating of distinguished is a higher rating than excellent, and higher standards are permitted under Policy 6-303, Rev. 20 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html). The criteria for retention at the rank of Assistant Professor, tenure, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria for each level is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluation guidelines for ratings in research, teaching, and service are described in subsequent sections.

**Assistant Professor**: Retention at this rank requires ratings of at least Satisfactory in all three functions of research, teaching, and service.

**Associate Professor**: Promotion to this rank requires ratings of at least Excellent in research and teaching, and a rating of at least Satisfactory in service.

**Professor**: Promotion to this rank requires a rating of Distinguished in research and ratings of at least Excellent in teaching and service.

**Tenure**: The requirements for achieving tenure are basically the same as those requirements for promotion to Associate Professor. With tenure, a permanent relationship between the faculty member and the University is implied. In a decision to grant tenure, careful consideration is given to the faculty member's past and present teaching, research and publications, professional competence, and involvement in the University community.

While the Department does not promote current tenure track faculty to Associate Professor without the concurrent granting of tenure, under some circumstances an individual may be hired at the level of Associate Professor or Professor without the immediate granting of 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 for promotion to the rank of Professor, or that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a Professor. The probationary period for an individual hired without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is five years (see University of Utah Policy 6-303 III B 2 c (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html)).

**A General Note on Evaluation.** A professor’s activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service will be considered in terms of their significance and constancy. The data gathered on a faculty member at the time of consideration for retention, promotion, or tenure are considered to be predictive of future activity. Emphasis is placed on a record of continuous productivity.

Further, all faculty members are expected to abide by the University’s Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-316; http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-316.html). Failure to abide by the Faculty Code may be considered under the appropriate areas of research, teaching, and service, and may be factored into the candidate’s rating in each of these areas.

B. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Research

Judgments about a faculty member’s research are based on both the quality and quantity of research products. However, the characteristics of productive research can differ as a function of the faculty member’s program, areas of professional specialty, areas of research expertise, and professional goals. Consequently, there are no strict quantitative criteria for amount and type of research work at the various faculty ranks. Rather, assessments of faculty research in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that balance the quality and quantity of research contributions and take into account the professional context of the faculty member.
Research Quantity
Quantity of research is not judged by simple publication counts. Publications that reflect a primary role or responsibility by the faculty member are valued more than those that reflect a secondary or tertiary role. This is usually, but not always, associated with order of authorship in publications. In addition, a series of publications over time that represents sustained programmatic research in one or more topic areas is valued highly.

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

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

*Creation of New Knowledge.* This category includes research products that present new theory, methodology, or empirical evidence relevant to the field of education or psychology. New theory refers to an original proposal that explains a system of behaviors or processes, not simply new hypotheses or models of isolated behaviors. New empirical evidence can be quantitative or qualitative, but the emphasis is on the development of new and original understanding from the data, not merely an empirical description of phenomena. New methodological contributions can take many forms (e.g., research-related methods or methods of professional practice), but to belong in this category, contributions must be novel rather than re-expressions of existing methods.

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

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

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

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

2) Significance of the Research Outlet
The quality of research contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear. Four categories of significance are listed below with common examples. The examples are meant to serve only as general guidelines for assessing the significance of outlets. In addition, some types of research outlets are not listed as examples (e.g., software, psychological or educational tests, video productions, unfunded grants, etc.), because they vary considerably in their significance. Each product of research is considered for its own unique merits relative to this facet of quality.
Exceptional. Examples of this category include authored scholarly books by respected publishers, articles in widely recognized journals that are general to fields of education and/or psychology, articles in top tier peer-reviewed journals in a specialty area, major funded research grants, and widely adopted general textbooks or high quality advanced textbooks.

Primary. Examples of this category include articles in respected peer-reviewed journals, book chapters in a high quality edited book, edited books, general textbooks, externally funded research seed grants, major funded training grants with significant research components, and invited addresses to prominent national/international conferences.

Secondary. Examples of this category include articles in lower tier peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed abstracts, authored books on professional topics for the general public, presentations at national/international professional conferences, conference proceedings, and funded training grants with minor research components.

Tertiary. Examples of this category include articles in non-peer reviewed journals, unpublished technical reports, and regional and local conference presentations.

It should be noted that applying for grants or receiving grant funding is not explicitly necessary for tenure or promotion. Applying for grants and receiving grants is simply one of many scholarly activities that are considered in retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. It is possible to meet the expected level of performance through many different types of scholarly activities.

3) Potential Impact of the Work

Judgments of impact (or predicted impact) range from minimal to exceptionally high. These judgments are based on the Department RPT Committee members’ individual assessments of the work, conclusions from qualified external reviewers, citation rates if the publications have existed for a sufficient period of time, and in some cases other forms of recognition such as awards and honors. Both the breadth and the depth of impact are considered.

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

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

Summary Rating Scale for Research

Ratings on the 4-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research as described above, given the faculty member’s time in rank.

Distinguished: The candidate has made outstanding and sustained research contributions in one or more topic areas. The contributions are programmatic, original, consistent over time, and have established the individual as a recognized scholar in the topic area(s).

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

Satisfactory: The candidate has made acceptable research contributions for time in rank. The quality and quantity of existing contributions suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient research contributions given time in rank.
C. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

Within the university system, the term teaching refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. We also recognize that student mentoring with respect to professional practice is a high priority in the scientist-practitioner model of education embraced by professional programs in the Department. For this reason, RPT judgments in the Department of Educational Psychology are made primarily with respect to three components of teaching: (1) course instruction; (2) development of programs, curricula, and professional training opportunities; (3) direction of graduate work which primarily involves advising, mentoring, and supervising department graduate students. While these are the three fundamental areas of responsibility on which all faculty members are evaluated, there are other professional activities that also contribute to excellence in teaching. These include: (4) writing grants that encompass student training and/or financial support, and (5) developing educational materials that have impact within and beyond departmental instruction (e.g., publication of educational software, textbooks, supplemental materials, instructional videos, etc.).

1) Course instruction
Within the Department of Educational Psychology, course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) the organization and facilitation of seminars that are related to program and department curriculum needs; (c) practicum instruction, professional supervision, and management of internship or field practicum placements; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Student ratings from course evaluations, SAC reviews, and general assessments of course content and method by other faculty members are all used in the evaluation of course instruction as defined here. The overall evaluation of a faculty member’s effectiveness as an instructor gives consideration to factors that can affect student ratings and SAC evaluations. At a minimum, satisfactory course instruction must include dependability of the faculty member with respect to course meetings and availability outside of the classroom. This includes expectations of faculty behavior described in University of Utah Policy 6-316 (Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-316.html).

2) Program and curriculum development
The department’s various graduate programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing program/curriculum development and maintenance. In particular, the design and implementation of professional training programs must take into account national accreditation standards, state certification requirements, professional licensure and credentialing requirements, and related external factors. In addition, practicum and field training sites must be established and maintained with various educational, public school, health service, and/or mental health agencies and institutions in the community at large as well as on campus. The contributions of faculty members to the establishment, coordination, and maintenance of multi-faceted graduate training programs, beyond their teaching of specific courses, is thus recognized as a necessary and important function within the evaluation of teaching performance.

3) Student mentoring and supervision in research and professional development
In this department, work with graduate students outside of the classroom is as important as teaching in the classroom. Activities of primary importance in this area include the chairing and serving on thesis and dissertation committees. This area of responsibility also includes supervision of students providing professional services, service on non-thesis committees, and general student advising and mentoring. Student supervision associated with training grants can also be a major consideration in this category. Contributions to thesis and dissertation committees are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality of committee service. While there are no quotas for student committee service, faculty members are expected to contribute a reasonable share of the committee service load relative to other faculty members in the same program and at the same rank. Indicators of quality are drawn from: (a) SAC reports, (b) faculty opinion from serving on committees with the candidate, (c) publication of thesis and dissertation projects, (d) student presentation of thesis and dissertation projects at professional conferences, and (e) professional awards and recognition of theses and dissertations chaired.

4) Training and student support grants
Writing grants for the training and financial support of students is a valued contribution to teaching beyond the fundamental responsibilities of course instruction, program development, and student mentoring. Externally funded training grants are the most substantial contributions in this area. Minor training grants and funded research grants that include student financial support and provide students with research experience are lesser but still notable contributions in this area. Grants such as those mentioned here are valued to some degree under both categories of research and teaching, proportional to the degree to which they contain research and student training elements. Grants, while valued, are not explicitly required in the teaching area. They are simply one way in which a faculty member can show their commitment and contributions to teaching.
5) Developing educational materials
This category includes the production of educational materials that have applications both within and beyond the faculty member’s own teaching. Textbooks, educational tests, educational software, instructional videos, and similar products generally have value in the evaluation of research, but depending on the nature of the product, they may have primary weight in the category of teaching. As with training and student support grants, this area is not viewed as a fundamental teaching responsibility for faculty, but instead it reflects commitment and exemplary contribution to the area of teaching.

Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.
Ratings on the 4-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the five components of teaching, relative to the faculty member’s time in rank. The first three components reflect the fundamental teaching responsibilities of faculty members in this department, and consequently they are weighted most heavily.

Distinguished: The candidate has made important and sustained contributions in teaching. Over time, the candidate has demonstrated excellence with respect to course instruction, program development and maintenance, and student mentoring and supervision in research and professional development.

Excellent: The candidate has made significant contributions to the department in areas of course instruction, program development, and student mentoring.

Satisfactory: The candidate has made acceptable contributions in the area of teaching for time in rank. The faculty member shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, program development, and student mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of teaching given time in rank.

D. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Service

The viability of the Department of Educational Psychology depends in part on its ability to maintain an active presence in the University system, to represent itself within the larger professional communities, and to maintain itself as a public resource. Although this can be achieved partially through faculty research and teaching, public and professional service is another important mechanism for maintaining this presence.

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) university service, and (3) community or public service. It is not necessary for a faculty member to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the unique strengths and interests of faculty members and the different program foci.

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

2) University Service
This category refers to service at any or all levels of the University: (a) academic program area, (b) Department, (c) College, and (d) University. This includes serving in administrative positions at any of these levels. Chairing and serving on standing and ad hoc committees also represent valuable service contributions at each level.

3) Community or Public Service
This category includes professional service in various local and community settings. Service to schools and other educational organizations, state government agencies, and healthcare and mental health organizations are all included here. Finally, this category includes professional service to the public at large. This could take many forms, and it includes such activities as direct professional service to community and cultural organizations, as well as course instruction that incorporates a service learning component.
Summary Rating Scale for Service. Ratings on the 4-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas, relative to the faculty member’s time in rank.

**Distinguished**: The candidate has made outstanding and sustained contributions in at least one area of service. The faculty member’s service contributions have distinguished him/her as a recognized leader in the profession, University, or community.

**Excellent**: The candidate has made significant contributions to his/her profession, the University, and/or the community through professional service.

**Satisfactory**: The candidate has made acceptable contributions in the area of service for time in rank. The faculty member shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the faculty member will be significant.

**Not Satisfactory**: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of service given time in rank.
Memorandum

University RPT Standards Committee

To: Elaine Clark, Chair, Department of Educational Psychology

Michael L. Hardman, Dean, College of Education

cc: Susan Olson, Associate Vice President-Academic Affairs

From: Carleton DeTar, Chair, URPTSC 2009-2010

Date: July 16, 2010

Subject: Approval of RPT Statement

This is to confirm that the attached version of the departmental RPT Statement, dated as approved by the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee, effective July 16, 2010, has, pursuant to University Policy 6-303, been reviewed and approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and may be implemented for RPT proceedings for the academic year 2010-2011.

Congratulations on your fine work in revising the Statement to comply with University Policies and serve the missions of your department and the University.