

School of Cultural and Social Transformation
Division of Ethnic Studies

Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement for Tenure-line Faculty

Approved by Division of Ethnic Studies Tenure-line Faculty: November 6, 2017

Approved by Dean: November 28, 2017

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on November 5, 2017 and the Senior Vice President on June 15, 2018, for implementation on July 1, 2018.

The Division of Ethnic Studies is a free-standing division within the School of Cultural and Social Transformation.

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

The mission of the Division of Ethnic Studies (ratified, 2007) is as follows:

The Division of Ethnic Studies at the University of Utah provides students with methodological and epistemological tools to study the histories, languages, identities, politics, and cultures of racialized, transnational, and indigenous populations in the U.S. We focus on critical examinations of social categories such as indigeneity, culture, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and nation. We explore these issues with comparative, relational, and interdisciplinary frameworks in order to interrogate historical and contemporary questions of power, privilege, and inequity. The faculty in the Division of Ethnic Studies engages in empirical and theoretical research, student centered teaching, and creative collaborations that promote social justice and challenge existing knowledge paradigms.

Table of Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty
 2. Informal and Formal Reviews
 - 2.1. Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period
 - 2.2. Informal Reviews
 - 2.3. Triggering Formal Retention Reviews
 - 2.4. Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor Rank Without Tenure
 - 2.5. Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor
 3. RPT Guidelines
 - 3.1. Summary of RPT Standards
 - 3.2. Evaluation of Research
 - 3.3. Evaluation of Teaching
 - 3.4. Evaluation of Service
 4. RPT Procedures
 - 4.1. Participants
 - 4.2. Information Review Procedures
 - 4.3. Formal Review Procedures
- Appendix A. RPT File Contents
- Appendix B. Approvals

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

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

Prior to the effective date of this statement, the Division of Ethnic Studies was a program and unable to hold tenure for faculty members. All Ethnic Studies faculty appointed in the program were shared appointments (see definition below), with other academic units (namely departments) able to hold the tenure-line. With the establishment of the School for Cultural and Social Transformation, and the transition of Ethnic Studies to a division able to hold faculty tenure, this new statement of RPT criteria for new and existing Ethnic Studies faculty was created. After July 1, 2016, the Division of Ethnic Studies may be made up of any or all types of the following faculty appointments:

Single-appointment faculty members are those whose tenure is held entirely by the Division of Ethnic Studies.

Joint-appointment faculty members, per Policy 6-319 (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-319.php>), are reviewed by and subsequently hold tenure in both the Division of Ethnic Studies and another academic unit. Both informal and formal reviews take place separately and in parallel, unless a memorandum of understanding lays out a process for collaboration between the two academic units during RPT reviews. When timeline or process conflict between the two appointing units, a memorandum of understanding regarding how to handle that conflict must be developed and included with the offer letter.

Shared-appointment faculty members, per Policy 6-001 (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-001.php>), are reviewed by and subsequently hold tenure entirely in one academic unit (either the Division of Ethnic Studies or another academic unit), but a Shared-Appointment Agreement states the percentage of the faculty member's work that is shared with the other academic unit. The process for the shared-appointment unit's participation in the review process is described in 6-001 and 6-303 (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php>) and in the RPT Statement of the academic unit in which the faculty member's tenure-line resides.

This Statement applies to all faculty candidates for whom a portion of their tenure-line is held by the Division of Ethnic Studies. For shared-appointment faculty members whose tenure is held by another academic unit, the Division of Ethnic Studies follows the *procedures* as described in the tenure-line holding unit's RPT Statement and in Policies 6-001 and 6-303; and, during that process, the Division of Ethnic Studies *evaluates* the candidate's research, teaching, and service based on the criteria and standards described in Section 4 of this Statement, below, so as to provide an advisory report to the tenuring academic unit.

Candidates at the assistant professor rank whose appointments began prior to the effective date of this statement, who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure, will continue to be reviewed under the RPT requirements in the tenure-line holding academic unit that were in place at the time of their appointment. Upon a positive decision, their tenure and rank, if they choose and in accordance with the following provision for currently tenured shared-appointment faculty, will become effective in both the tenure department and the Ethnic Studies Division.

Existing tenured shared-appointment faculty may elect, between July 1, 2016, and December 31, 2017, additionally to hold tenure in the Ethnic Studies Division unless otherwise specified by prior agreement between the original tenure home and the Division of Ethnic Studies. In any case, faculty will continue to hold tenure in their tenure-line department. Those faculty members electing also to hold tenure in the Division of Ethnic Studies will become joint appointments. Existing shared appointment faculty are not permitted to move to hold tenure only in Ethnic Studies. To request to hold tenure in Ethnic Studies, the faculty member shall request the Ethnic Studies Chair to submit a request to the Senior Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After December 31, 2017, any tenured shared-appointment faculty who wish to hold tenure in Ethnic Studies may request to do so, but will be required to follow the full process of review within Ethnic Studies and according to RPT guidelines as outlined below for single-appointment faculty.

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

2. Informal and Formal Reviews

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

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

b. Normal probationary period. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of assistant professor is seven years. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of associate professor or professor is five years.

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

Table 1: Normal Review Schedule

Rank at Appointment	Year of Informal Review	Year of Formal Review
Assistant Professor	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 5 th , 6 th	4 th , 7 th
Associate Professor and Professor (appointed without tenure)	1 st , 2 nd , 4 th	3 rd , 5 th

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the College RPT Advisory Committee or the Division Chair, according to University Policy.

c. Shortening or extending the probationary period. Candidates may request early tenure reviews (i.e., *shortening* the otherwise applicable probationary period) on the grounds described in and by following the procedures provided for in University Policy. Because early review cases require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress, few requests are made and few are granted. Candidates are therefore encouraged to consult with the Division Chair and the Dean and senior colleagues before requesting an early tenure review.

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

2.2 Informal Reviews

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

2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

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

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

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

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when they have met the requirements for that rank. The Division does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. In general, however, such requests are not made until the time of one’s first tenured faculty review, which occurs five years after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member’s stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research/creative activity, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure.

University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

This statement describes the criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period; tenure; promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard

performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

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

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that they have *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research/creative activity or teaching, at least sustained *effectiveness* in the other, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service.

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

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

3.2 Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

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

a. Description of Research/Creative Activity.

Research/Creative Activity Quantity: Although quantity of research publication/creative activities are important it is not the only evaluation-measure. Publications/creative activities 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/Creative Activity Quality: Quality refers to the intellectual importance of the contribution made by a book, article, other publication, or creative activity, including its complexity and distinctiveness. Such quality will be assessed according to a number of considerations, including the RPT Advisory Committee's own judgment, the evaluation provided in letters submitted by external evaluators, and the status of the venue in which research is published, among other possible factors. It is the candidate's responsibility for establishing the case for the quality of the work and to explain their role in co-authored publications/creative products.

Faculty members will be evaluated holistically according to the following general criteria:

- Evidence of initiative and independence in the conceptualization and completion of scholarly research projects, such as single or first authorship of publications or other indications of a systematic program of scholarly research. Accordingly, while the Division values collaborative research, priority will be given to single- or first-authored work.
- Evidence of research that makes a significant scholarly contribution as indicated by publication in a variety of scholarly forums, including but not exclusively publications of primary importance.
- Evidence of intellectually rigorous, in-depth, and sustained publication record comparable in quantity and quality to that of peers of the same rank at other comparable institutions in the same professional sub-discipline.
- Evidence of a sustained intellectual project that develops a larger contribution to one or more specific dimensions in the field.

The quality of individual research/creative contributions are evaluated with respect to three facets: purpose, significance of outlet, and impact.

1) Purpose of the Contribution

The mission of the University, in part, is to create new knowledge. Consistent with this, research/creative quality is in part evaluated by the degree to which the work contributes to new understanding and/or creative contribution. Five categories of research/creative 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. However, some research/creative purposes reflect to a higher degree the University mission of creating new knowledge, and the Division recognizes the greater significance of these forms of research/creative activities.

Creation of New Knowledge: This category includes scholarship that present new theory, methodology, empirical evidence, or innovative creative contributions relevant to the mission of the Division of Ethnic Studies. 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 or critical-normative value. New empirical evidence can be quantitative or qualitative, but the emphasis is on the development of new and original understandings, 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 and practices.

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 recommendations for the direction of future research or practical application.

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/Creative Outlet

The quality of research/creative contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear. Each piece of research/creative activity 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 within the field of Ethnic Studies generally, articles in top tier peer-reviewed

journals in a specialty area, major funded research grants, single authored academic books, 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, policy documents, 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, popular media such as newspaper articles or academic blogs, and regional and local conference presentations.

3) Potential Impact of the Work

Judgments of impact (or predicted impact) range from minimal to exceptionally high. These judgments are based on individual assessments of the work, conclusions from qualified external 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 are viewed holistically, taking 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 positive impact on a community partner, and the depth of analysis and interpretation.

Breadth of impact. This is the degree to which contributions broadly affect (or are likely to broadly affect) different areas within the field of Ethnic Studies, 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/or across disciplines, fields and/or specialty areas.

b. Statement on Community Engaged Scholarship

Community Engaged Scholarship (CES) involves the investigation, analysis, and the transformation and dissemination of knowledge based on community-informed, reciprocal partnerships involving the university and community members. CES contributes to both the public good and the university mission, is rooted in disciplinary or field-based expertise, uses appropriate methodologies, and involves public dissemination of products that can be peer reviewed. Such activities should demonstrate respect for the contributions made by community partners, as well as respect for the principle of “do no harm.”

Research/creative activity in this area must be disseminated widely and publicly, and have an impact beyond those who participated in the research. Evidence of impact may include: (i) publication of books, chapters, articles in peer-reviewed journals, and articles in highly regarded non-peer-reviewed journals, (ii) substantial written work in well-regarded, edited electronic outlets with large audiences, (iii) presentation of research at professional meetings and/or invited lectures, and (iv) when CES is creative activity rather than research, the creation itself may be evidence of its influence if it has a sustained impact in the community and bears other hallmarks of influence (*e.g.*, a juried art installation).

c. Research Funding

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the university and the Division and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the university. To the extent that funding is necessary for the candidate’s research program, all successful and unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding will be considered evidence of research productivity.

d. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/creative activity as described above.

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

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

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

3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. Evaluations of teaching in the Division of Ethnic Studies encompass: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, (3) student advising and mentoring, and where appropriate (4) community engaged pedagogy.

a. Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics; and (e) practicum instruction, professional supervision, and management of internship or field practicum placements, community engaged learning. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction may include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and guest presentations, (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, letters from community partners, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) also may be included if the candidate so chooses. The Division expects faculty to comply with the code of conduct related to faculty instruction and supervision described in University Policy 6-316 Section 3 and Section 4. The Division recognizes that different courses present different pedagogical challenges for students and instructors that do not always translate into strong or satisfactory teaching evaluations. These courses implicitly challenge students' paradigms and assumptions about race, gender, and social class. The Division's holistic approach to evaluating teaching is mindful of discrepancies in teaching evaluations when these courses are part of an instructor's teaching load.

b. Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new courses, publication of textbooks or other teaching materials, development and maintenance of practicum and field training sites, and development of professional training programs. Efforts to secure teaching, training and student support grants are valued contributions to teaching beyond the fundamental responsibilities of course instruction, program development, and student mentoring. Externally funded training grants and research grants that include support for students

are valued contributions in this area. Grants such as those mentioned here are valued under both categories of research and teaching, proportional to the degree to which they contain research and student training elements.

c. Student advising and mentoring

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

d. Community Engaged Pedagogy

The Division values pedagogical practices seeking to transform and enrich engagement between the academy and respective communities. Community engaged pedagogy promotes student success to transform and empower lives by bridging learning and practice, informing curricular innovation, and building the capacity of students and community members to be lifelong civic leaders and collaborators. Community engagement also develops, transfers, and transforms knowledge by drawing on both academic and community knowledge, and demonstrating leadership and sharing knowledge with communities and others in the field. The Division recognizes that these endeavors are time intensive and, at times, untraditional in their structure. Assessing the impact of community engaged teaching may involve facets such as, but not limited to: (a) Course instruction, (b) Curriculum and program development and (c) Student advising and mentoring as listed above.

e. Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.

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

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

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

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

3.4 Evaluation of Service

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

a. Professional Service

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

b. University Service

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

c. Public Service

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

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

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

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

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

4. RPT Procedures

4.1 Participants

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

- a. Candidate. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.
- b. Division RPT Advisory Committee. Membership in and voting on the Division RPT advisory committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT advisory committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.
- c. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. The chairperson of the RPT advisory committee is a tenured member of the Division faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to vote in the election.
- d. Ad Hoc Subcommittee. The ad hoc subcommittee prepares a report about an RPT candidate for consideration by the RPT advisory committee. One member is appointed for a candidate's informal review, and two members for a formal review. The members of the subcommittee are qualified to vote on the advisory committee's recommendations regarding the candidate. They are selected in consultation with the candidate by the Chairperson of the RPT advisory committee. For formal reviews, the candidate in consultation with the Chairperson of the RPT advisory committee selects one member of the subcommittee to serve as the chairperson for the subcommittee.
- e. Division Chair. The administrative head of the Division.
- f. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of students in the Division of Ethnic Studies.
- g. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer teaching reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the Division Chair.
- h. External Evaluators. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Division RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and Division Chair in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

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

4.2 Informal Review Procedures

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

a. First-Year Informal Review. The Division Chair will conduct the first-year informal review during the Spring Semester in order to clarify the RPT Guidelines, map the candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and service trajectory, as well as discuss their record. The Division Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research/creative activity, teaching, and service. The Division Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review within two weeks of the meeting, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

b. Informal Reviews after the First Year. These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

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

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

The Division Chair adds course evaluation results from the University of Utah to the file. The candidate may add evaluations from other institutions.

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

The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will appoint an eligible member to review the candidate's file and write an informal review report that evaluates progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the candidate and added to the RPT file. The candidate shall have an opportunity (but not an obligation) to provide a written response to the report.

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

The RPT advisory committee will then meet to discuss the report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT advisory committee chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the initial report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT advisory committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the Division Chair shall prepare their written recommendation to be included in the file. The candidate will then have the option to provide within seven business days, a written response to the Committee report and/or the recommendation of the Division Chair. After all informal reviews, the Division Chair and the individual assigned to review the candidate's file shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and their progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Division Chair or members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion review to Associate Professor or to Professor follow the same format.

a. Division Chair Responsibilities. By April 1, the Division Chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year. The Chair will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Chair by April 15th.

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

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

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

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT advisory committee chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint members to and select a chairperson for the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to oversee the candidate's file in the RPT process. For each candidate being reviewed, the RPT advisory committee chairperson also will request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Division Chair shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching review and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT advisory committee chairperson, after consulting with the Division Chair and the Ad Hoc Subcommittee chairperson, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion review. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The Division Chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will close no later than September 15th, except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Division RPT advisory committee meeting.

- 1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT advisory committee chairperson to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly work, (iii) a personal statement that summarizes research/creative activity, teaching, and service contributions and future plans as they relate to division RPT standards. The candidate may submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

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

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

g. Formal Review—Division RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.

- 1) *Division RPT Advisory Committee Action.* The full RPT advisory committee will meet no later than October 21st. Each committee member is responsible for reviewing the candidate's file prior to the meeting. The committee will discuss the record as it pertains to the candidate's contributions in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy (Policy 6-303-III-E-5), the Division Chair may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate.)

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

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

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

- 2) *Division Chair Action.* After studying the candidate's file, the Division Chair shall prepare their written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the candidate's RPT file, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the Division Chair.

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

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

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

Candidate's Responsibility

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the RPT Advisory committee chairperson for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:
 - a. All research/creative activity publications since the candidate began his/her professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on blind review, or other selection method.
 - b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.
 - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
 - d. Honors received for research/creative activity.
 - e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.
 - f. Individual student research/creative activity supervised.
 - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
 - h. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.
2. Personal Statement. This document should describe accomplishments as well as future plans in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy.
3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.
4. Course syllabi for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the candidate chooses to include. You should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers, the SAC, and the RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee to use this material for their reports.

5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research/creative activity is unclear, the candidate may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.
6. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

Division's Responsibility

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

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.
2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
3. SAC report(s) for the current formal review and all past formal reviews.
4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.
5. Copies of all prior years' RPT files.
6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Division Chair describing the candidate's service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
8. External evaluator letters for formal reviews. These letters are kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her right to read them.
 - a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
 - b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief curriculum vitae
 - c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, RPT advisory committee chairperson, or Division Chair)

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

Review Committee Approval:



Lincoln L. Davies, Chair
Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee

Date: 4/26/18

Senior Vice President Approval:



Amy J. Wildermuth,
Associate Vice President for Faculty (designee)
Academic Affairs

Date: 6/15/18