

Legislative history--- Revisions to University Policy 6-303, Policy 6-310, and Rule 6-310(IDTP),

as approved by the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees in May/June 2014, with effective date of May 15, 2014.

[Prepared by Bob Flores for the Institutional Policy Committee]

Contents:

(i) Memorandum proposing and explaining the revisions—with update for final Senate meeting --- page 1

Contents of revised Regulations, final versions, as approved by the Academic Senate 2014-05-05 and by the Board of Trustees 2014-06-01, with effective date of May 15, 2014

(ii) Policy 6-303 Revision 21 --- page 10

(iii) Policy 6-310 Revision 2 --- page 43

(iv) Rule 6-310 (IDTP) Revision 2 --- page 53

(1) __Proposal for revising Regulations on Faculty Review Standards and Procedures: Policy 6-303, Policy 6-310, and Rule 6-310 (IDTP)

Memorandum

From: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (formerly University RPT Standards Committee)

To: Senate Executive Committee

Re: **Proposal for revising Regulations on Faculty Review Standards and Procedures-- Policy 6-303, Policy 6-310, and Rule 6-310(IDTP).**

Date: March 31, 2014.

I. Introduction:

This proposal is the second phase of a project to revise University Regulations which govern standards and procedures for periodic reviews of individual faculty members. The first phase proposal was approved in January 2014. It involved revision of Policy 6-002 (The Academic Senate) to integrate career-line faculty into the set of Senate standing committees. For the committee which the Senate has established to represent the Senate in overseeing the systems by which reviews of faculty members are conducted, that first phase changed the name, membership structure, and functions of the committee. In that first-phase proposal it was explained that to fully implement those system changes started with the revisions of 6-002, it would be necessary to follow through with revising related contents of the other Regulations that directly govern the faculty review systems in which the Senate's committee is involved. The January proposal explicitly included a commitment to return later this spring semester with this second-phase proposal, to complete the overall project.

The most important accomplishments from the combined results of the two phases are (i) to expand the responsibilities of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (formerly University RPT Standards) to have direct authority for approving contents of the Statements of Standards, Criteria, and Procedures for Faculty Reviews which are developed and implemented by individual departments and colleges, for *all* categories of faculty, (ii) to expand membership of that Committee to accommodate its new responsibilities, and (iii) to establish a relationship of the Committee and the cognizant vice president's office in which the final approval authority for such Statements is jointly shared by both, so that reviewing and approving contents of the Statements will be carried out jointly, combining the important perspectives of faculty members elected to the Committee by the Senate, with expertise and resources of the administrative office. Altogether these will result in systems for developing, reviewing, and approving such Statements which should be more efficient and lead ultimately to higher quality

systems for reviews of faculty members. To finish accomplishing those improvements begun by the first phase revisions of the Senate's Committee description in 6-002, this proposal will revise Policy 6-303 (which will now govern all types of reviews of tenure-line faculty, pre- and post-tenure), and Policy 6-310 and Rule 6-310 (which govern reviews of career-line faculty as well as non-faculty instructional personnel). Along with the main changes regarding the role of the Senate's Committee, other changes are proposed for these Regulations to (iv) conform to the changed nomenclature for categories of faculty adopted in spring 2013 (tenure-line, and career-line), and (v) clarify various aspects of the Regulations to provide better guidance on developing and approving the contents of such Statements by which reviews of individual faculty members are governed, with clarifications based on experience gained over the past several years.

II. Highlights of revisions:

A. Policy 6-303:

- Changing the name used in 6-303 for the Senate's Committee, to conform to the change made in Policy 6-002 in January, with the former University RPT Standards Committee renamed as the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. (Similarly, references to two other committees are updated to use their new names—the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee, and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights).
- Changing the nomenclature used within 6-303 to refer to “tenure-line” rather than “regular” faculty, to conform with the mandate for such changes to be made throughout all University Regulations, as stated in the revising of Policy 6-300-- University Faculty Categories and Ranks-- which was approved in spring 2013.
- Moving into 6-303 (new Part III-L) the main existing Policy provision for a system of periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty (*Tenured Faculty Reviews—TFR*). With that move, 6-303 will become a ‘one-stop’ resource for the most important information regarding review systems for tenure-line faculty members in all career stages, including the stages of pre-tenure Retention, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) and those post-tenure TFR reviews. Also regarding the TFR procedures, a new explanation is added that having such review processes in place is mandated by statewide policy of the Utah Board of Regents, to make clear that the University is acting in full compliance with the letter and spirit of the Regents policy. The existing provision regarding TFR is being moved to 6-303 from its current location in Policy 2-005. (To keep this current proposal at a manageable size, this current proposal does not include revising the contents of 2-005, but that will need to be done in a later phase, changing 2-005 so that it will merely refer to 6-303, rather than covering the same topic of TFR procedures in a duplicative and contradictory way.)
- Assigning to the Senate Committee on Faculty Review Standards a new role in approving contents of Tenured Faculty Review Statements, such that the Committee and the office of the cognizant vice president will jointly share that authority and responsibility of

approving Statements. (Part III-L) This follows through with changes for the Committee made in January's approval of revised 6-002. Also, a note is inserted acknowledging that after some experience in its new role in approving Statements for TFR processes, the Committee will likely identify and propose improvements for this new TFR section of the Policy.

- Similarly, establishing a jointly shared authority and responsibility of both the Committee and the vice-president's office for approving contents of RPT Statements (governing Retention, Promotion, and Tenure reviews of faculty). (Part III-A-2). This follows through with changes made in January's approval of revised 6-002.
- For both RPT and post-tenure TFR review procedure Statements, providing explicitly that the Senate's Committee, in consultation with the vice president, may establish a schedule for periodically reviewing and updating the contents of the Statements, to ensure they are kept consistent with current Regents Policy and University Regulations and do not become obsolete and fail to reflect changes in departmental standards and practices. This authority of the Committee was present but somewhat unclear under prior versions of Policies, was then made clear in the January revising of 6-002, and the clarifying revision of 6-303 will conform to that change. (Part III-A-2, and III-L)
- Explicitly providing for the Committee, in consultation with the vice president's office, to provide guidance for departments and colleges in updating contents of both the RPT Statements and the TFR Statements, including by preparing and distributing guidance materials. (Part III-A-2, and III-L). This conforms with the January change made to 6-002.
- Making several mostly minor clarifications regarding the RPT review processes that are governed by 6-303, based on experience of the Committee gained from working with the vice president's office and departments and colleges over the past several years, identifying certain points within the Policy where clarification will be useful. For efficiency, these are proposed to be made as part of this project, rather than requiring a separate project. They include:
 - Providing within in 6-303 a helpful summary of the topics governed by separate Policies which govern the length of RPT probationary periods, including possible grounds of extending or shortening such periods. This will facilitate departments including in their RPT Statements a similar summary, to ensure that pre-tenure faculty are adequately informed about their rights (e.g., rights to parental leaves which may extend the probationary period). This new section (Part III-A-3) briefly summarizes topics governed by Policies 6-311, 6-315 & 8-002, 6-320).
 - Clarifying that RPT Statements should describe the "evidence" departments will use in determining whether an RPT candidate has met the requisite standard of performance for each criterion of research/creative activity, teaching, and service. (Various locations).

- Clarifying that on procedural matters for which University Policy allows departments to make choices among multiple alternatives, those choices made should be described in the RPT Statements (e.g., the length of the pre-tenure probationary period, the number and scheduling of mid-probationary formal retention reviews, procedures for selecting external evaluators). (Part III-A-2)
- Requiring that Statements include a notice as to when new Standards will become applicable for new hires, and what ‘grandfathering’ arrangements are provided for existing faculty. The office of General Counsel has advised such notice is necessary, and the Committee, the vice presidents’ office, and the Counsel’s office have over the past two years have jointly developed a standard clause for this purpose which the Committee has required be inserted in all recently approved Statements. So this change will conform Policy to recent practice. (Part III-A-2)
- Providing that peer observation of teaching and peer examination of teaching materials should “ordinarily” be included among multiple methods as part of “best practices” for assessing an RPT candidate’s teaching performance. (Part III-D-3). This will bring Policy 6-303 into accord with policy of the State Board of Regents which requires periodic reviews of teaching performance and requires that the University “evaluate teaching through student, *collegial*, and administrative assessment.” (See Regents R481 at <http://higheredutah.org/policies/>). The Committee proposes phrasing this new passage as only “ordinarily” requiring peer observation, so that there will be some flexibility for a department to substitute other methods that are found to be at least equally effective.
- Clarifying which time periods for a candidate’s responses to various phases of reviews are measured as “calendar” days and which are based on “business days.” The existing version was vague on those points, thus creating grounds for confusion and disputes. (Various sections).

B. Policy 6-310 [renamed as] Reviews of Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty Members, and Other Instructional Personnel (Standards and Procedures):

Because this Policy governs reviews of career-line faculty, and the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee has not yet incorporated into its membership a set of representatives of the career-line faculty (which will be done for the 2014-2015 year), the Committee has called upon two groups to assist in identifying and crafting appropriate revisions for Policy 6-310. One was a specially convened Task Force on Career-Line Faculty and other related topics. The other was the elected Senate members

representing career-line faculty throughout the University. This proposal is therefore a joint undertaking of the Committee, that Task Force, and the career-line Senate members. The proposed revisions include some that are required to conform with the changes previously begun through revisions of Policy 6-002 and Policy 6-300, and a small number of additional changes that will clarify ambiguities in the existing 6-310, as well as implementing points identified as useful through the past several years of experience working with the existing Policy.

- Changing the nomenclature used within Policy 6-310 to refer to faculty categories as “career-line” and “adjunct” rather than “auxiliary” faculty, to conform with the mandate for such changes to be made throughout all University Regulations, as stated in the revising of Policy 6-300 (University Faculty Categories and Ranks) which was approved in spring 2013.
- Assigning to the Senate Committee on Faculty Review Standards a new role in approving contents of the Statements developed by colleges to govern reviews of the career-line and adjunct faculty. Similar to the arrangement described above for Statements governing tenure-line faculty reviews per Policy 6-303, the Committee and the office of the cognizant vice president will jointly share that authority and responsibility of approving Career-line reviews Statements, and of developing and providing guidance for formulating such Statements. This follows through with changes for the Committee made in January’s approval of revised 6-002. It will serve the important function of ensuring faculty perspectives in the approval and guidance processes. With the accompanying expansion of membership of the Committee to include career-line members, those perspectives will come from both career-line and tenure-line members. Similar to its responsibilities with regard to Statements of Procedures for RPT and TFR reviews (described above for 6-303) the Committee, in consultation with the administration, may develop a schedule for periodically updating these Statements, and will provide helpful guidance for the units, including by sharing “best practices” developed by other units. (Part III-C)
- The original version of the Policy was enacted in 2007 as a very rapid response to concerns raised by the University’s accrediting body at that time, and as has been noted by units attempting to develop the requisite Statements, that rapidly enacted Policy is rather vague and provides units with only minimal guidance. With that in mind, a “User Note” is being inserted acknowledging that after some experience is gained in its new roles of developing guidance and approving Statements for Career-line processes, the Committee will likely later identify and propose further improvements for this Policy.
- Adding a statement of principle that the Policy, and the faculty review systems which are established under its authority, are to be guided by fundamental principles of academic freedom and academic excellence. (Part I) And a reminder is added that when appropriate under the circumstances facing a particular unit, reappointment terms of longer than a single year (up to five years) are considered “strongly encouraged” for full-time career-line faculty, because the stability which accompanies longer-term appointments is an

important element for ensuring meaningful academic freedom, and fostering academic excellence. (Part III-A-4)

- Adding an explanation that departments and colleges will likely find it useful to use for the evaluation of teaching of career-line and adjunct faculty some of the same methods and processes used for evaluating teaching of tenure-line faculty (as described in the RPT Statements governed by Policy 6-303, mentioned above). (Part III-A-2). The concerns of the University’s accrediting body which compelled original adoption of this Policy were primarily about the University’s lack of systems for ensuring the quality of teaching by what at that time were known as “auxiliary” faculty, and so the Committee is seeking to aid departments and colleges to put in place systems for reviews of teaching which are both effective and efficient.
- Adding a statement of principle that the University “strongly encourages and highly values involvement of career-line faculty in shared-governance activities.” When career-line faculty members serve the interests of the University community by participating in such activities, for example by serving as elected members of the Senate or Senate committees (in keeping with the restructuring of the Senate through recently revised 6-002) their home units should reasonably recognize and accommodate such valued service, as part of the systems for reviews, reappointments and promotions. (Part III-A-5)

C. Rule 6-310 (IDTP): Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel in Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs:

Only two changes are proposed for this Rule.

- First, consistent with the previously approved reconfiguring of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and assigning it as the primary representative of the Senate on matters regarding processes for reviews of career-line faculty members (by previous revision of Policy 6-002 and the current revisions of Policy 6-310), a new passage is added allowing that Senate Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, to provide its expert guidance for the development and approval of “Statements of rules” governing reviews of career-line faculty members within the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. (Part III-F) That guidance should prove helpful, given the expertise the Committee is developing as a result of its new configuration (expanded to include perspectives of career-line representatives) and its parallel function regarding processes for reviews of the career-line faculty in all other units of the University, per Policy 6-310 above.
- Second, as a minor update, the list of such Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs which appears in the Rule is revised to delete mention of the University Writing Program. That unit has recently been approved to transition to the status of an *academic*

department, and upon completion of that transition its status as a Program will necessarily end, so its name should be removed from the list.

III. Consultations and further information.

This proposal was developed through joint efforts of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (with tenure-line faculty members representing each of the University's academic colleges), a special Task Force on Career-line Faculty convened by the Office for Faculty (with broad representation of career-line and tenure-line faculty from throughout the University), and the career-line members of the Academic Senate during spring 2014 (representing all academic colleges, the University Libraries, and the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs established under Rule 6-310). Bob Flores, Professor of Law, Senate Policy Liaison, and Special Assistant on Faculty Policy for the Office for Faculty, acted as primary researcher and draftsman. Hank Liese, Associate Professor of Social Work, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs--College of Social Work, and Special Assistant to the Associate Vice President for Faculty, served as co-chairperson of both the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and the special Task Force on Career-line Faculty during this project. The proposal has been presented to the Institutional Policy Committee (with representation of all administrative areas of the University, including the office of General Counsel), and has been reviewed by the elected faculty and student members and ex officio administration representatives of the Senate Executive Committee.

For further information, contact Bob Flores, robert.flores@law.utah.edu 581-5881, or Hank Liese, hank.liese@socwk.utah.edu.

##

Update for Senate meeting of May 5, 2104.

This proposal was presented to the Academic Senate April 8, 2014 as a Notice of Intent Calendar item. Senate members were invited to discuss with their constituents and submit any feedback by April 16 to allow discussion of the feedback at meetings of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and the Senate Executive Committee, so that any resulting refinements of the proposal could be included for the Senate May 5th agenda, for Debate and voting on approval.

Three comments were received. None stated any concerns or made any suggestions about those parts of the three Regulations that are encompassed within the original proposal. Suggestions were made that certain other parts of the Regulations (not within the scope of this current proposal) should be reviewed by the Standards Committee next year for possible revision. Those included (i) possible revisions to the methods of conducting absentee voting in Retention, Promotion, and Tenure cases (Policy 6-303), (ii) possible revisions to the time frames for department chairs and deans to add their recommendations on formal Retention, Promotion, and Tenure reviews (also Policy 6-303), and (iii) possible revisions to focus attention more fully on how faculty in the Research category are to be evaluated during reviews (Policy 6-310). These ideas will be considered by the Standards

Committee next year as part of the planned further work on those two Policies (plans alluded to in the “User Notes” which are to be embedded in each of the Policies as part of this current proposal).

Based on that feedback formally solicited and received, no significant concerns about any of the contents of the current proposal have been identified, and no suggestions of any amendments to the proposal have been brought to attention, and accordingly none were discussed with either the Standards Committee or the Executive Committee.

If there are any such concerns or suggestions not previously communicated, Senators are asked to raise them prior to the May 5 meeting so that processing of this agenda item can proceed as quickly as possible (given the very lengthy agenda and multiple major items up for consideration in addition to this proposal). Comments or concerns may be given to:

Hank Liese (co-chair of the Faculty Review Standards Committee)

hank.liese@socwk.utah.edu 5-6935

Bob Flores (proposal drafts person in chief)— robert.flores@law.utah.edu 1-5881

(2)

[Proposed Revision 21 of Policy 6-303. Draft 2014-03-30.]

Policy 6-303, Revision 2021: Reviews of Tenure-Line Faculty Members (RPT and TFR Criteria, Standards and Procedures). ~~Retention, Promotion, and Tenure~~ Effective Date: May 15, 2014

I. Purpose and Scope.

To establish criteria, standards, and procedures for reviews of tenure-line faculty members for purposes of retention, promotion, and tenure decisions (RPT), and for periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured-faculty members (TFR) of regular faculty. ~~To implement policies of the Utah State Board of Regents regarding such reviews, including [Regents Policy R4811, Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-Tenure Review.]~~ To establish departmental retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committees and committees for reviews of tenured faculty, and describe their functions. To describe certain functions of the ~~University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure~~ Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee, and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights-Committee, and functions of University officers (department chairpersons, deans, cognizant vice presidents, and the President, as related to retention, promotion, and tenure, and post-tenure reviews.

This Policy governs performance review processes for all faculty members appointed to any tenure-line faculty position in any academic unit of the University. The rights associated with the status of retention in a tenure-track position, or holding a tenured position, are described in other University Regulations, including Policy 6-311. Review processes for faculty members appointed to career-line, adjunct or visiting faculty category positions (as described in Policy 6-300), or for persons in non-faculty academic employee positions (as described in Policy 6-309), are separately governed by [Policy 6-310]. Review processes for persons holding any special “named position” such as an endowed chair are separately governed by [Policy 9-003: Endowed Chairs].

(EndNote 1: Adaptation for variations in organizational structure.)

(EndNote 2: [NEW] Adaptation for The University of Utah Libraries.)

II. Definitions. ~~(Reserved)~~

A. The faculty categories of “tenure-line,” “tenure-track,” and “tenured,” are defined for purposes of this Policy as described in [Policy 6-300: The University Faculty--Categories and Ranks.](#)

B. The faculty appointment status of “tenure” is defined for purposes of this Policy as described in [Policy 6-311: Faculty Retention and Tenure.](#)

C. The academic units of “academic department,” “academic college,” and “interdisciplinary academic program,” are defined for purposes of this Policy as described in [Policy 6-001: Academic Units and Academic Governance.](#)

III. Policy: Reviews of Tenure-line Faculty Members (RPT and TFR) ~~Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.~~

Overview: This Policy governs the criteria, standards, evidence and procedures for all reviews of tenure-line faculty members both pre-tenure and post-tenure. Parts III-A to III-J govern reviews conducted during the pre-tenure probationary period leading up to the granting of tenure, and also any reviews for purposes of promotion in rank conducted after granting of tenure. Part III-K governs reviews for granting of tenure at the time of initial appointment. Part III-L governs regular periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members (other than reviews for the purpose of granting a promotion in rank).

A. Retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) reviews

1. Purpose:

- a. Retention. A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to ~~regular faculty ranks~~ tenure-track faculty positions prior to the granting of tenure. Annual reviews shall be scheduled during this probationary period to evaluate the academic performance of non-tenured individuals, to provide constructive feedback on their academic progress, to retain those who meet the applicable standards for retention, and to terminate the appointment of those who do not meet the standards of the department and the expectations of the University during the probationary period after their

initial appointments. (See University Policy 6-311, and Board of Regents Policy R481 regarding termination of appointment, notice of termination, and the terminal appointment period.)

- b. Promotion. Promotion in rank is the acknowledgment by the University of continuing and increasing professional competence and responsibility in teaching, research and creative work, and University and public service.
- c. Tenure. Granting tenure implies a commitment by the University to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline, and the University in a manner befitting a responsible academic person. (See Policy 6-311.) Granting tenure is regarded as the University's most critical personnel decision. Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be ~~awarded~~granted to faculty members prior to their advancement to the rank of associate professor. It is therefore imperative, before such commitments are made, that a responsible screening process be followed to ensure that the most highly qualified candidates available are granted tenure. ~~Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years as per Policy 2-005 Section 5-C.~~ *{Drafting note: this information regarding Tenured Faculty Reviews is moved below to new Part III-L and revised as shown there.}*

2. Criteria, Standards, Evidence and Procedures (RPT)

- a. Development and approval of statements of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures ("RPT Statements"). *{Drafting note: capitalization corrections for the phrase "RPT Statement" are made throughout this draft, but to minimize burden on readers are not marked as changes. The same is true for the terms, President of the University.}*

~~i. Each department (or college) shall formulate and distribute to all regular faculty members~~ and when appropriate revise a Statement of criteria, standards, evidence and procedures to be used in retention, promotion, and tenure ("RPT") reviews. These RPT Statements shall address the qualifications of candidates with respect to the primary criteria areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative activity, and (3) University, professional, and public service. These Statements shall be consistent with applicable provisions of University Regulations, especially including Policies 6-303, 6-311(Retention and Tenure), and 6-316 (Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), as well as professional codes if appropriate, and with the purpose of the University of Utah as stated in

Chapter 1, Section 1, of the State Higher Education System Regulations. The Statements shall include the rationale for the criteria and standards, and a description of evidence to be used in assessing performance relative to selected standards for each criterion. The Statements~~and~~ shall include a description of departmental procedures which are required by University Regulations (or instead provide specific references to the pertinent provisions of those Regulations), and a description of departmentally selected procedures on which~~where~~ University Regulations permit departmental variation, such as the selection of either a six-year or seven-year normal probationary period, and number and scheduling of mid-probationary formal retention reviews (Part III-A-3), timing of eligibility for post-tenure review for further promotion in rank (Part III-B-2-d), the procedures for informal reviews in p(Part III-B-1-a) ~~of this Policy and,~~ any rules for allowing non-voting faculty participants in meetings of the departmental RPT advisory committee ~~as referred to in p~~(Parts III-A-3 III-E-1 and III-K-1) ~~of this Policy,~~ any requirement of external evaluations for reviews other than tenure or promotion reviews (Part III-B-2), procedures for selecting a set of external evaluators (Part III-D-9), and any procedures for assigning to individuals or special committees specified responsibilities within RPT proceedings (e.g., mentoring, peer reviews of teaching, file preparation, file review, or preparation of reports). Each revision of a Statement shall specify the date on which its requirements become effective for all newly appointed candidates, and describe any delay period ('grandfathering') or consent procedure for making changed requirements applicable for reviews of existing faculty members.

ii. Each Statement and any revision of a Statement must be approved by majority vote of the regular tenure-line faculty of the department, the dean, and jointly finally approved by the cognizant senior vice president and the Senate Faculty Review ~~the URPT~~ Standards Committee.

Two or more departments within a multi-department college may jointly adopt a single RPT Statement, and in such cases the required approval of the faculty shall be by majority vote within the tenure-line faculty of each joining department. If all departments within the college so join, the

Statement shall be treated as a “college-wide RPT Statement,” operative within all of the departments.

In its role in approving RPT Statements, the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee acts as delegee of the authority of Academic Senate, pursuant to Policy 6-002-III-D-1-k, and in accord with that Policy the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a regular schedule for reexamination and revision of RPT Statements, initiate reviews of Statements on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, prepare guidance materials for use in developing and approving Statements, and otherwise assist departments with development of Statements, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other departments.

iii. An RPT Statement fully approved becomes the governing Statement for that department until replaced by a fully-approved revised version. The department chairperson shall make contents of the current governing Statement available to all tenure-line faculty members. Pertinent contents of the governing Statement shall be provided to all committees and individuals participating in RPT proceedings and all committees or individuals making any recommendation or decision in an RPT proceeding shall do so consistent with the governing University Regulations and the substantive criteria, standards and evidence set forth in the governing RPT Statement.

b. Criteria and evidence.

i. The primary criteria of teaching, research/creative activity, and service shall be assessed for retention, promotion, and tenure in terms of standards incorporating both the quantity and quality of work achieved. Departmental RPT Statements shall identify types of evidence to be used as means of assessing quantity and quality appropriate to the discipline or profession.

ii. Any departmental expectation of accomplishment of or potential for obtaining external funding support (and the rationale for imposing such expectation) shall be described with particularity in the departmental Statement.

iii. In carrying out their duties in teaching, research/other creative activity

and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities ([Policy 6-316](#)).

Assessments of teaching, research/other creative activity and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty.

- c. Standards. Insistence upon the highest attainable standards for faculty members is essential for the maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery as well as the assimilation and transmission of knowledge. Departmental RPT Statements and the decisions based upon them shall emphasize the University's commitment to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence.

- i. Teaching and research/other creative activity. For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department. A department may select standards higher than these minimum requirements if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank. Departmental RPT Statements shall clearly describe the standards applicable for each rank.

- ii. University, professional, and public service. Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent

of their public service. Demonstration of effective service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for retention, promotion, and tenure. A department may select higher standards if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

- d. Prior accomplishments. Candidates in a ~~regular~~ tenure-line 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 applicable RPT criteria and standards. 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 and standards. (For evaluation process, see [Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-1](#).)

3. ~~Department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee~~
[User note: In Revision 21 of this Policy, the existing description of the voting membership and chairperson of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee which previously appeared in Part III-A-3 was moved to Part III-E-1 below (to be incorporated with the description of the actions of the Committee). And the summary descriptions of the RPT pre-tenure probationary period and procedures for changing the length of a probationary period (details of which are governed by other Policies) were added into Policy 6-303-III-A-3, to better guide departments in formulating RPT Statements and better inform RPT candidates regarding those important topics.]

[Drafting note: The following passage describing the department RPT committee is moved to III-E-1 below.]

- a. ~~[Department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee]~~ Committee membership:
- i. ~~Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for retention if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.~~
 - ii. ~~Promotion. In each department all regular tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.~~
 - iii. ~~Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.~~
 - iv. ~~Small academic unit rule. Any department or division advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department or division 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.~~

v. ~~Single vote rule. No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any person's case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).~~

b. ~~Chairperson. The chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the department. In this election all regular ~~tenure-line~~ faculty members of the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be entitled to vote. The department chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee.~~

{Drafting note: The following passages in ~~[[double brackets]]~~ summarily describing the RPT probationary period are added here to make this important information more accessible, and they are based on the very detailed descriptions existing in the various separate governing policies cited.}

[[#3. RPT pre-tenure probationary period and schedule of reviews.

As more fully described in and governed by the following cited Policies:

a. The normal pre-tenure probationary period, (i) for candidates initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor or Instructor is *seven* years (unless the department within the approved RPT Statement has adopted the alternative of *six* years), and (ii) for candidates initially appointed at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor is *five* years. (Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-B)

b. There shall be (i) a final formal review for tenure during the final year of the probationary period, (ii) normally either one or two mid-probationary-period formal reviews for retention (with the number and normal scheduling to be specified in the approved RPT Statement), and (iii) informal reviews in all other years. (Part-III-B below)

c. The probationary period length (and accordingly the schedule of formal reviews) for a particular candidate may be varied on the grounds and through the procedures prescribed regarding (i) shortening based on “credit for prior service” or “extraordinary progress toward tenure” (Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-1), or (ii) extending, based on “leave of absence,” “effect of administrative assignments,” or “extraordinary circumstances” (Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-2), or under the terms of other relevant Regulations, including those regarding Faculty Parental Benefits (Policy 6-315, Policy 8-002) or Part Time Status (Policy 6-320).]]

B. Informal or Formal Reviews (RPT procedures).

All ~~tenure-eligible~~ track faculty members shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/other creative activity, responsibility, and service. Informal annual reviews are required in each year in which a formal review is not held. More extensive, formal reviews are required for mid-probationary retention reviews; final probationary year reviews (consideration for tenure); consideration for termination at any point in the probationary period (such as triggered reviews); and promotion decisions. (A chart of the timing and review requirements is set forth below at [Policy 6-303-III-D-12.](#))

1. Informal reviews. Informal reviews must minimally include 1) a face to face meeting between the candidate and the department chair (or a designee, as per department rules) to discuss the candidate's progress based on the file; 2) involvement, determined by the department, from the RPT advisory committee (and academic program if relevant); and, 3) a written report to be made available to the candidate, the members of the RPT advisory committee and the department chair.
 - a. Procedures. The ~~department RPT Statement of RPT criteria, standards and procedures adopted by the department (or college)~~ must prescribe specific requirements for informal reviews. Minimally, it must state the required documentation and who provides it, procedures for preparing and distributing the written report, the nature of the involvement by the RPT advisory committee (and interdisciplinary academic program if relevant), procedures and criteria for appointment of a chair's designee, if any, and the timetable for the annual reviews. Departments may elect to include in their Statements more extensive review procedures than the minimum required. Procedures for first-year reviews shall be described separately if differing (typically less extensive) from informal reviews of later years.
 - b. Actions after the report. Candidates shall have the opportunity to make a written response to the report. The report and the response, if any, are then filed in the candidate's cumulative file with a copy of each sent to the dean. The informal review concludes at this point.
 - c. Triggering formal retention reviews. If a ~~tenure-eligible track~~ faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external ~~evaluator review~~ letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.
2. Formal reviews. Formal reviews must provide a substantive assessment of the candidate's research or other creative activity, teaching and service to date. Formal reviews require a vote of the full RPT advisory committee.

External evaluations, as discussed below ([Policy 6-303-III-D-9](#)), are required for tenure and promotion reviews. Departments, through departmental RPT Statements, may also mandate external evaluations for mid-probationary and/or triggered reviews. When such external evaluations are not mandated, candidates still retain the right to have external letters solicited unless quality of research or creative activity is not an issue in the review (e.g., a triggered review focused solely on teaching) and provided that such request is made before the review commences.

- a. Mid-probationary retention reviews. All tenure-~~eligible~~track faculty members shall have at least one formal, mid-probationary review in their third or fourth year, as determined by departmental rules. Department RPT Statements must prescribe the number of reviews and the year(s) in which they occur.
- b. "Triggered" reviews. The results of an informal review may "trigger" a formal review earlier than ordinarily prescribed by departmental rule if an informal review has demonstrated inadequate performance or progress, as described in [Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c](#) above.
- c. Tenure. Tenure-~~eligible~~track faculty members must be reviewed for tenure by the final year of their probationary period. As summarized in Part III-A-3 above (and directly governed by [Policy 6-311-III-Section-4](#)):
 - i. Deadline for tenure review. The final year is the fifth year for ~~persons~~candidates appointed at the ranks of associate professor or professor and the seventh year for those appointed at the rank of assistant professor (unless the department has established, through its RPT Statement, a six year probationary period for assistant professors). ~~See Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-B~~
 - ii. Request for earlier review. Within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement and Policy 6-311 candidates by ~~University Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-1, tenure-eligible faculty~~ may request a review for tenure earlier than the year of the mandatory review.
- d. Promotion in rank.

i. Timing for tenure-~~eligible~~track faculty. Tenure-~~eligible~~track faculty members are usually reviewed for promotion to higher rank concurrently with their tenure reviews. Under unusual circumstances, tenure-~~eligible~~track faculty members may request a review for promotion earlier than the year of the mandatory tenure review.

ii. Timing for tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members may request a review for promotion within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement.

C. Notice to involved individuals (RPT procedures).

1. Notice to candidate. Each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure shall be given at least 30 days advance notice of the department RPT advisory committee meeting and an opportunity to submit any information the candidate desires the committee to consider.

2. Notice to department faculty and staff. At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.

3. Notice to student advisory committee. Prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall notify the college's representative to the Student Senate and the department student advisory committee(s) (SACs) of the upcoming review and request that the department SAC(s) submit a written report evaluating teaching effectiveness and making RPT recommendations as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC evaluation and report should be based on guiding principles approved by the ~~University RPT~~ Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson. The SAC shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its report, but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the reports, the SAC's recommendations shall be deemed conclusively waived and their absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.

4. Notice to interdisciplinary academic program. When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an interdisciplinary academic program through a shared-appointment agreement with the department (as described in Policy 6-001-III-A), the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by an approved RPT Statement of Procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.

D. Candidate's file (RPT procedures).

Proper preparation and completeness of each candidate's file are essential for the uninterrupted progress of a RPT review through all the stages of the review process. Required components and their timing are identified in the table below in Policy 6-303- III-D-12.

1. Structure of the file. The file is envisioned as a notebook in the department office, which is growing throughout a faculty member's probationary period at the University. However, a physical notebook is not the only method allowable - for example an electronic file or other format may be used alone or as a supplement. The file shall be cumulative and kept current as described in the following sections.
2. Curriculum vitae. The candidate's file is expected to provide a current and complete curriculum vitae (CV), which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories related to the department's RPT criteria. The CV should be updated annually, but not during the course of a given year's review. During a review, new accomplishments may be reported and documented as a part of any of the reports or responses in the regular process.
3. Evidence ~~of~~ for research/creative activity and evidence for teaching.

a. The candidate is expected to provide evidence ~~of~~ for review of research and other creative activity, updated annually, consistent with the department's description of evidence considered appropriate for this criterion, as provided in the RPT Statement.

b. The RPT Statement shall describe the types of evidence to be included in the file appropriate for evaluation regarding the criterion of teaching. These shall include *multiple* indicators of quality of teaching, consistent with the University's commitment to "assess its courses and instruction in multiple ways" (Policy 6-100-III-N). In addition to the minimum requirements of (i) course evaluation results, developed using the University's approved "Course Feedback Instrument and Report" pursuant to Policy 6-100-III-N (and filed per Part III-D-4 below), and (ii) SAC report (developed and filed per Part III-C-3 and D-7), the types of evidence should ordinarily include (iii) assessments from peer observations and analyses of teaching and teaching materials conducted by peer observers qualified by experience and familiarity with the methods of teaching and subjects appropriate for the discipline and department.

The Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and office of the cognizant vice president advise and guide departments regarding best practices for methods of assessing teaching quality, to be incorporated in the approved RPT Statements in keeping with the University's commitment to high quality education.

4. Past reviews and recommendations. The department chairperson shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, *i.e.* SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present); ~~and teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included.~~ The past reviews and recommendations in a file for a post-tenure review 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.

(See Policy 6-100-III-N regarding the "Course Feedback Instrument and Report forms" approved by the Academic Senate for use in development of teaching/course evaluation summaries the chairperson shall include in the candidate's file.)

5. Evidence of faculty responsibility. Letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials,

arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the candidate's file.

6. Recommendation from academic program. In the event that an interdisciplinary academic program with which the department has a shared-appointment agreement regarding the candidate produces a recommendation as under [this Policy 6-303 Part III-C-4], the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.
7. Recommendation from the department student advisory committee. If the department SAC produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C-3, the recommendation shall be placed in the candidate's file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.
8. Other written statements. Any other written statements - from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, staff, or interested individuals--which are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate, must be placed in the file by the department chairperson before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.
9. External evaluations. The purpose of external evaluations is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. Along with the actual review, the external evaluator should describe his/her qualifications and relationship to the candidate. The department chairperson should make sure that any letters of evaluation from outside the department are requested early enough for the letters to arrive and be included in the candidate's file before the program and department RPT advisory committee meetings. Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the faculty member being reviewed shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

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

signature date

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

signature date

That form, with the candidate's signature below the statement preferred by the candidate, shall be included in the candidate's review file. When the candidate reserves the right to read the external letters of evaluation, respondents shall be informed in writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed.

10. Candidate's rights. Candidates are entitled to see their review file upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.
11. Review of file. The candidate's file shall be made available to those eligible to attend the departmental RPT advisory committee meeting a reasonable time before the meeting, which may be specified in the department RPT Statement.
12. Table of Minimum University Requirements for Reviews.

Type	Retention			Tenure	Promotion to Associate or "full" Professor
	Informal	Formal	Formal		
Category	Informal	Formal	Formal	Formal	Formal
When	Annual	Triggered-b,c	Mid-Probationary	End of Probation, or see U-Policy 6-311	Typically end of probation or when meets department standards

Involved parties:						
	External reviewers	No	As per departmental rule-a	As per departmental rule-a	Yes	Yes
	Academic program, if appropriate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	SAC	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Department RPT	Representation-d	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Department chair-f	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	College RPT	No	As per 6-303-G-1-a	As per 6-303-G-1-a	Yes	Yes
	Dean	Receives report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate includes in file: (minimum requirements)						
	Curriculum Vitae	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Includes in File: (minimum requirements)						
	SAC report	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

External Letters (could be internal to University but external to department)	No	As per departmental rule-a	As per departmental rule-a	Yes	Yes
Past Reviews and Recommendations-e	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic program report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Comments from others	Optional	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Student Course Evaluations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

a. Candidates retain the right to have external letters be solicited in a formal review if quality of research or creative activity is an issue in the review. See [Policy 6-303-III-D-9](#) above.

b. This triggered review may occur in the same year as the review or in the subsequent year.

c. The required components for triggered and mid-probationary reviews may be identical or different, as determined by department rule.

d. This representation occurs through the type of involvement set forth in departmental rule. See [Policy 6-303- III-B-1](#) above.

e. Reports from all voting levels in all RPT reviews and letters or reports from all annual reviews. [Policy 6-303- III-D-4](#)

f. A designee may be used for informal reviews in large departments' reviews as noted in [Policy 6-303-III-B-1](#).

E. Action by the department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee (RPT procedures).

1. Meetings, membership, and chairperson of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee. The department chairperson shall call a meeting of the departmental RPT advisory committee to conduct reviews ~~as described in Policy 6-303-III-B~~. *{Drafting note: the following description of the membership and chair of the RPT Advisory Committee, appearing in [[double brackets]] is being moved here from its former location in Part III-A-3, and then slightly revised as marked. It is moved so that the membership description will be adjacent to the description of Committee functions and procedures, rather than having the overlapping topics inconveniently separated by several pages.}*

[a. Committee voting membership:

- i. Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for retention if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

- ii. Promotion. In each department all ~~regular~~ tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

- iii. Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

- iv. Small academic unit rule. Any department (or division) advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department (or division) chairperson 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 chairperson's contacting such

faculty members, the chairperson 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.

v. Single vote rule. No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any ~~person's~~candidate's case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and interdisciplinary academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).

b. Chairperson. The chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the department. In this election all ~~regular~~ tenure-line faculty members of the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be entitled to vote. The department chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee. **]]** *{Drafting note: end of passage moved here from II-A-3.}*

2. Committee secretary. A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary.

3. Quorum. A quorum of a department advisory committee for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of its members, 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.

{Drafting note: the automatic formatting starting here has some problem, which will need to be repaired before posting to the Regulations website. Paragraph #4 through #6 should be at the same outline level as #3 and #7.}

4. Absentee voting. Whenever practicable, the department chairperson shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting at which a vote is taken by the department advisory committee.

5. Limitations on participation and voting. 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. Under the single-vote rule (Part III-E-1-a above), ~~Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacities shall not vote at the department level.~~
6. Committee report. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is ~~jointly appointed with an~~ also a member of an interdisciplinary academic program through a shared-appointment agreement and per [Part III-C-4 above] the program produces a recommendation, the department advisory committee report shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program.
7. Approval of the committee report. This summary report of the meeting, signed by the secretary and bearing the written approval of the committee chairperson, shall be 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 modification as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

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

F. Action by department chairperson (RPT procedures).

1. Recommendations. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.
2. Notice to faculty member. Prior to forwarding the file, the department chairperson shall send an exact copy of the chairperson's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member.
3. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department RPT advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. 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.
4. Forwarding files. The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.

G. Action by dean and college advisory committee (RPT procedures).

1. Referral of cases to the college advisory committee / membership of committee. Each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee and define its membership. The definition of membership shall specify whether there must be representation from all or fewer than all departments within the college, and whether or in what way representatives from a department are to participate or not participate in matters involving candidates from the representatives'

departments, consistent with ~~[Part III-E-1-a-v-A-3-a-v. of this Policy]~~ (single vote rule). The definition of membership shall be included in the charter of the college council (governed by Policy 6-003), or may be included in a college-wide RPT Statement~~(the college's Statement of RPT criteria, standards and procedures~~ (described in Part III-A-2 of this ~~P~~Policy).

a. Retention. The dean at his/her discretion may request the college advisory committee to review and submit recommendations on any candidate for retention. However, if termination of a candidate is recommended by the SAC, or the department advisory committee, or the department chairperson, the dean shall transmit the entire file on that candidate to the college advisory committee.

b. Promotion or tenure. The dean shall forward the entire file on all cases dealing with promotion or tenure to the college advisory committee.

c. Attendance and participation at meetings. Neither the dean nor the chairperson of the department concerned shall attend or participate in the deliberations of the college committee except by invitation of the committee.

d. Recommendations of the college advisory committee. The college advisory committee shall review the file of each case referred to it and shall determine if the department reasonably applied its written criteria, standards and procedures to each case. The college committee shall make its recommendations on an individual's retention, promotion, or tenure, based upon its assessment whether the department's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented. The college committee shall use the department's criteria and standards (or college criteria and standards if the college has college-wide instead of departmental criteria and standards) in making its assessment. If documents required by policy are missing, the college committee may return the file to the department for appropriate action. The college committee shall advise the dean in writing of its vote and recommendations.

2. Recommendations of the dean. The dean shall then review the entire file for each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure and shall make recommendations in writing, stating reasons therefore, and shall forward the file,

including all the recommendations, to the cognizant senior vice president (for academic affairs or for health sciences).

3. Notice to faculty members. Prior to forwarding the file, the dean shall send an exact copy of the college advisory committee's report of its evaluation and an exact copy of the dean's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member and to the department chair.
4. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the report of the college advisory committee's evaluation and/or the dean's evaluation. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the dean's evaluation which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the dean within seven [calendar] days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the dean's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the dean within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the dean.
5. Forwarding files. The dean shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the cognizant senior vice president.

H. Action by cognizant vice president, and the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (RPT procedures).

1. Referral of cases to the University committee. The cognizant senior vice president shall forward to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee ("UPTAC") [[see Policy 6-304](#)] for its review and recommendation the files in all cases in which the college is organized and functions as a single academic department ("single-department college") or there is a differing recommendation from any of the prior review levels--the student advisory committee, the interdisciplinary academic program, the department RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson, the college RPT advisory committee, or the college dean. The cognizant senior vice president, in his/her sole discretion, may also send any other RPT case to UPTAC for its review and recommendations. UPTAC provides advice to the senior vice president.
2. Recommendations of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The committee shall review the entire file for all cases referred to it,

and after due deliberation shall submit its recommendations with reasons and its vote to the cognizant senior vice president.

a. In cases reviewed only because they arise from single department colleges, UPTAC shall determine whether the college reasonably applied its written criteria, standards and procedures to each case and whether the college's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented.

b. In cases in which there were differing recommendations from the prior reviewing entities, UPTAC shall identify the source(s) of the differences or controversy, determine how each level addressed the issues in controversy, and assess the degree to which the file is sufficiently clear to support any conclusive recommendation.

c. In cases which are reviewed at the discretionary request of the senior vice president, UPTAC shall review the file to respond to the specific issues identified by the senior vice president.

d. In making all reviews, UPTAC shall perform its duties consistent with requirements of [Policy 6-304](#) (including disqualification of interested members), and UPTAC shall consider only the material in the file. UPTAC shall summarize its assessment of the issues identified in a, b, or c above in a written report to the senior vice president, but not report a conclusion of its own on the candidate's overall qualification for retention, promotion, or tenure.

3. Consideration by the senior vice president. The cognizant senior vice president shall review each file, including the recommendations (if any) of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. If the senior vice president determines that the file is incomplete or unclear, he/she may return the file to the department with a request to clarify specific matters, materials, and/or issues. All levels of review shall reconsider the file and their votes if appropriate, with the candidate responding in writing at the normal points in the process. (SAC need not reconsider the file unless teaching is the issue in question.)

4. Senior vice president's decision. In cases of positive retention decisions, the senior vice president's decision shall be the University's final decision. In all cases of promotion and tenure and in cases of retention when termination is recommended, the senior vice president shall prepare a final

recommendation to the President with respect to the candidate's retention, promotion, and/or tenure, stating reasons therefore.

5. Notice of senior vice president's recommendation. In positive retention cases, the senior vice president shall transmit the final decision and the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) to the candidate, the department chair, and the dean. In all other cases, prior to forwarding the file to the President, the senior vice president shall send an exact copy of the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) and an exact copy of the senior vice president's recommendation with respect to that faculty member to the candidate, the dean, the department chairperson, and the chairpersons of the departmental RPT advisory committee and the Student Advisory Committee, together with a copy or summary of [Policy 6-303-III-subsection I](#) (Appeal of recommendation). The chairpersons of the departmental RPT and student advisory committees shall notify the members of their committees in an expeditious manner of the senior vice president's recommendation. The senior vice president shall not submit the final recommendation to the President until at least fourteen [calendar] days have elapsed following the giving of such notice, so that parties may notify the senior vice president's office if they intend to appeal.

6. Extension of time limits. The time limits provided by this subsection H may be extended by the senior vice president in the interest of justice.

I. Appeal of recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure (RPT procedures).

1. Appeal by faculty member RPT candidate. A faculty member RPT candidate may appeal to the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee (SCHC) for review of an unfavorable final recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure by following the procedures provided in [Policy 6-011](#) ~~6-002-III-Section 10~~ and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. The SCHC is the hearing body for an appeal brought on any grounds, including academic freedom, but if the candidate alleges that the unfavorable recommendation violates academic freedom, then the SCHC shall refer that part of the appeal to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights-Committee for pre-hearing consideration and report, as per [Policy 6-010](#) ~~6-002-Section 10-III-F-1-a-ii~~.

2. Other appeals. Appeals of the vice president's recommendation on promotion and/or tenure may also be initiated by the department SAC, a majority of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson, or the dean, when the vice president's recommendation opposes their own recommendation. The appeal is made to the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee and should follow the procedures provided in [Policy 6-011](#) ~~6-002-III-Section 10~~, and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. Authorized parties initiating an appeal may have access to the entire file except that the faculty member RPT candidate may not see external letters which he/she waived the right to read.

J. Final action by president (RPT procedures).

1. Action in absence of review proceedings. If no proceedings for review have been initiated under [Policy 6-303-III-I](#) within the time provided therein, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure of a faculty member shall be transmitted to the President for action. After reviewing the recommendation, giving such consideration to the documents in the candidate's file as the President deems necessary under the circumstances, the President shall make a final decision granting or denying retention, or granting or denying promotion, and/or tenure, and shall advise the candidate, the cognizant vice president, the dean and the department chairperson of that decision, stating reasons therefore.
2. Action after conclusion of review proceedings. If proceedings for review have been timely initiated under subsection III-I of this Policy, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure shall be placed in the candidate's file but shall not be transmitted to the President for action. Except as provided in [subsection J-3], below, the President shall not consider the merits of the matter and shall not take final action with respect thereto until the pending review proceedings have concluded. Upon conclusion of the review proceedings, the President shall review the file and make a final decision consistent with [paragraph J-1], above.
3. Notice of termination. When review proceedings have been timely initiated under subsection III-I of this Policy, the president, on recommendation of the cognizant vice president, may give a candidate advance written notice of termination pursuant to [Policy 6-311-III-Section 5](#). Such notice shall be effective as

of the date it is given if a final decision to terminate the faculty member's appointment is subsequently made by the President, on or before the termination date specified in the notice, but shall have no force or effect if a final decision is made by the President on or before that date approving retention, promotion, and/or tenure or otherwise disposing of the case in a manner that does not require termination.

K. New appointments with tenure-expedited procedures for granting tenure

Tenure may be granted at the time of initial appointment of a faculty member (commonly known as 'hiring with tenure'). See [Policy 6-311-III-Section 3-B](#). When a decision regarding tenure is to be considered contemporaneously with a decision regarding initial appointment, the procedures for the appointment and initial rank decisions are governed by [Policy 6-302](#), and the procedures for the tenure decision are as described here in this ~~p~~Policy in Section III-K.

Section K allows the use of expedited procedures for tenure decisions arising in circumstances in which more complex and lengthy procedures are inappropriate.

1. For purposes of expedited decisions on granting of tenure at the time of initial appointment of a candidate, the voting membership of the department RPT advisory committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members of the department, regardless of rank (subject to the single vote rule, Part III-E-1-a-v, limitations of Part III-A.3-a-v, and part III-E-5). If allowed by departmental rule described in the departmental RPT Statement, other faculty members may participate in consideration of the candidate, but shall not vote on the tenure decision.

2. The chairperson of the department shall provide interested persons with notice of scheduled meetings of the committee, and invite them to submit information for consideration by the committee. Notice may be given orally, or in writing as circumstances permit, and should be given as early as practicable under the circumstances. Notice shall be given to the candidate, the department faculty and staff, and student representatives (including any members of the student advisory committee who are available, and/or other students determined by the department chairperson to adequately represent student interests). If it is contemplated that the candidate will also become a member of an interdisciplinary academic program through a shared-appointment agreement (see Part III-C-4 above) with ~~appointed to an academic program separate from~~ the tenure-granting department, notice shall also be provided to the chair/director of that academic program, who may in turn give notice to members of that program.

3. The candidate's file shall include information submitted by the candidate, faculty, staff, and student representatives of the department, and representatives of any related interdisciplinary academic program, and other information determined by the department chairperson or department RPT chairperson to be relevant. It shall include a curriculum vitae, available evidence of research/creative activity, available evidence of teaching effectiveness, and a report from student representatives, and may include available evidence regarding faculty responsibility. The file shall include letters of evaluation from at least three ~~outside~~ external evaluators. It shall be presumed that the candidate waives any right to see such external evaluation letters, unless the candidate submits to the RPT chairperson a written request for access to any letters prior to the time the letters are submitted.

4. The actions of the department RPT committee and the department chairperson shall proceed as described in ~~p~~Parts III-E and F of this ~~p~~Policy, except that i) the RPT committee chairperson may set a shortened period for inspection of the report of the RPT meeting, ii) the candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation, and iii) the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation.

5. The actions of the dean and college RPT advisory committee shall proceed as described in ~~p~~Part III-G, except that the candidate need not be provided copies of the committee's or the dean's recommendations, and the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either recommendation.

6. The actions of the vice president and UPTAC shall proceed as described in ~~p~~Part III-H for a tenure decision, except as follows. UPTAC reviews all recommendations of tenure accompanying new appointments, regardless of college or of votes by prior levels. UPTAC may delegate its responsibilities to a subcommittee formed for purposes of such expedited proceedings, and its reports may be made in abbreviated form. The candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee's report or the vice president's recommendation. The student representatives need not be provided such copies, but when practical shall be informed of the recommendations of UPTAC and the vice president. The vice president may submit the final recommendation to the President immediately (without awaiting notice from any person of an intent to appeal).

7. In expedited proceedings neither the candidate nor any other person has a right of appeal of either a favorable or unfavorable recommendation of the vice president. The final action of the President shall be taken as provided in ~~p~~Part III-J.

L. Tenured Faculty Reviews (“TFR”).

1. In keeping with the principle that the faculty and administrative officers of the University have jointly “an affirmative obligation to manage its tenured faculty positions in a manner clearly conducive to the achievement of excellence in the discharge of its academic mission” and that there is a specific obligation of departments and colleges for “effectively carrying out programs for performance review and career development of tenured faculty members.” (Policy 6-311-III-Sec. 7-A), and in accord with Utah Board of Regents Policy requiring reviews of tenured faculty (both annual reviews along with all other faculty members, and also in-depth periodic post-tenure reviews--Regents Policy R481 Post-Tenure Review), the University establishes the following review processes for tenured faculty.

2. Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed annually (through an abbreviated process along with all other faculty members), and shall be reviewed every five years through a more in-depth post-tenure review process. ~~[[Policy 6-303-III-A-1. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years as per Policy 2-005 Section 5-C.]]~~

[Drafting note: this sentence above in [[brackets]] is moved here from Part III-A-1, then revised as marked. The passages below in [[brackets]] are existing content of Policy 2-005, being moved here to Policy 6-303-III-L, and revised as marked. The major changes incorporated in this spring 2014 Revision 21 project, compared to previous policy and practice are that the document describing procedures is given a name as “TFR Statement”, and Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee is given a new central role in the approval of the contents of that Statement, as well as a role of advising and guiding departments in formulating the contents. Thus the changes significantly increase the role of University faculty members in formulating the Statement contents, bringing to bear the experience and resources of the University-wide committee (which committee is now being extensively restructured to accommodate its new responsibilities, by the simultaneous revision of the Policy 6-002 description of the committee). In addition, the “user note” will be temporarily included, making users aware that the Standards Committee and office of the vice presidents will likely be developing a proposal for further extensive revising of this section of the Policy, after the Committee has had some experience in its new roles, and best practices can be identified and shared.]

3. ~~[[Policy 2-005-III-C Section 5. Department Chairpersons. Review of Tenured Faculty. & Section 3. Deans, Duties and Responsibilities.]]~~ It shall be the duty of the department chairperson to administer a review of the work of each tenured faculty member of the department every five years. The dean shall ~~==~~ ascertain that each department in the college is effectively reviewing tenured faculty members.

~~Such~~ Procedures for these five-year periodic reviews shall involve a faculty review committee. Procedures ~~for such a review process~~ shall be formulated by the chairperson, in consultation with the department faculty, in a written Tenured Faculty

Review (“TFR”) Statement, which shall be ~~and~~ submitted for approval to the dean of the college and jointly for final approval to the cognizant senior vice president ~~for academic affairs for approval~~ and Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. Any revision of these ~~Procedures~~ TFR Statement will be subject to similar approval.

In its role in approving TFR Statements, the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee acts as delegee of the authority of Academic Senate, pursuant to Policy 6-002-III-D-1-k, and in accord with that Policy the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a regular schedule for reexamination and revision of TFR Statements, initiate reviews of Statements on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, prepare guidance materials for use in developing and approving Statements, and otherwise assist departments and colleges with development of Statements, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other departments.

4. If, as a result of the TFR review Procedure, the person under review is deemed not to be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of his/her department, the chairperson, together with a review committee, shall consult with the faculty member in question and develop strategies for improvement of his/her performance.]]

[User note: This Part III-L regarding Tenured Faculty Reviews is a new section within Policy 6-303, added through Revision 21 in spring 2014, combining contents existing contents of Part III-A-1, and existing contents moved here from Policy 2-005, with updating. As of 2014, a project is underway to consider further extensive revising of this Policy section, which will be based on experiences of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee in its new role in approving TFR Statement contents, and advising and guiding in their formulation. For further information on the project, contact the V.P. Office for Faculty.]

~~Footnote 1~~ — (EndNote 1: Adaptation of Policy 6-303 for variations in organizational structure of academic departments and colleges.)

a. ~~The regulations stated~~ provisions here in Policy 6-303 are stated in terms appropriate for the most widely adopted form of organizational structure of academic units, in which a tenure-line faculty appointment is made in a subdivision known as an "academic department," which is organized together with related subdivisions in a parent "multi-department academic college." In that structure, [Policy 6-311](#) provides that tenure is established in an academic department. There are several variations in organizational structure relevant to appointments and tenure of faculty, as explained in [[Policy 6-001 Academic Units and Academic Governance](#), and [Policy 2-004](#) (Organization of the University)]. See also [2-005](#) (Officers of the University).

b. ~~These regulations~~ provisions in Policy 6-303 shall be interpreted for appropriate adaptation to accommodate such relevant variations in organizational structure, including the following:

i. Where necessary, the term "department" shall refer to an academic subdivision within a parent multi-department college, which operates as equivalent to a department but is known by another name, including any "free-standing division" or "school." See [Policy 6-001](#), and [Policy 2-004](#).

ii. Where necessary, the term "college" shall refer to an academic organization which operates as equivalent to a college, but is known by another name, including a "school." See [Policy 6-001](#), and [Policy 2-004](#).

c. For colleges that have no formal internal academic subdivisions (known commonly as 'single-department colleges' or 'nondepartmentalized colleges'), appointments and tenure are established in the college. See [Policy 6-001](#), [Policy 2-004](#), and [Policy 6-311](#) ~~Section 1~~. Accordingly, the procedures described here for development of criteria and standards, and making and reviewing of retention, promotion and tenure decisions, shall be modified appropriately, including as follows:

i. Formulation of criteria, standards and procedures for retention, promotion, and tenure reviews, described here in 6-303-III-A-2 and elsewhere, shall be conducted by the college (including approval of the governing RPT Statement by majority vote of the tenure-line faculty of the college, and the dean).

ii. The functions described here in 6-303-III-A and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level RPT advisory committee shall be performed by a college RPT advisory committee. The description of the membership and leadership of the committee shall be interpreted to include appropriate modifications, including that the college dean is ineligible to serve as committee chair, and that committee members shall be drawn from the ~~ranks of the~~ college faculty.

iii. The functions described here in 6-303-III-B-1, and III-F and elsewhere as being performed by a department chair person shall be performed by the college dean (see [Policy 2-005](#)-Section 5-F), including such activities as holding meetings with RPT candidates.

iv. The functions described here in 6-303-III-~~Section~~ C-3 and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level student advisory committee shall be performed by the college SAC.

v. The actions described here in 6-303-III-~~Section~~ G, and elsewhere as being performed by a college dean and college-level RPT committee shall be inapplicable. Instead, RPT actions from

a single-department college shall be forwarded for review at the level of the cognizant vice president and appropriate committees as provided in Section III-H and elsewhere.

vi. For tenured faculty reviews (TFR), the functions described here in 6-303-III-L shall be performed by the dean and tenure-line faculty of the college.

(EndNote 2: Adaptation of Policy 6-303 for University Libraries.)

[Reserved.] [Note to users: As of 2014, a project is underway to develop content providing for adaptation of RPT and TFR procedures for the University Libraries, as part of a larger project of updating and revising multiple Regulations regarding the Libraries and library faculty members. That content may be proposed to be included in a Note within Policy 6-303, or in a new University Regulation.]

[Note: The parts this Regulation (listed below) are Regulations Resource Information – the contents of which are not approved by the Academic Senate or Board of Trustees, and are to be updated from time to time as determined appropriate by the cognizant Policy Officer and the Institutional Policy Committee, as per Policy 1-001 and Rule 1-001.]

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources

- A. Rules
- B. Procedures
- C. Guidelines
 - [Checklist](#) & Guideline for Department RPT Statements
 - University RPT Standards Committee Approval Process Overview ([Approval Process Handout](#))
 - [University RPT Standards Committee Guide on Articulating Department RPT Statements](#)
- D. Forms
- E. Other related resource materials
 - [Supplemental Rules](#) (Department Statements of RPT Criteria Standards & Procedures)
 - [Resource](#) information

V. References:

(Reserved)

VI. Contacts:

The designated contact officials for this Policy are:

A. Policy Owner (primary contact person for questions and advice): Associate Vice President for Faculty and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.

Policy Officers: Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences.

These officials are designated by the University President or delegee, with assistance of the Institutional

Policy Committee, to have the following roles and authority, as provided in University Rule 1-001:

"A 'Policy Officer' will be assigned by the President for each University Policy, and will typically be someone at the executive level of the University (i.e., the President and his/her Cabinet Officers).

The assigned Policy Officer is authorized to allow exceptions to the Policy in appropriate cases.... "

"The Policy Officer will identify an 'Owner' for each Policy. The Policy Owner is an expert on the Policy topic who may respond to questions about, and provide interpretation of the Policy; and will typically be someone reporting to an executive level position (as defined above), but may be any other person to

whom the President or a Vice President has delegated such authority for a specified area of University operations. The Owner has primary responsibility for maintaining the relevant portions

of the Regulations Library... [and] bears the responsibility for determining -requirements of particular Policies..."

University Rule 1-001-III-B & E.

VII. History

Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 6-303 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-5.1.

Revision History: **{Drafting note: update history information for Revision 21. }**

B. Current version: Revision 20

Effective date July, 1, 2010

Approved: Academic Senate March 2, 2009

Approved: Board of Trustees March 10, 2009

Editorially revised July 30, 2009

[Legislative History](#) of Revision 20

C. Earlier versions:

[Revision 19](#): Effective dates July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2010

[Legislative History](#) of Revision 19 (Part A - Memo)

[Legislative History](#) of Revision 19 (Part B - Drafting notes)

[Revision 18](#): Effective dates May 16, 2005 to June 30, 2007

[Revision 17](#): Effective dates March 21, 2005 to May 15, 2005

[Revision 16](#): Effective dates June 9, 2003 to March 20, 2005

[Revision 15](#): Effective dates December 28, 1990 to June 8, 2003

(3)

{Proposed Revision 2, of Policy 6-310. Draft 2014-03-30 }

Policy 6-310: Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Auxiliary Reviews of Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty Members, and Other Instructional Personnel (Standards and Procedures). Revision 21. Effective date: May 15, 2014.

I. Purpose and Scope

This Policy and associated Regulations ~~are intended to~~ serve the University's fundamental general commitments to academic freedom and academic excellence in all areas, ~~and~~ particularly in its teaching mission, and are intended to maintain the high quality of the University's ~~auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty members~~ and of non-faculty instructional personnel by establishing ~~minimum~~ requirements for systematic review processes to ensure that quality and encourage academic unit practices supportive of academic freedom as a foundation for academic excellence. Because ~~auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty members~~ and non-faculty instructional personnel engage in a wide range of activities within a variety of organizational structures, considerable flexibility is allowed for academic units to determine details appropriate to such processes for their own operations, provided that such processes comply with University-wide requirements and are consistent with the University's fundamental principles. Accordingly, this Policy addresses requirements of review processes, including criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for reviews.

This Policy applies for all academic units of the University which appoint any ~~auxiliary career-line, adjunct, or visiting~~ faculty member (of any category) or employ any non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined here), including academic colleges, academic departments, free-standing academic divisions, ~~qualified~~ interdisciplinary ~~academic teaching~~ programs, and libraries. This Policy governs reviews only for the above-designated categories of faculty and other instructional personnel. For reviews of tenure-line faculty see Policy 6-303, and for reviews of persons holding special "named positions" (such as endowed chairs) see Policy 9-003.

~~Effective date: March 9, 2010~~

II. Definitions

For purposes of this Policy and any associated Regulations, these terms are defined as follows.

The faculty categories of “career-line” (which includes subcategories of “Clinical”, “Lecturer” and “Research”), “adjunct”, and “visiting” are defined for purposes of this Policy as described in “Auxiliary faculty member” means any individual who holds a faculty appointment (including library faculty) within any academic unit of the University as a Lecturer, Clinical, Research, Adjunct, or Visiting faculty member. (See [Policy 6-300--Auxiliary Faculty](#); [The University Faculty--Categories and Ranks](#)).

“Non-faculty instructional personnel” for purposes of this Policy means any individual who does not hold a ~~regular or auxiliary~~ faculty appointment at the University (in any of the faculty categories described in Policy 6-300), but is employed by any course-offering academic unit of the University to teach any credit-bearing course. (Course-offering units and credit-bearing courses are as described in Policy 6-001 and Policy 6-100). Such personnel may include those classified as academic staff (associate instructors, or research associates), as well as graduate student instructors of record, or postdoctoral fellows. (See [Such categories of non-faculty academic personnel positions are as described in Policy 6-309: Academic Staff, Educational Trainees, Postdoctoral Fellows and Medical Housestaff](#)).

“Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program” means an academic unit of the University which is an “interdisciplinary academic program” as described in Policy 6-001 and which further meets the specified criteria as being a program with teaching as a primary mission, contributing substantially to the University's overall teaching mission, and interdisciplinary in subject matter. Such programs, which are not otherwise included among the University’s faculty-appointing units authorized to appoint members of the University faculty (see Policy 6-001-III, and Policy 6-300-II) (~~regular or auxiliary~~), may pursuant to this Policy and an associated Rule be designated as qualified appointing units with limited authority to make faculty appointments in certain instructional ~~auxiliary~~ career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty categories ~~members~~.

A “faculty-appointing unit” for the limited purposes of this Policy is any academic unit which is authorized to and does make any appointment of any ~~auxiliary~~ career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty member (regardless of whether the unit also appoints tenure-line faculty members). The various other types of “faculty-appointing” academic units are described in [Policy 6-001-III](#).

III. Policy

A. ~~Auxiliary~~ Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty

1. Initial Appointments of ~~Auxiliary~~ Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty.

a. Authority for appointments of ~~auxiliary~~ career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty by academic units.

i. As provided in Policy 6-001, aAny academic unit which has authority to appoint members of the ~~regular~~ tenure-line faculty (as defined in Policy 6-300, ~~tenure-eligible, tenured~~) or ~~library faculty equivalent~~) has full authority for appointments of faculty in all categories, and therefore also has the authority to act as an appointing unit to appoint members of the ~~auxiliary~~ faculty in any category of career-line (Clinical, Lecturer, Research), or Adjunct, or Visiting ~~or equivalent for faculty of the libraries~~, and to employ any other non-faculty instructional personnel. These units include academic colleges, academic departments, free-standing academic divisions, and the University Libraries ~~(and libraries)~~. (In addition to Policy 6-001, see Policies [2-004](#), [6-311](#), [6-300](#), [6-301](#), [6-302](#), [6-306](#), [6-312](#)).

ii. Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs designated for purposes of this Policy as meeting the criteria specified in a University Rule ([Rule 6-310](#)) associated with this Policy shall have the *limited* authority to act as appointing units to appoint members of the ~~auxiliary~~ career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty in an instructional ~~auxiliary~~ faculty category. These include only those academic units specifically designated in such University Rule as being Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. These Programs shall also continue to have the authority to employ other non-faculty instructional personnel.

b. Qualifications and credentials for *initial appointments* of ~~auxiliary~~ members of the career-line, adjunct, and visiting categories of faculty.

All faculty-appointing units initially appointing ~~auxiliary~~ members of the career-line, adjunct, or visiting categories of faculty must verify that the candidates possess appropriate credentials by way of degrees and field of study for the position consistent with University Regulations, and must maintain on file appropriate documentation for each individual appointed.

The terms of such appointments and the processes for making such appointments shall be consistent with University Regulations regarding appointments of ~~auxiliary~~ faculty members in such categories, including Policy 6-300 –III- D and -E (limited and maximum lengths of terms of ~~auxiliary~~ faculty appointments) and Policy 6-302 (procedures for faculty appointments and reappointments).

2. Evaluation and Reappointment of ~~Auxiliary~~ members of the Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting categories of Faculty.

a. All faculty-appointing units which appoint any ~~auxiliary~~ members of the career-line, adjunct, or visiting categories of faculty in any category must develop and present for approval a Statement of academic unit rules that provide for ~~procedures~~ criteria and standards, evidence and procedures for the initial appointment and subsequent review processes for evaluation and reappointment of each category of ~~auxiliary~~ career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty used/appointed in the unit. These Statements must address ~~evaluation~~ reviews and reappointments of both compensated and uncompensated (volunteer) faculty members, and must provide for more thorough review of the former.

For multi-department academic colleges (described in Policy 6-001-III-A-1-b, encompassing multiple departments (or free-standing divisions), such Statements/rules shall be established at the college level and be applicable college-wide for all appointing units within the college (unless it is determined that separate independent rules are necessary for one or more of the units because of widely varying circumstances within the college). A college-wide main Statement with general provisions applicable for all units may include designated appendices providing further details specific to particular units within the college.

b. The Statements shall provide for and describe procedures for conducting reviews of faculty members prior to their being considered as candidates for reappointment. The procedures for making initial appointments and reappointments (including reappointments with promotion) of ~~auxiliary~~ career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty members in any category, after such a review has been conducted, are governed by and (as described in the

Statements) shall be consistent with University Policy [6-302](#) (including the required recommendation from the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee of the appointing unit) (with adaptations as appropriate for the organizational structure of the appointing unit).

c. For purposes of reappointments, ~~e~~ Each appointing unit must designate a committee or individual(s) responsible for administering ~~evaluation~~ review processes and making a recommendation to the unit's Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee before that committee's members vote on the reappointment or non-reappointment. That designation shall be described in the unit's Statement of procedures for ~~evaluations~~ reviews and reappointments.

d. The review processes shall include (i) at least minimum-level reviews conducted annually for all faculty members (including . Statements of appointing unit rules may distinguish between procedures followed for annual evaluations associated with annual reappointments, and annual reviews of faculty members with multi-year appointments not due for a more extensive reappointment review), and those followed for (ii) more thorough reviews of long-serving auxiliary faculty, which must occur at least every five years (consistent with Policy 6-300 limiting each appointment to a maximum term of five years). (iii) Review processes and requirements for the longer-term reviews ordinarily will differ from those for the annual reviews, and each shall be suited to the nature of the positions and responsibilities of the faculty members. (iv) For faculty members whose duties include teaching, the annual reviews shall at a minimum include annual consideration of course evaluations (conducted per Policy 6-100-III-N) by at least one responsible reviewer, and the course evaluations along with multiple other indicators of teaching quality must be used in these more thorough longer-term reviews. The required evidence and procedures adopted by the appointing unit for such teaching-related longer term reviews may and typically will be closely modeled on those followed by the unit in conducting teaching-related reviews of tenure-line faculty pursuant to Policy 6-303 (as described in approved "RPT" and "TFR" Statements).

e. In pursuit of the University's commitment to excellence, appointing unit rules must provide for action, such as developing and implementing a plan for improvement or non-reappointment, if evaluation of a candidate indicates areas of concern. Concomitantly, when evaluations show high quality performance,

appointing units are encouraged to use appropriate means of recognizing such performance and retaining high quality ~~auxiliary~~ faculty, including offering of promotions in rank, and longer term reappointments (see III-A-4 below).

f. If an academic unit serves as the appointing unit for a faculty appointment for an individual whose work primarily takes place in a different unit, the appointing unit shall consult with the primary workplace unit in developing and implementing criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for evaluations.

g. When a faculty member holding an *Adjunct* appointment in one academic unit also holds a ~~regular~~ tenure-line faculty appointment in another unit of the University and is subject to thorough periodic reviews in that home unit, the unit of the *Adjunct* appointment may simply rely on the regular review procedure in the faculty member's home unit (as governed by Policy 6-303 and the home unit's "RPT" and "TFR" Statements), supplemented by an annual consideration of course-evaluations for any teaching occurring in the unit of the *Adjunct* appointment, or may do its own review.

3. Documentation of Reviews of ~~Auxiliary~~ members of the Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty.

Reviews of faculty members must be documented, and documentation of each review must be retained in the ~~department~~ appointing unit and available on request by the cognizant senior vice president.

4. Promotions of Long-Serving ~~Auxiliary~~ members of the Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty, and Multi-year Reappointments.

The University's commitment to excellence is served by recognizing and retaining ~~auxiliary~~ faculty of high quality. Accordingly, appointing units with ~~auxiliary~~ faculty in the career-line categories of Clinical, Lecturer, Research, or the Adjunct category, must establish criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for reviews leading to promotions in rank. (Available ranks are described in Policy 6-300, and promotions, after review, which are accomplished through reappointment with promotion per Policy 6-302). These should apply primarily for long-serving ~~auxiliary~~ faculty members (and especially for those in full-time positions). Because multi-year appointments are recognized as important in

implementing the University's fundamental principles of academic freedom and significantly contributing to overall academic excellence. Appointing units are also strongly encouraged to consider offering multi-year reappointments for faculty with high qualifications (particularly for accomplished teaching faculty making significant contributions to the University's teaching mission), as may be appropriate to the circumstances of the unit. (~~See~~ As described in Policy 6-300 ~~annual terms as norms, longer~~ terms of up to 5 years are permitted, although annual or shorter multi-year terms are used when appropriate). Statements of unit rules shall include descriptions of the required ~~information~~ criteria, standards, and evidence for reviews regarding promotions in rank, and any rules adopted by the unit regarding length of terms of appointments for particular faculty categories.

5. Governance Roles for ~~Auxiliary~~ Career-line Faculty.

As reflected in Policy 6-300 describing rights and responsibilities for the career-line faculty, and in Policies 6-001 and 6-002 describing roles of faculty generally and career-line faculty particularly in the Academic Senate and University councils and committees, the University strongly encourages and highly values involvement of career-line faculty in shared-governance activities, in roles appropriate relative to the roles of tenure-line faculty in academic policy-making. Academic units appointing ~~auxiliary~~ career-line faculty (particularly long-serving members) in the career-line categories of Clinical, Lecturer, or Research are also strongly encouraged to establish rules addressing participation of such faculty members in departmental and/or college academic governance and service, including in peer faculty review processes (and ~~when~~ shall recognize and accommodate appropriate, ~~recognition of participation in~~ University service, including elected positions on the Academic Senate and its Senate Committees as described in Policy 6-002), and encouraged to make resources for professional development available to such faculty. Description of such matters should be included with the Statement of unit rules required under this Policy.

B. Employment, Evaluation and Reemployment of Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel

Academic units which regularly employ any non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined for this Policy) shall develop and submit for approval a description of procedures, criteria, evidence, and standards for employing and reemploying, and most

importantly for periodically evaluating the *teaching work* of such personnel. A brief statement describing such matters may be incorporated with the Statement of academic unit rules required under Part III-A of this Policy (for those units which appoint ~~auxiliary career-line, adjunct, or visiting~~ faculty). The criteria for employment/reemployment must ensure that such personnel have appropriate qualifications by way of education and field of study appropriate to the assigned duties. Evaluation plans must provide for closer scrutiny of new instructors and those teaching in new areas. Classroom observation of new instructors is encouraged. Academic units must designate a committee or individual(s) responsible for evaluating all such instructional personnel and making a recommendation on each person to the department chair person or designee responsible for staffing courses prior to reemployment. Units must maintain on file appropriate documentation of the qualifications of all active non-faculty instructional personnel.

C. Approval Requirement for Rules

The Statements of academic unit rules for appointment, evaluation, and reappointment (including reappointment with promotion) of ~~auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting~~ faculty (Part III-A), and/or employment/reemployment and evaluation of other non-faculty instructional personnel (Part III-B) must be approved by the dean of the college (or equivalent), and jointly by the submitted to the cognizant senior vice president for approval and Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. In its role in approving such Statements, the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee acts as delegee of the authority of Academic Senate, pursuant to Policy 6-002-III-D-1-k, and in accord with that Policy the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a regular schedule for reexamination and revision of such Statements, initiate reviews of Statements on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, prepare guidance materials for use in developing and approving Statements, and otherwise assist units with development of Statements, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other units.

User note: As of 2014 this Policy is under review for further clarification, and a proposal for revisions will be developed, based on the experience gained as the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee is restructured and implements its new roles provided for in Revision 2, in guiding and

assisting with development of and final approval of review Statements, as representative of the Academic Senate and faculty of the University.]

Note: Parts IV-VII of this Regulation (and all other University Regulations) are Regulations Resource Information - the contents of which are not approved by the Academic Senate or Board of Trustees, and are to be updated from time to time as determined appropriate by the cognizant Policy Officer and the Institutional Policy Committee, as per Policy 1-001 and Rule 1-001.

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources.

A. Rules

[Rule 6-310](#) (IDTP)

B. Procedures [reserved]

C. Guidelines [reserved]

D. Forms [reserved]

E. Other related resource materials. [reserved]

V. References:

[Policy 6-300](#), University Faculty—Categories and Ranks

[Policy 6-003](#), College Faculties and Councils

[Policy 6-302](#), Appointments of Faculty

[Policy 6-309](#), Academic Staff, Educational Trainees, Postdoctoral Fellows, and Medical Housestaff
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, Accreditation Standard 4.A., Policy 4.1 on
Faculty Evaluation

VI. Contacts:

The designated contact officials for this Policy are:

A. **Policy Owners** (primary contact person for questions and advice): Associate Vice President for Faculty and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.

B. **Policy Officers:** Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences.

These officials are designated by the University President or delegee, with assistance of the Institutional Policy Committee, to have the following roles and authority, as provided in University Rule 1-001:

"A 'Policy Officer' will be assigned by the President for each University Policy, and will typically be someone at the executive level of the University (i.e., the President and his/her Cabinet Officers). The assigned Policy Officer is authorized to allow exceptions to the Policy in appropriate cases.... "

"The Policy Officer will identify an "Owner" for each Policy. The Policy Owner is an expert on the Policy topic who may respond to questions about, and provide interpretation of the Policy; and will typically be someone reporting to an executive level position (as defined above), but may be any other person to whom the President or a Vice President has delegated such authority for a specified area of University operations. The Owner has primary responsibility for maintaining the relevant portions of the Regulations Library... [and] bears the responsibility for determining which reference materials are helpful in understanding the meaning and requirements of particular Policies... ."

University Rule 1-001-III-B & E

VII. History:

Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 6-310 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-5.7

Revision History:

1. Current version: Revision ~~2~~

Approved Academic Senate: ___???

Approved Board of Trustees: ___???

Legislative History of Revision 2 {link to new history file }

2. Earlier versions:

Revision 1 *{link to marked outdated version of Revision 1 }*. Effective
March 9, 2010 to ___???

[Legislative History](#) of Revision 1

[Revision 0](#): effective May 14, 2007 to March 8, 2010

. [Legislative History](#) of Revision 0

(4)

{Proposed Revision 2 of Rule 6-310 (IDTP). Draft 2014-03-30.}

University Rule 6-310(IDTP)-- Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel in Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. Revision #2.

Effective Date: July 1, 2014. (Note: Ending the status of the University Writing Program as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program, accomplished by deleting its name from the list within this Rule, is to take effect upon completion of all steps for that academic unit to transition into the status of an academic department, as has been approved by the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees. The office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will give notice when those steps are completed.)

[Drafting note: Contents of Part I, Part II, and most contents of Part III are not shown here, to keep the proposal length of manageable size and because no changes are proposed for the contents not shown here.]

....

III. Rule.

....

2. Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs are:

- The Ethnic Studies Program
- The Gender Studies Program
- The LEAP Program
- ~~The University Writing Program~~
- The Honors College (formerly known as the Honors Program).
- The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program
- The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program.

....

F. Guidance from the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee.

The Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, as primary delegee of the Academic Senate authority under Policy 6-002 and Policy 6-310, may in consultation with the cognizant vice president provide guidance for development, periodic updating, and approval of the Statements regarding Lecturer faculty (Part III-C) and the Statements regarding non-faculty instructional personnel (Part III-E) governed by this Rule, and for future revisions of this Rule.

.....

___ end ___