

University of Utah  
**Legislative History -- Policy 6-303 Revision 24.**

As approved by the Academic Senate March 3, 2020,  
and the Board of Trustees April 14, 2020,  
with designated effective date of July 1, 2020.

Prepared by Bob Flores, Senate Policy Liaison, for the Institutional Policy Committee

Note: The primary purpose and effect of this revision was to change the methods of student input in the processes for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure for Tenure-line faculty members. The most significant changes included eliminating two formal steps formerly performed by departmental Student Advisory Committees—one of making a formal “recommendation” at the department level, and the other of having that formal recommendation alone be the basis for referring a case to the “UPTAC” committee.

The changes were intended to improve student involvement in RPT processes by requiring training of participating students, and requiring careful attention to student input by departmental faculty committees and administrative officers at multiple levels.

In addition to the changes regarding student input, various other minor changes were made to the Policy for clarity and consistency.

Contents:

(Explanatory memoranda/ materials).

1. Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process, 2019-2020 Report and Proposal for Revised Policy 6-303, March 30, 2020. – *Pg 2*
2. Background for and Highlights of Proposal to Revise Policy 6-303, March 30, 2020-- By Senate Policy Liaison. – *Pg 4*
3. Slide show for Academic Senate, March 30, 2020—by Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process. – *Pg 7*

(Policy)

4. Policy 6-303 Revision 24 redline version showing changes made. By Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process, & Senate Policy Liaison. – *Pg. 12-52*



## **Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process 2019-2020 Report and Proposal for Revised Policy 6-303**

March 30, 2020 Academic Senate Meeting

Co-chairs: Devon Cantwell, Sarah Projansky

Committee Members: Anna Marie Barnes, Brittany Coats, Darryl P. Butt, David Hill, Elaine Clark, Kaitlin McLean, Lori McDonald, Mark St. Andre, Martell Teasley, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Maureen Mathison, Patricia Hanna, Robert Flores, Robert Fujinami, Stuart Culver, Thomas Cova, Wendy Hobson-Rohrer

- This Committee's **primary recommendation** is that University Policy 6-303 eliminate the RPT-SAC vote and the concomitant ability of RPT-SAC to send a case to UPTAC.
  - Attached, please find (1) a redline version of Policy 6-303 and (2) a description of the project that provides background and highlights the changes we propose.
- **Additional recommendations:**
  1. The University should oversee RPT-SAC training, which at minimum should include:
    - a. Implicit bias training
    - b. Context of the specific RPT process for each candidate
    - c. How to review the materials from an impartial perspective
    - d. Expectations for RPT-SAC report:
      - i. The evaluation should be linked to the evidence
      - ii. The full discussion should be captured. If there is disagreement amongst the committee, it should be explained in the report.
      - iii. It is the department chair's responsibility to ensure each part of the report is filled out correctly, before placing the report in the file.
  2. We recommend that there be a way to verify that all RPT-SAC members have had training before participating in the meeting and in writing the report.
    - a. One possibility is for the University to train college/department trainers.
    - b. Training should address timelines, so that the trainers and RPT-SACs are not taken by surprise when it is time to train and then produce the report.
  3. RPT-SACs should have access to more than just course evaluations. This material could include but not be limited to: CV, teaching philosophy/statement, syllabi/other course materials, anonymous surveys of students, interviews with students, etc.
    - a. Regardless of the type of material, it needs to be systematic and non-prejudicial.
    - b. We note that some department RPT-SACs already use multiple sources of evidence. We recommend consulting with departments to identify types of evidence and means of collecting evidence that have worked well.
  4. We encourage departments/units to develop a way to measure mentoring.
    - a. This could include being sure a member of a candidate's lab is on the RPT-SAC, it could include focus groups, it could include anonymous surveys, etc.
  5. We encourage departments/units that have multiple types of trainees beyond traditional undergraduate and graduate students (e.g., post-docs) to create multiple RPT-SACs.

6. After the review is complete, the Department Chair and the RPT-SAC could meet to discuss next steps for the candidate's teaching. The Chair could explain how any of the concerns raised in the RPT-SAC report are being addressed, or how the strong mentoring that the RPT-SAC identified in the report will be recognized, etc. This would help students know that their contributions to RPT are taken seriously and have impact.
7. Because units do not always enforce RPT-SAC policies/guidelines, we recommend that the university develop a means to ensure appropriate procedures are followed.
8. We recommend that a plan be put in place to ensure that this conversation continues, with both faculty and students participating. This plan should include a way to identify what is working and what isn't working with the new system, and to tweak as needed.



## Background for and Highlights of Proposal to Revise Policy 6-303 to change the means by which students provide input in RPT processes

Presented to the Academic Senate, March 30, 2020

by the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process

Prepared by Bob Flores, Senate Policy Liaison

### **BACKGROUND**

The underpinnings of this project include work beginning in 2017-2018 and continuing through 2018-2019 and the current year 2019-2020. University Regulations had long provided for formal roles in the RPT processes for departmental Student Advisory Committees. And, for many years there had been growing concerns about significant indications of biased outcomes in SAC recommendations regarding faculty members of color and women. A first task force was formed in 2017-2018 under leadership of then Associate Vice President for Faculty Amy Wildermuth, chaired by Professor Patricia Hanna (Philosophy and Linguistics), with assistance of Senate Policy Liaison Bob Flores, and other faculty and administrators. This task force was asked to develop a proposal to revise Policy 6-303 to replace the SACs with other more effective methods for student input in RPT processes. Before the task force could bring a final proposal forward for Senate consideration in spring 2018 as planned, however, the concerns over biased SAC evaluations had grown so serious that preemptive administrative action became necessary.

The University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action studied the situation and in April 2018 specifically recommended that the senior vice presidents temporarily implement an exception to the existing Policy regarding the roles of SACs, in order to prevent faculty members and the University from further harm from the evident pattern of bias. Acting on that recommendation, on April 23 the senior vice presidents adopted a temporary exception to the relevant provisions of Policy 6-303, to remain in force until a permanent revision of the Policy is accomplished (which is what is now being proposed to the Senate). That exception replaced the SACs' vote with other student input methods, which were developed by the senior vice presidents' offices in conjunction with ASUU officers. In addition, the administration developed training regarding implicit bias for students involved in RPT reviews.

Meanwhile, the project for a permanent revision of Policy 6-303 was taken up under authority of the Academic Senate. In August 2018, as proposed by then Interim Associate Vice President for Faculty Harriet Hopf, the Senate created a Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process, which now—in 2019-2020—Associate Vice President for Faculty Sarah Projansky is helping to facilitate, along with Committee Co-Chair Devon Cantwell (graduate student). Since April 2018 and throughout this process, contributions from members of this committee and many other faculty members, administrators, and, quite importantly, student leaders have helped us arrive at the proposal this ad hoc committee is now making to Senate.

This proposal has been presented to the Institutional Policy Committee, and was reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee at its March 16, 2020 meeting. Next, if the Academic Senate approves, with the approvals of SVP Dan Reed, SVP Mike Good, and President Ruth Watkins, the proposal will be presented for final approval of the Board of Trustees. Following this, AVP Projansky and AVP for Academic Affairs Health Sciences Bob Fujinami, as well as the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, will work with colleges, schools, and departments to implement the changes.

## **HIGHLIGHTS OF THE SPECIFIC CHANGES PROPOSED TO POLICY 6-303**

The proposed revisions would result in Revision 24 of Policy 6-303; we recommend that Revision 24 would formally take effect as of July 1, 2020 (although preparations for the changed practices for student involvement would begin earlier).

The most significant changes appear in Parts III-A-2-a-I, III-C-3, III-D-7 , III-E-6-a, III-G-1-a, III-G-1-d, III-H-1, III-H-5, III-I-2, as described below. A few more minor changes are also proposed and included in the marked version of the Policy, but not described here.

- III-A-2-a-I requires department to include in its approved RPT Statement a description of “procedures for obtaining and incorporating in the review process evidence regarding teaching, which will include input from students.”
- III-C-3 requires department chair to give notice of upcoming RPT reviews to ASUU Student Senator and to department’s RPT-SACs, to ensure training of RPT-SACs, and to provide RPT-SACs with University approved form for RPT-SAC reports. Specifies that training “shall cover, but need not be limited to, the process for and importance of student input into the RPT process, teaching expectations under the departmental RPT Statement, and recognition of unconscious bias.” This *replaces* former passage under which department chair would request that SAC submit written report evaluating teaching effectiveness and making RPT recommendations with respect to candidate.
- III-D-7, first, sets guidelines for membership, leadership, and meetings of RPT-SAC’s, with flexibility for departments to choose the number and size, within parameters. A department must have at least one, but may have multiple committees for different categories of students—e.g., undergraduate and graduate students. The minimum size of RPT-SACs is three members. The RPT-SAC members elect their chairperson. Details of committee structure are to be included in department’s RPT Statement. Second, are the procedures during an RPT formal review. The department chairperson calls a meeting of the RPT-SAC. RPT-SAC produces a written report on University-approved report form, “evaluat[ing] teaching achievements—using the standards found in the departmental RPT Statement, ... The report shall be based on at least two different forms of evidence regarding teaching.”
- Continues longstanding provision that if RPT-SAC fails to do its work and produce a report despite efforts of department chair, the role of RPT-SAC is “conclusively waived” and is not grounds for complaint by faculty member appealing an adverse decision.
- III-E-6-a requires that the Department RPT Advisory Committee pay heed to the input given by the students through the RPT-SAC, and specifically that the “departmental RPT advisory committee report shall reflect the department’s discussion and consideration of the RPT-SAC report(s). In particular, when concerns are raised in any RPT-SAC report, the department advisory committee report must address these concerns.”

- III-G-1-a eliminates the former provision that made referral to a college-level RPT advisory committee *mandatory* in a case in which termination (i.e., non-retention) of a candidate had been recommended by a departmental SAC. With this change, referral to the college-level committee is mandatory when termination is recommended by the faculty committee of the department, but is optional for the dean, not mandatory, when termination is recommended by the student RPT-SAC.
- III-G-1-d allows a college-level RPT advisory committee to return an RPT case file to a department for appropriate action “if the department advisory committee report or the chairperson’s letter do not follow the requirements of this Policy and the department RPT Statement, including attention to any RPT-SAC report or shared-appointment unit’s recommendation....”.
- III-H-1 *eliminates the former provision that required an RPT case be referred to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (UPTAC) if the student advisory committee had voted no on an action.* Please note that this former step in the appeals process, along with the related step below involving appeals to the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee, was among the most serious concerns that prompted this project to revise the methods for student input in RPT.
- III-H-5 eliminates the former provisions that required departmental student SAC members be given notice of the recommendations being made in RPT cases by the senior vice president. With this change, notices of these near-final decisions about RPT made by the senior vice president will continue to be given to the RPT candidates, the department chairpersons, and departmental RPT committee chairpersons, but not directly to the student RPT-SACs who were involved in reviewing the candidate months earlier.
- III-I-2 *eliminates the former provision that gave a department student SAC the right to initiate an appeal to the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee* if the recommendation of the senior vice president in an RPT case was opposite to the recommendation earlier made by the SAC. This former step in the appeal process, along with the related step above involving appeals to UPTAC, was among the most serious concerns that prompted this project to revise the methods for student input in RPT.

# Senate Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process

- **Co-chairs:** Devon Cantwell, Sarah Projansky
- **Committee Members:** Anna Marie Barnes, Brittany Coats, Darryl P. Butt, David Hill, Elaine Clark, Kaitlin McLean, Lori McDonald, Mark St. Andre, Martell Teasley, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Maureen Mathison, Patricia Hanna, Robert Flores, Robert Fujinami, Stuart Culver, Thomas Cova, Wendy Hobson-Rohrer
- **Senate Policy Liaison:** Robert Flores

# Background: Why This Committee Exists

- April 2018
  - The University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action issued a memo showing that SAC recommendations were disproportionately sending RPT files of women and/or underrepresented race/national-origin faculty members to UPTAC.
  - President Ruth Watkins exercised her right under University Rule 1-001.III.B.1.a to “allow exceptions” to policy, and asked the SVPs to work with ASUU to come up with a temporary solution
- 2018-2019 & 2019-2020 RPT cycles
  - SAC Report Form, rather than SAC recommendation and vote



# Committee's Primary Recommendation

We recommend that University Policy 6-303 eliminate the RPT-SAC vote and the concomitant ability of RPT-SAC to send a case to UPTAC.

# Specific 6-303 Revisions

- Rename: Student Advisory Committee (SAC) to Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT-SAC)
- Eliminate student vote and recommendation regarding RPT action
  - RPT-SAC no longer can send case to UPTAC
  - RPT-SAC no longer receives notification of SVP recommendation
  - RPT-SAC no longer can appeal a case to CHC
  - RPT-SAC Report no longer included in “past reviews and recommendations”
- Strengthen student input
  - Require RPT-SAC training
  - Department RPT Statement must include details of RPT-SAC(s) structure
  - University-approved RPT-SAC Report Form now mentioned in 6-303
  - All levels of review must consider RPT-SAC report(s), and if they don't the College Advisory Committee or SVP may return the file to the Department for correction
    - This is not new, but it is now emphasized

# Committee's Additional Recommendations

- The University should oversee **RPT-SAC training**, which at minimum should include:
  - Implicit/unconscious bias training
  - Context of the specific RPT process for each candidate
  - How to review the materials from an impartial perspective
  - Expectations for RPT-SAC Report
- RPT-SACs should have **access to more than just course evaluations**
- Departments/units should develop a way to **measure mentoring**
- The University should develop a means to **ensure appropriate RPT-SAC procedures are followed**
- A plan should be put in place to ensure that this **conversation continues**, with both faculty and students participating

{approved Senate 2020-3-30, Trustees 2020-4-14}

## Policy 6-303: Reviews of Tenure-Line Faculty Members (RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures). Revision ~~2324~~.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Effective Date July 1, ~~2017~~2020

### I. Purpose and Scope

**A. Purpose:** To establish criteria, standards, and procedures for reviews of tenure-line faculty members for purposes of retention, promotion, and tenure decisions (RPT). 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 to describe their functions. To describe certain functions of the 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, and certain functions of University officers (department chairpersons, deans, cognizant vice presidents, and the President); as related to retention, promotion, and tenure reviews.

**B. Scope:** This Policy governs performance review processes for all faculty members appointed to any tenure-line faculty position in any academic unit of the University (except processes for periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty, which are governed by Policy [6-321](#)). 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: *Adaptation for The University of Utah Libraries.*)

## II. Definitions

- 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)

Overview: This Policy governs the criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for certain types of 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. Regular periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members (other than reviews for the purpose of granting a promotion in rank) are governed by separate [Policy 6-321](#).

- A. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Reviews
  - 1. Purpose

- a. Retention. A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to 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 [in](#) 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 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.
2. Criteria, [s](#)Standards, [e](#)Evidence, and [p](#)Procedures (RPT).

- a. Development and approval of Sstatements of RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures ("RPT Statements").
- i. Each department (or college) shall formulate 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 shall include a description of departmental procedures ~~which-that~~ 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 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 (Part III-B-1-a), any rules for allowing non-voting faculty participants in meetings of the departmental RPT advisory committee (Parts III-E-1 and III-K-1), 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

**Commented [RF1]:** The existing Policy rather confusingly has multiple variations of phrasing this concept, sometimes referring to "research and other creative activity"—as here, sometimes, "research/ other creative activity", sometimes "research/ creative activity" or other variations. For consistency and conciseness, we're revising most instances to be simply "research/ creative activity."

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), and the procedures for obtaining and incorporating in the review process evidence regarding teaching, which will include input from students (Part III-C-3 and D-7). 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 (i.e., 'grandfathering'-'grandparenting') 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 tenure-line faculty of the department, the dean, and jointly finally approved by the cognizant senior vice president and the Senate Faculty Review 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 delegate 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.

Commented [RF2]: Replacing with gender neutral phrase.



- 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 Sstatement.
  - 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 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.)

*[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.]*

### 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 ~~a~~ 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 ~~a~~ candidates initially appointed at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor is five years. ([Policy 6-311](#)-III-Section 4-B)

Commented [RF3]: Existing Policy uses plural forms in many instances where it's more appropriate to use singular referring to an individual RPT candidate, and so we've marked various instances to revise to singular.

- 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.

All tenure-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. ~~An~~ ~~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 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. ~~A C~~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-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 evaluation letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.
2. Formal reviews. ~~A F~~formal reviews must provide a substantive assessment of the candidate's research or other creative activity, teaching and service to date. ~~A f~~Formal reviews requires 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, a candidates still retains 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-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. ~~A~~ Tenure-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 a candidates appointed at the ranks of associate professor or professor and the seventh year for ~~these one~~ appointed at the rank of assistant professor (unless the department has established, through its RPT Statement, a six-year probationary period for assistant professors).
  - ii. Request for earlier review. Within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement and [Policy 6-311](#), a candidates may request a review for tenure earlier than the year of the mandatory review.
- d. Promotion in rank.

- i. Timing for tenure-track faculty. Tenure-track faculty members are usually reviewed for promotion to a higher rank concurrently with their tenure reviews. Under unusual circumstances, a tenure-track faculty members may request a review for promotion earlier than the year of the mandatory tenure review.
  - ii. Timing for tenured faculty. A 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 RPT advisory committee(s) (RPT-SAC). At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee closing of the file, the department chairperson shall notify the college's Associated Students of the University of Utah (ASUU) Student Senator representative to the Student Senate and the department student RPT advisory committee(s) (RPT-SACs) of the upcoming review and ensure training for all RPT-SAC members. Training shall cover, but need not be limited to, the process for and importance of student input into the RPT process, teaching expectations under the departmental RPT Statement, and

~~recognition of unconscious bias. The department chairperson shall also provide the RPT-SAC(s) with a copy of the University's approved form for RPT-SAC reports, 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 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.~~

Commented [HH4]: [Some of] The deleted section was moved [below] to the section of the policy related to the review.

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 that~~ 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 an 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 for research/creative activity and evidence for teaching.
  - a. The candidate is expected to provide evidence 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) [RPT-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 chair 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. 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-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 Report from the department student RPT advisory committee.** If the department RPT-SAC(s) produce(s) a recommendation report as under [Policy 6-303-III-C-3](#) above, the recommendation report shall be placed in the candidate's file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

**a. Procedures for Action by the department Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT Procedures)**

**i. Meetings, membership, and chairperson of the Student RPT Advisory Committee(s) (RPT-SACs).** The department chairperson shall call a meeting(s) of the RPT-SAC(s) to provide input for formal reviews.

**A. Committee membership**

**1. A Department may have multiple RPT-SACs if each includes representatives from different categories of students (i.e., distinct committees for undergraduate and graduate students). All RPT-SAC meetings must have at least three members participate, and all members who participate in the meeting and in writing the report must have had prior training. The department RPT Statement shall provide details of the number and membership of**

RPT-SAC(s), including whether they are elected or appointed.

**B. Committee chairperson:** Each RPT-SAC shall elect a chairperson from its membership at the start of the review meeting, at the latest.

**C. Committee report.** Each RPT-SAC shall submit a written report to the department RPT Advisory Committee, to be included in the candidate's file. The report shall be written on the University's approved RPT-SAC Report Form. The report shall evaluate the candidate's teaching achievements, using the standards found in the departmental RPT Statement (i.e., excellent, [very good], effective, or not satisfactory). The report shall be based on at least two different forms of evidence regarding teaching.

**A-D.** After review, the committee members who attend the meeting shall sign the report to indicate their approval.

ii. The RPT-SAC(s) shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its the report(s), but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the report(s), the RPT-SAC(s)' ~~recommendations-contributions~~ shall be deemed conclusively waived and ~~its-the~~ absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.

iii. Confidentiality. All RPT-SAC committee deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.

Commented [SP5]: This section moved from above.

7-8. Other written statements for RPT File. Any other written statements -- from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, staff, or interested individuals-- ~~which that~~ 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.

8-9. 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 evaluators should describe his/her/their 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~~candidate 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 letters of 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.

~~9-10.~~ Candidate's rights. ~~A. Candidates~~ ~~are~~ ~~is~~ 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/the~~ 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.

~~10-11.~~ 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.

~~11-12.~~ Table of Minimum University Requirements for Reviews.

Type	Retention			Tenure	Promotion to Associate or "full" Professor"
	Category	Informal	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

<b>Involved Parties:</b>					
External <u>reviewersEvaluators</u>	No	As per departmental rule-a	As per departmental rule-a	Yes	Yes
Academic Program, if appropriate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<u>RPT-SAC</u>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department RPT	Representation-d	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department chair-f	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
College RPT	No			Yes	Yes
Dean	Receives Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Candidate includes in file: (minimum requirements)</b>					

Curriculum Vitae	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Department includes in file: (minimum requirements)</b>					
<b>RPT-SAC report</b>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
External <b>Letters Evaluations</b> (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 <b>P</b> rogram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



report <u>(if applicable)</u>					
Comments from others	Optional	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Student Course Evaluations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

- a. Candidates ~~retains~~ retains 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](#).

~~[[ Action by the department Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT Procedures)]]~~

**Commented [RF6]:** In earlier draft, the proposed new content about student SAC appeared here as new Part III-E. That placement would have greatly disrupted the numbering of subsequent headings, which would require changing cross-references that appear in numerous other Policies and Departmental RPT Statements and other official documents across the University. So the contents are instead placed above in Part III-D-7 where they fit most naturally with existing contents.

E. ~~Action by the department R~~etention, P~~romotion, and I~~tenure A~~advisory C~~ommittee (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.
  - 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 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 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 or, in the School of Medicine only, the chairperson may also be elected from the department's career-line faculty members with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. In this election all 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.
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~~ 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.
  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 ~~R~~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 that~~ shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee.
  - a. The departmental RPT advisory committee report shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the RPT-SAC report(s). In particular, when concerns are raised in any RPT-SAC report, the department advisory committee report must address these concerns.
  - a.b. If a candidate is 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 ~~P~~procedures)

1. Recommendations. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare ~~his/hers~~ written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure, ~~or promotion and tenure~~, of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.
2. Notice to ~~faculty member~~ candidate. Prior to forwarding the file, the department chairperson shall send an exact copy of the chairperson's evaluation of each ~~faculty member~~ candidate to that ~~faculty member~~ candidate.
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/hers~~ the 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, ~~and~~ membership of committee. Each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee

**Commented [RF7]:** The Policy primarily uses "candidate" to refer to individuals who are candidates for retention, promotion, or tenure. In a few spots, lingering from earlier versions, the older phrasing of "faculty member" is still found, and that is now being corrected to bring those to be consistent. That avoids confusion between those faculty members who are members of committees engaged in reviewing, and those who are candidates being reviewed.

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~~ 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 (described in ~~Part III-A-2~~ of this Policy).

- a. Retention. The dean at ~~his/her~~their 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 RPT 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 of 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 or significantly unclear, the college committee may return the file to the department for appropriate action. Additionally, if the department advisory committee report or the chairperson's letter do not follow the requirements of this Policy and the department RPT Statement, including attention to any RPT-SAC report or shared-appointment unit's recommendation, 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 of 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/their 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-that 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 ~~P~~rocedures)
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 following 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~~their 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 that~~ 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. (RPT-SAC(s) 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-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 ~~P~~rocedures).
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](#) and upon the grounds enumerated in that ~~section~~[Policy](#). 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 for pre-hearing consideration and report, as per [Policy 6-010](#).
  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](#), and upon the grounds enumerated in that ~~section~~[Policy](#). 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~~[they](#) waived the right to read.

J. Final action by president (RPT ~~P~~[P](#)rocedures)

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-subsection 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-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: ~~E~~ 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 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). 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 ~~RPT-SAC-advisory committee~~ who are available, and/or other students determined by the department chairperson to ~~adequately~~ represent student interests adequately). 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 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 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 Parts III-E and F of this 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 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 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 Part III-J.

L. Tenured Faculty Reviews ("TFR").

*[User note: Periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members (other than for the specific purpose of considering promotion-in-rank) are now governed by new [Policy 6-321](#), beginning July 1, 2017.]*

---

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

- a. The 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 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 that~~ 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 ~~"non-departmentalized colleges"~~), appointments and tenure are established in the college. See [Policy 6-001](#), [Policy 2-004](#), and [Policy 6-311-1](#). 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 by 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 college faculty.
- iii. The functions described here in 6-303-III-B-1, ~~and III-F~~, and elsewhere as being performed by a department chairperson 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-C-3](#) and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level student [RPT-SAC](#) advisory committee shall be performed by the college [RPT-SAC\(s\)](#).
- v. The actions described here in 6-303-III-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.~~

Commented [RF8]: This portion of the Endnote is no longer appropriate to retain in Policy 6-303, because the topic of TFR has been moved over to Policy 6-321 as of 2017.

**(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

[Approved University Template for Departmental RPT Statements {add link}](#)

[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](#) (Departmental 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): ~~T~~he Associate Vice President for Faculty—Academic Affairs, and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.
- B. Policy Officer: ~~T~~he 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:

### A. Current Version: Revision 24

Approved: Academic Senate, March 30, 2020

Approved: Board of Trustees, April 14, 2020, with designated Effective Date July 1, 2020

[Legislative History of Revision 24](#) [{link to legislative history file}](#)

### B. Earlier versions:

Revision 23 [{link to archived version}](#) Effective dates July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020.

[Legislative History of Revision 23](#) [{link to file}](#)

Revision 22 [{link to archived version}](#) : Effective dates April 14, 2015 to June 30 2017

[Legislative History of Revision 22](#) [{link to file}](#)

Revision 21: [{link to archived version}](#) Effective dates May 14, 2014 to April 13, 2015

[Legislative History](#) of Revision 21

[Revision 20](#): Effective dates July 1, 2010 to May 14, 2014

[Legislative History](#) of Revision 20

[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