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1. **Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty**

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

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Professor (see below), candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior RPT requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate’s choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Department Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations.

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

2. **Informal and Formal Reviews**

2.1 **Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period**

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

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

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

**Table 1: Normal Review Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank at Appointment</th>
<th>Year of Informal Review</th>
<th>Year of Formal Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th</td>
<td>4th, 7th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the Department RPT Advisory Committee or the faculty member’s department chair, according to University Policy.

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

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

### 2.2 Informal Reviews

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

### 2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

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

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

Departments typically do not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at or promote current tenure-line faculty to the Associate Professor or Professor rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. Under appropriate exceptional circumstances, however, a new faculty member may be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or a current tenure-track faculty member may be promoted to Associate Professor without the immediate granting of tenure.
2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

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

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member’s stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research/creative activity, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: excellent, effective, and not satisfactory.

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period; tenure; promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate’s research/creative activity, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

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

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that he or she has reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. The fourth year retention review will assess the likelihood of achieving tenure and will consider the candidate’s potential as well as actual results and work-in-process. For tenure and promotion, evidence of actual performance (as opposed to potential) will be required.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of excellent in research activity, at least sustained effectiveness in teaching, and at least sustained effectiveness in service.

Associate Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank requires that one has developed a broad reputation for high-quality research; demonstrated sustained effectiveness in teaching; and performed effective service in some combination of university, public, and professional settings. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.
Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in research activity resulting in a national and international reputation in his or her field, at least *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

### 3.2 Evaluation of Research

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

#### a. Description of research

Assessments of research requires judgment by individual departments, and there are important quantity differences across academic disciplines. As such the department should provide guidance as to the expected quantity—which may include, but is not limited to, recent promotion records of faculty from peer institutions. High-quality research is imperative. Quality is measured by the strength of the individual’s research record. Quality is certified in part by the strength of publication outlets. In the long run, the quality of any research is determined by its impact on the field of study. The candidate must have a program of research in place indicative of an ongoing commitment to the discovery of knowledge that will provide solid expectations of future productivity.

Research quality is demonstrated by publications in high-quality refereed journals appropriate to the candidate’s field, and is also assessed through direct examination of published papers.

Evidence of research quality and impact can include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Citation analysis
- External reviewer assessments
- Influence on subsequent research (that builds upon the candidate’s work)
- Internal quality assessment by colleagues
- Research awards from recognized organizations and institutions
- Journal quality.

Evidence of journal quality can include, but is not limited to:

- Journal citation and impact factors
- External reviewer comments
- Journal rankings complied by outside academics
- Peer and other institution feedback.

The department and candidate should work together to present evidence regarding journal quality.
Departments in the David Eccles School of Business have a tradition of encouraging collaborative work. In some circumstances, however, questions can arise regarding the nature and extent of a candidate’s contribution to jointly authored work. The candidate and department is encouraged to clarify in their research statement how their body of research work establishes their independent contribution and impact as a scholar. Evidence of such independent contribution and impact is required for tenure.

b. Summary Rating Scale for Research Activity

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

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

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

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

### 3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

Assessment of the candidate’s teaching quality evaluates the candidate’s:

- commitment to learning as the primary objective of the educational process,
- ability to create a learning environment that makes state-of-the-art knowledge, which is necessary for creative, integrative-thinking and problem-solving in a global economy, accessible to our students and business community; and
- ability to imbue our students with the skills and attitudes necessary for life-long learning.

Teaching is assessed using the following sources and evidence (listed in alphabetical order):

- Course syllabi, course materials, and grading
- Peer teaching reviews
- Student Advisory Committee (SAC) written recommendation
- Student evaluations of every course, every term administered, especially scores on “overall instructor” and “overall course” as well as student comments
- Teaching awards from recognized organizations and institutions
- Teaching portfolio assembled to demonstrate teaching competence.

Evaluation of teaching will be based on mastery of subject matter and delivery techniques, evolutionary changes in the courses, improvements as a teacher, student evaluations, and work with masters and Ph.D. students, rather than development of uniquely new materials and methods.
The evaluation of teaching will focus primarily on for-credit courses offered through DESB, but can also consider other forms of teaching, including DESB executive education and non-credit courses. Activities such as serving on undergraduate honors projects, advising individual students and student groups, working with Masters and Ph.D. students, etc. will also be considered.

Within the University system, the term teaching refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. There are therefore three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, and (3) student advising and mentoring.

a. Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate’s course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate’s syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate’s course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate’s teaching done by personnel from the University’s Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses.

b. Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new and novel courses and the publication of textbooks or other teaching materials.

c. Student advising and mentoring

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring; (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees; and (3) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.

Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.
Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching described above.

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

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

- Provides evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level,
- Delivers materials by integrating current, cutting-edge theory and best management practices into the classes,
- Follows a personal development plan to improve teaching performance over time,
- Maintains high quality performance in the administrative duties associated with teaching (commitment to class schedules, preparation, accessibility to students, timely submission of grades, etc.),
- Provides a strong learning experience for the students (including providing appropriate foundation for subsequent courses), and
- Shows appropriate improvement in delivery and course content over time.

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

### 3.4 Evaluation of Service

The successful candidate will accept and perform service obligations necessary for the operation and performance of their department, the DESB, their Profession, and/or the University of Utah in a professional and competent manner. While this standard allows for declining to serve when the faculty member feels that the assignment is inappropriate, his/her share of service work must be maintained. Tradeoffs may exist between inside and outside service work. A lighter load of inside service work may be augmented by serving the public good through outside activities.

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

a. **Professional Service**

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

b. University Service

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

c. Public Service

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

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

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

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

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

### 4. RPT Procedures

#### 4.1 Participants

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

a. **Candidate**. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.

b. **Department RPT Advisory Committee**. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.

c. **Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson**. The Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured faculty member at the rank of Professor of the department faculty,
elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.

d. Department Chairperson. The administrative head of the department.

e. DESB RPT Committee Membership. The DESB RPT Committee will consist of the chairs of the departmental committees and one additional member of each department who is tenured and holds the rank of Associate Professor or higher (the additional member will also be elected by the department annually by a vote of the entire tenure track faculty).

f. Senior DESB RPT Committee Membership. The Senior DESB RPT Committee is a sub-committee of the DESB RPT Committee and will consist of only the chairs of the departmental committees. This group will elect one member to serve as the chair of both the Senior DESB RPT Committee and the DESB RPT Committee. The purpose of this sub-committee is to provide a group qualified to review promotions to Professor.

g. Dean. The administrative head of the college.

h. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of students, normally from the department but may include students from outside the department when the candidates teaches primarily in programs outside the department. The SAC may be composed of undergraduate and/or graduate students.

i. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer-reviews of teaching. They are selected by the department chair.

j. External Evaluators. The evaluation of a candidate’s research and publication is very important to the retention, tenure, and promotion process. One important method of gaining additional insight into the candidate’s overall contribution to the body of knowledge is through evaluations made by external reviewers. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and the department chair in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate’s scholarly/creative work.

All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate’s scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures
Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted.
a. Informal Reviews after the First Year. These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

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

In the case of a candidate having a “joint” appointment in another academic department or a “shared” appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the department chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit’s perspective on the candidate’s progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the DESB prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

Course evaluation results from the University of Utah are added to the file by the department chair. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the candidate.

The Student Advisory Committee is not asked to submit a report for and external evaluators are not involved in informal reviews.

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

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate’s file: (i) the initial report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee’s meeting. After studying the candidate’s record, the [head of unit] shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, [the head of the unit OR the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and] the individual assigned to review the candidate’s file shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If [the unit head] or members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will review the candidate’s research/creative activity, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research,
teaching, or service. The department chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal tenure review and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format. A formal mid-probationary retention review follows this format with the exception of external reviewers.

a. Department Chair Responsibilities. By April 1, the department chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the department chair by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed for tenure or promotion to Professor, the department chair will also request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

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

In the case of a “joint” appointment in another academic department or a “shared” appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the department chair shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit’s perspective on the candidate’s progress, which should be submitted to the Department prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The department chair will notify the Student Advisory Committee of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform that reports shall be due to the department chair no later than September 15. The department chair must provide the candidate’s relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than August 1. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, assign an individual of the RPT Advisory Committee to oversee the candidate’s file in the RPT process.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The department chair shall ensure that Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate’s file prior to any formal review.
d. **External Evaluators.** Five or six potential external evaluators are required for tenure cases and 4-5 potential external evaluators are required for promotion to professor cases. The candidate may indicate no more than two individuals that he/she does not accept for an external reviewer. One half of the reviewers (rounded downward in the case of an odd number) will be selected from the candidate's list and the remainder from the department list. The department chair will construct a list of all potential external reviewers that were contacted, indicating which reviewers were recommended by the candidate and which by the department, and include this list along with letters received in the candidate’s RPT documentation. If some reviewer candidates decline to provide a review, the declination and any reason provided should be noted on the list. The candidate will sign the Waiver or Non-Waiver of Rights to see the external letters and include this waiver in the RPT documentation.

Candidates must provide a list of 5-6 potential external evaluators for tenure cases or promotion to associate professor cases or 4-5 potential external evaluators for promotion to professor cases and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The department chair after consulting with the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and the person selected to oversee the candidate’s file, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than five external evaluations for formal tenure review, and formal promotion to Associate Professor and no fewer than four external evaluations for promotion to Professor. At least 1 external evaluator will be from the candidate’s list. The department chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

The initial official contact with external reviewers will be made by the department chair. This contact will be done (or followed) by a request letter. At the appropriate date on the time line, the department chair will send the candidate’s file (see Appendix A) and the review letter to the final list of external reviewers. To provide consistency, the template letters in Appendix B should be used. The template letters will request that the letters be sent to the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty and Research, and the Dean’s office should be copied on all communications with potential external reviewers.

e. **RPT File Contents and File Closing Date.** A candidate’s file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

1) **Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents.** Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson to place in the candidate’s file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans, for the relevant criteria (research/
creative activity, teaching, and service). The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

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

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

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

1) **Department RPT Advisory Committee Action.** The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but no later than October 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research/creative activity, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the department chair may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee’s recommendations. Committee members will vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate).

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

The minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.
The candidate is to be informed of the Committee recommendation by the Committee Chairperson as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee’s deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chairperson about the Committee’s meeting and recommendation.

2) Department Chair Action. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the department chair.

Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level. Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy. (Policy 6-303-III Sections G-J).
https://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php
Appendix A: RPT File Contents

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

Candidate’s Responsibility

It is the candidate’s responsibility to provide the following documentation to the department chair for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. **Curriculum Vitae.** This should include at least the following:
   a. All research publications/creative works since the candidate began his/her professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on blind review, or other selection method.
   b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.
   c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
   d. Honors received for research/creative work.
   e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.
   f. Individual student research supervised.
   g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
   h. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.

2. **Personal Statement.** This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy.

3. **Copies of recent publications,** including title page of authored or edited books.

4. **Course syllabi** for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the candidate chooses to include. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers, SAC, and the RPT Advisory Committee.

5. **Other relevant materials,** such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the
file. Where the candidate’s role in particular research is unclear, the candidate may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate’s contribution to the work.

6. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

Department Responsibility

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

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.

2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.

3. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).

4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.

5. Copies of all prior years’ RPT files.

6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.

7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the department chair describing the candidate’s service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate’s file.

8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her right to read)
   a. Signed form evidencing candidate’s waiver or retention of right to read
   b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae
   c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, department chair or Committee Chairperson)
Appendix B: Letter Templates

Letter to Request Materials from Outside Reviewer for Tenure With or Without Promotion

DATE

NAME and ADDRESS

Dear Professor XXX:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an outside review for YYY who is being reviewed for (promotion and/or tenure). YYY (has signed a letter waiving his/her right to see the external evaluation letters, has not waived his/her right to see the external evaluation letters).

This review follows our normal process (is an early review for ... etc.). YYY is currently an untenured (Assistant, Associate) Professor of (Accounting, Finance, Management, Marketing) at the David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah. This year marks YYY’s (nth) year at the University and according to School policy all faculty members must be formally reviewed no later than the 7-th year for a tenure decision. [YYY is also applying for promotion to associate professor at this review.]

According to School policy, the successful candidate needs to meet the base requirements in research, teaching and service. Specifically, with regard to research:

    To achieve tenure, the candidate must produce a substantial body of high-quality scholarship. Research quality is demonstrated by publications in high-quality refereed journals appropriate to the candidate’s field. Research quality and impact are also assessed through direct examination of published papers.

I have enclosed the packet of information prepared by YYY. It includes a copy of YYY’s vita, her/his published papers and her/his current working papers. It also includes an overview of her/his research program as well as a statement of the impact of her/his published work.
In your review of YYY's work, please comment on the quality and the quantity of YYY's work, the impact this research has had or is anticipated to have on the discipline of (Accounting, Finance, Management, Marketing). One key consideration in our evaluation is whether YYY's research record merits tenure [and promotion] at a peer institution to the University of Utah. For your convenience we have attached a list of peer institutions compiled by the University of Utah. Clearly some of the schools on this list have stronger research departments than the University of Utah in YYY's field while others are weaker.

We realize that you may have little knowledge of YYY's teaching or service contribution. However, if you have observed her/his presentations at workshops or at academic conferences or if you have any other knowledge of teaching/service activities, we would appreciate your comments.

We need your review letter by (date). If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (801-581-1111) or contact me by E-mail at (ZZZ). We need a copy of your vita when you send your review because RPT Committee members outside our department (School of Accounting) may desire to know the qualifications of our reviewers. Please also include a statement describing your relationship, if any, to the candidate.

We realize that performing outside reviews is time-consuming and that your only rewards come in the form of service to the academic community. We very much appreciate your contribution in assisting us in this important evaluation process.

Please send your letter to:

Associate Dean for Faculty and Research
David Eccles School of Business
1655 East Campus Center Drive
Salt Lake City, UT   84112

Sincerely,

AAA
Enclosure
Department
Title
April 16, 2018

Letter to Request Materials from Outside Reviewer for Promotion to Full

DATE

NAME and ADDRESS

Dear Professor XXX:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an outside review for YYY who is being reviewed for promotion to Professor. YYY (has signed a letter waiving his/her right to see the external evaluation letters, has not waived his/her right to see the external evaluation letters).

YYY is currently a tenured Associate Professor of DEPARTMENT. The timing of a request for promotion to Professor is determined by the candidate. A statement from our School policy on promotion to full professor is included below for your reference.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor in the DESB of the University of Utah is the acknowledgment of sustained and significant contributions in research, teaching, and service. This promotion is also recognition that an individual is prepared for and likely to take on leadership roles in the DESB. Specifically, promotion to Professor will require that the candidate has published articles in high-quality peer-reviewed outlets since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, is nationally recognized for research published during his or her career, and shows evidence that research productivity is likely to continue after promotion. In addition, teaching that is respected by students and faculty is required, as is a sustained record of effective service to the School and external communities. DESB promotion and tenure committees may exercise reasonable flexibility in evaluating candidates’ suitability for promotion to Professor, balancing heavier contributions in one area against lighter contributions in another. However, flexibility does not entail an elimination of standards in any area. Further, the contribution in at least one of teaching or research must be exemplary.

I have enclosed the packet of information prepared by YYY. It includes a copy of YYY’s vita, samples of her/his published papers and her/his current working papers. It also includes an overview of her/his research program as well as a statement of the impact of her/his published work.

In your review of YYY’s work, please comment on the quality and the quantity of YYY’s work, the impact this research has had or is anticipated to have on the discipline of (Accounting, Finance, Management, Marketing). One key consideration in our evaluation is whether YYY's research record merits promotion at a peer institution to the University of Utah. For your convenience we have attached a list of peer institutions compiled by the University of Utah. Clearly some of the schools on this list have stronger research departments than the University of Utah in YYY’s field while others are weaker.
April 16, 2018

We realize that you may have little knowledge of YYY’s teaching or service contribution. However, if you have observed her/his presentations at workshops or at academic conferences or if you have any other knowledge of teaching/service activities, we would appreciate your comments. In addition, for promotion to Professor, we are interested in the national visibility of our faculty from research, teaching and/or service. We ask that you also comment on YYY’s national visibility if you have sufficient basis for that determination.

We need your review letter by (date). If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (801-581-1111) or contact me by E-mail at (ZZZ). We also need a copy of your vita when you send your review because RPT Committee members outside our department (School of Accounting) may desire to know the qualifications of our reviewers. Please also include a statement describing your relationship, if any, to the candidate.

I realize that performing outside reviews is time-consuming and that your only rewards come in the form of service to the academic community. I very much appreciate your contribution in assisting us in this important evaluation process.

Please send your letter to:

Associate Dean for Faculty and Research
David Eccles School of Business
1655 East Campus Center Drive
Salt Lake City, UT  84112

Sincerely,

AAA
Enclosure
Department
Title