

**Department of Education, Culture and Society
University of Utah
Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines**

I. Department Mission

The Department of Education, Culture and Society (ECS) seeks to promote exemplary scholarship, teaching, and service as crucial components in the achievement of social justice in education. Toward the achievement of this goal, the Department has as a vital part of its mission the creation of an environment that is devoted to the study of questions about the economic, social, political, and cultural context of past and contemporary educational policy and practice and that is supportive of pedagogical, research, policy, and service contributions to national organizations and to local educational institutions and communities concerned with the pursuit of equity in and through education.

II. University Regulations

The retention, promotion, and the granting of tenure to faculty members are regarded as the ultimate guarantee of academic freedom and as actions of crucial importance to the fulfillment of the Department's mission. Accordingly, the thorough and responsible execution of retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) procedures at all administrative levels is vital to the rights of individual faculty members and to the continued success of the Department within the University environment. This means that RPT decisions must be made both carefully and thoughtfully. All evaluations of faculty performance must be in accordance with the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure outlined in this document.

RPT decisions are inherently related to faculty appointment actions. An appointment to a faculty position at the University of Utah may be either in one of the "regular" ranks (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer) for an indefinite term of service, or in one of various auxiliary ranks (adjunct, clinical, visiting, research) for a definite term of service. Every appointment of the latter category terminates at the end of a specified term of service unless renewed through appointment. However, all appointments in the "regular" ranks are to be regarded as continuous, but subject during an authorized probationary period to reviews that may result in either retention or non-retention, and ultimately in either termination or tenure according to due process.

The retention review of a non-tenured faculty member should be regarded as a continuation of the original appointment action, the question being whether or not to continue the appointment during the probationary period. The criteria for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor are normally the same. Tenure should not

be awarded in the absence of promotion to associate professor, except in extraordinary circumstances. In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of associate professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that she or he will continue to achieve the standards expected of an associate professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of professor. Criteria for promotion to the rank of full professor are outlined below.

Basic guidelines and authority for Departmental policies, practices, and procedures in such matters are delineated in University Regulations, <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/9/9-5.1.html>. <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8-tbl.html>, Chapters IV, “Appointments, Annuities, and Retirement” <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-4.html>, VI, “Faculty Retention and Tenure” <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-6.html> , and Ch. XII, “Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities,” Pt. II <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-12-2.html> and Pt. III, <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-12-3.html>, Pt. IV <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-12-4.html> and the Faculty Handbook, 2.10 – 2.19 <http://www.admin.utah.edu/fhb/> and Appendix B: “Rules of Procedure of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee” http://www.admin.utah.edu/fhb/appendix_b.html.

III. Overview of the RPT Process

The Department will conduct a formal review of each non-tenured Instructor or Assistant Professor during the third and fifth years. Formal review for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor normally occurs in the seventh year. Assistant Professors may request a formal review for promotion and tenure prior to the completion of the normal seven-year probationary period but not prior to the completion of three years of service in the Department unless credit for prior service is negotiated at the time of appointment or at any single review after appointment but before a review for tenure commences. Formal review for promotion to the rank of Professor are conducted when appropriate at the request of the faculty member and the recommendation of the Department Chair.

Informal retention reviews for non-tenured faculty members with regular appointments will be conducted every year there is no formal review, beginning in the second year. Informal reviews are based on an internal review of the faculty member’s record. These reviews are conducted by the Department Informal Review Committee (see p. 18) and shall consider recommendations made during prior formal reviews or since the faculty member’s appointment, if no formal review has been conducted. They are intended to provide feedback and guidance for junior faculty working toward promotion and tenure. In cases where good progress toward promotion and tenure is not being made, the RPT Committee in conjunction with the Department Chair may ask for a formal review in accordance with University procedures.

In keeping with University regulations, formal RPT decisions involve multiple levels of review. At the Department level, there are two independent RPT recommendations: (1) the Department RPT Committee, and (2) the Department Chair. At the College level, there are also two independent levels of review: (1) the College RPT Committee, and (2) the Dean. These recommendations are forwarded for review to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs unless there are differing recommendations from any of the prior review levels. In such cases, files are first forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (UPTAC). Final decisions regarding Retention, Promotion, and Tenure are made by the Senior Vice-President of the University.

In preparation for all formal and informal reviews, each non-tenured faculty member shall meet at least twice a year with a tenured faculty member in the Department who will serve as a faculty mentor. The responsibility of the faculty mentor is to advise the faculty member in the preparation of her or his materials for review and to discuss any questions the faculty member may have about the review process. Among other things, the faculty mentor should help clarify the Department's expectations in teaching, research, and service at successive stages of the pre-tenure review process. The faculty member may choose his or her own mentor or ask the Department Chair to appoint one.

IV. Standards for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

Because the exercise of academic freedom is both the right of individual faculty and crucial to the healthy functioning of the academic community, each faculty member is encouraged to develop her or his particular talents and strengths within the criteria outlined herein. However, within these broad guidelines, the value of an individual's contribution in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service should be judged in terms of its contribution to the general goals of the Department. Activities that are central to those goals are weighed more heavily than those that are peripheral.

The criteria for evaluating research, teaching, and service are: "excellent," "good," and "unsatisfactory." Retention decisions should be based on the professional judgment of those conducting the reviews that progress is being made in a fashion that will allow a person to be promoted to associate professor with tenure within the normal probationary period. For promotion to associate professor with tenure the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in either scholarship or teaching and be rated as at least good in the other area and in service. For promotion to full professor, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in two areas, one of which must be scholarship, and must be judged at least good in the third area. "Excellent," "good," and "unsatisfactory" are described in the sections on research, teaching, and service.

A faculty member's activities in the three areas listed as criteria for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will be considered in terms of their significance and constancy and are considered to be predictive of future activity. Accordingly, emphasis will be placed on a record of sustained accomplishment commensurate with time in rank. Criteria for promotion to full professor include significant further growth on the part of the candidate as researcher, teacher, and community member, beyond that achieved at the level of tenure and promotion to associate professor. (See Section V for specific criteria.)

If these guidelines are changed in any substantive way, each faculty member is allotted a three-year grace period in which to prepare to meet specifications for performance in scholarship, teaching, and service contained in the new guidelines for purposes of any formal review. At the individual faculty member's discretion, either the old or the new guidelines may be used for any review falling within this three-year grace period.

V. Specific Criteria of Performance

A. Research

Scholarship and research represent a faculty member's vital engagement in the generation and dissemination of knowledge. In evaluating research as "excellent," "good," or "unsatisfactory," quantity is a consideration. However, while a high level of productivity is desirable, it should not come at the cost of the quality of the work. Rather, the research record should demonstrate a balance between quality and quantity, with the emphasis on the intellectual sophistication and innovative character of the overall record of publication.

Quality refers to the intellectual importance of the contribution made by a book, article, or other publication, including its complexity and distinctiveness. Such quality will be assessed according to a number of considerations, including the RPT Committee's own judgment, the evaluation provided in letters submitted by external evaluators, and the status of the journal or press in which research is published, among other possible factors. In her or his personal statement, the candidate should make the case for the quality of the work and explain his or her role in co-authored publications.

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

- Evidence of initiative and independence in the conceptualization and completion of scholarly research projects, such as single or first authorship of publications or other indications of a systematic program of scholarly research. (Accordingly, while the Department values collaborative research, priority will be given to single- or first-authored work.)
- Evidence of scholarship that makes a significant scholarly contribution as indicated by publication in a variety of scholarly forums, including but not

exclusively publications of primary importance (see below).

- Evidence of an intellectually rigorous, in-depth, and sustained publication record comparable in quantity and quality to that of peers of the same rank at other comparable institutions in the same educational sub-discipline.
- c Evidence of a sustained intellectual project that develops a larger understanding of one or more specific problems in the field.

Definitions of Types of Publications, Reports, and Other Materials

Candidates must make a case in their personal statement for the quality and classification of any given publication on their vitae. A candidate might argue that the ambitious character of an article renders it more important than would be suggested by the fact that it was an invited rather than a refereed article. The items listed under “primary, secondary, tertiary, and other” are not rank ordered in terms of importance within each category.

1. Primary Importance
 - a. scholarly books (authored or co-authored, rather than edited)
 - b. blind, peer-refereed articles of original research in print or on-line journals, syntheses of research in scholarly journals, or original theoretical essays in refereed scholarly journals.
 - c. peer-refereed book chapters
 - d. blind, peer-refereed conference proceedings
 - e. funded scholarly research grants
2. Secondary Importance
 - a. edited books
 - b. non-refereed chapters in books
 - c. textbooks for specific types of courses
 - d. invited essays in scholarly journals
3. Tertiary Importance
 - a. scholarly articles and essays in non-refereed journals
 - b. non-scholarly articles and essays in non-refereed journals
 - c. unfunded research grants submitted
 - d. scholarly book and text reviews
 - e. presentations at professional conferences
 - f. Unpublished technical reports and reports of research, theory development, and/or evaluations to institutions external to the University.

- g. publication of models of curriculum and instruction development.
- 4. Other
 - a. publication of supplemental teaching materials.
 - b. articles or letters in non-scholarly journals (e.g., letters in newspapers, or articles and reviews in popular periodicals or trade journals).

Although publishing exclusively in leading journals would be admirable, it is not normally required for promotion either to associate or full professor. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to achieve a balance between published work of primary importance, such as refereed articles in leading journals in the candidate's educational sub-field, and published work of secondary importance, such as non-refereed book chapters and invited articles and essays in other journals. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have published to a greater degree in leading journals in their educational sub-disciplines as well as in influential and highly regarded journals that serve a wider educational or disciplinary audience.

More generally, in the case of retention or promotion to associate professor with tenure, evidence is sought that the faculty member's work exhibits a sustained and systematic approach that engages with current scholarship, contributes to a field of scholarship related to the purposes of the Department and College, and is judged to be of high quality by national peers. Sustained effort in an area of scholarship is demonstrated by regular publication in high-quality outlets, refereed paper presentations at national professional conferences, ongoing research, and plans for future scholarly endeavors. For promotion to the rank of professor, evidence must clearly indicate that the candidate's program of scholarship has achieved national visibility and influence within the candidate's own educational sub-discipline and in the larger field of educational scholarship, has been maintained over an extended period of time, and has gained in quality as well as scope of influence. Such achievement may be demonstrated by national and international awards, publication in leading journals that serve an interdisciplinary audience or an audience outside the candidate's educational sub-discipline, and a sustained and ambitious program of scholarship. Explicit arguments in the candidate's personal statement addressing such issues will be helpful both to the Committee and to external reviewers.

B. Teaching

Faculty's work with students inside the classroom, on thesis Committees, and in other advising and educational capacities, represents a crucial dimension of the Department's commitment to students' scholarly inquiry, intellectual and other forms of educational development (e.g., students' development as teachers in their own right), and the promotion of social justice in education. Both through the dissemination of knowledge in classroom settings and through mentoring of students in specific projects of inquiry,

faculty teaching plays a crucial role in furthering the goals of the Department. A high value is placed on the quality of faculty teaching. At the same time, it is vital that all faculty be actively involved with a wide range of students in the Department.

Definition of teaching. Teaching is defined as instruction conducted under the auspices of the University of Utah. Such activities include:

- a. Teaching performance in courses, seminars, and practica.
- b. Advisement of students concerning their programs, theses, dissertations, master's projects, and individual research; and the modeling of professional ethics and standards.
- c. Development of innovative courses, materials, or methods of teaching, and/or programs that make a substantive contribution to the Department and that draw upon the scholarly expertise of the individual.
- d. Instructional duties related to the above teaching including: establishing and keeping regular office hours, accurate and current monitoring of students' and advisees' progress, prompt, dependable attendance at classes, and prompt and conscientious grading.
- e. Other instructional responsibilities such as mentoring teaching assistants.

Evidence of good or excellent teaching. Within the parameters of the Department's policies regarding time-off for departmentally granted leaves, course buy-outs for grants and fellowships, and administrative duties, the evaluation of a candidate's performance in the above listed areas will be based upon the individual's full load requirement within the Department of Education, Culture and Society. This evaluation should cover and concentrate on the time period in which the candidate has held her or his present rank and should take into consideration the difficulty of teaching particular courses as well as a faculty member's responsibilities for teaching large and/or service-oriented courses.

Good or excellent teaching requires scholarly expertise in an area as well as a demonstrated commitment to student learning. Evidence of a commitment to student learning includes carefully prepared courses, timely and thoughtful feedback on student work, and accessibility to students through office hours, email, and/or other reliable forms of communication. Specific evidence to be taken into account as to whether the candidate's teaching should be considered excellent, good, or unsatisfactory includes:

- a. the candidate's personal statement about pedagogy
- b. course syllabi, reading lists, and other course handouts
- c. end-of-term teaching performance evaluations
- d. the SAC report
- e. teaching grants and awards
- f. the development of new courses that serve a need in the Department
- g. guest lectures in other faculty's courses
- h. thesis committee work, including substantial tutoring and feedback
- i. other advising and mentoring of students. For example, the Committee

may consider the number of students advised, whether the candidate kept regular office hours and maintained acceptable phone or email communication with students, mentored students with regard to conference papers or work submitted for publication, and provided helpful feedback on students' written work.

In evaluating the faculty member for retention or promotion to the associate level with tenure, three criteria should prevail. The first criterion is that the faculty member has developed or is developing a set of courses in her or his areas of expertise that are of value to the Department's academic program. The second criterion is that the faculty member is receiving high ratings by students on a consistent basis, or when a person is experiencing difficulty, a strong trend toward improvement is evident. The third criterion is that the faculty member is advising and mentoring students on a regular basis. For promotion to the rank of professor, the faculty member is expected not simply to maintain her or his teaching at the same level of competence but to demonstrate greater depth of knowledge about their field than do candidates for promotion to associate professor, to be able to engage productively with a variety of students, and to demonstrate pedagogical sophistication in engaging students in complex material.

C. University, Professional and Public Service

Faculty are expected to be active and productive participants in developing and running the affairs of the University, College, and Department, in contributing to relevant professional organizations, and in interacting with local, state-based and/or national communities in ways that will contribute usefully to those communities. Since the Department is committed to having as diverse a faculty as possible and to serving communities interested in promoting social justice, it is understood that faculty may experience considerable demands from communities outside the College and University in pursuit of these ends; due both to their perceived membership in particular communities and to their knowledge of and commitment to social justice research and pedagogy, many faculty will be regarded as important resources and allies to particular communities (for example, communities of color). The Department recognizes and supports faculty's contributions to these diverse communities. At the same time, there is a need for all faculty members to contribute to the service functions of local, state, and national professional organizations and of the Department, College, and University.

Because of the mission of the Department, service to the Department is highly valued. However, professional service is also reflected in committee and administrative assignments within the College of Education, University, and nationally. Professional competence and service activities are reflected in a person's interaction with her or his colleagues and relevant communities of scholars. Such interaction is indicated by attending and contributing to professional meetings, serving as resource persons (journal editors or reviewers, panel members, external reviewers for other Departments, etc.), and participating actively on College, University, and professional committees,

Service that meets the ordinary working needs of the Department and non-departmental service that benefits the Department as well as service that makes some substantial or significant contribution to the College, University, and/or relevant scholarly organizations will be considered good. Service that meets these needs and also contributes substantially to local communities and academic organizations, or that makes exemplary contributions to national professional organizations and to the Department, College, or University, will be considered excellent. Although the Department recognizes that different members of the faculty will have different demands on their time (not all of which they will be able to choose, depending on their relations with particular communities), service rated good or excellent normally includes significant contributions to the Department as well as to the University and/or relevant professional organizations.

Types of service recognized by the Department include any significant committee or individual work that provides a needed contribution to the Department, College, University, relevant professional organizations, and local or broad communities. In the case of Committee work, the assumption is that the work involved is of a significant nature (e.g., not a brief one-time meeting), and that the faculty member attended regularly and was an informed and active participant. Examples of recognized service include some but not all of the following (these are not rank ordered):

- a. Membership on or chairing of Department committees
- b. Membership on or chairing of College or University committees
- c. Membership on or chairing of committees of professional organizations
- d. Membership on or chairing of community committees or serving in community leadership roles
- e. Recruiting students and faculty to the Department
- f. Serving as a mentor to students through University programs such as the Summer Research Opportunities Program, University Research Opportunities Program, or other professional programs (including those located at other institutions)
- g. Serving as a reader or reviewer for a journal
- h. Serving as an editor for a journal or serving on a journal's editorial board
- i. organizing panel presentations at conferences
- j. Serving on panels that develop policy statements
- k. Participating in workshops and colloquia that serve students or that feature students
- l. Mentoring other faculty
- m. Providing services to other departments (such as serving as an internal or external reviewer for another department's graduate review)
- n. Serving in an administrative capacity in a program, center, the Department, College, University, or professional organization.
- o. Service grants
- p. Providing services to schools or a community that draw on one's

- educational expertise (e.g., providing workshops for schools, serving as a consultant or resource person for a community)
- q. Other work that provides necessary service to the educational community, the institution, or a local community (to be described in the candidate's personal statement)

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to demonstrate more substantial service work than candidates for retention or promotion to associate professor not only in terms of quantity but in terms of the nature of the work demanded. Before tenure, faculty are expected to provide service that helps the Department, College, and/or University to perform necessary work, but are not expected to take on multiple highly demanding assignments.

VI. Procedures and Time Line for Formal RPT Reviews

Spring Semester

A. RPT Document

By March 1, the Department Chair will notify in writing all faculty to be reviewed the following autumn semester and will solicit optional reviews such as reviews for early tenure or promotion to full professor. Unless the candidate already has a copy, the Chair will give her or him a copy of the Department of Education, Culture and Society's Guidelines for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure and the PPM 9-5.1.

- B. Membership of RPT Committee — The Department RPT Committee consists of all tenured faculty in the Department of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate, with the exception of the Chair, who submits an independent review of the candidate. Faculty on sabbatical leave have the option of participating on the RPT Committee but ordinarily will be excused from participation while on leave. A Chair of the Department RPT Committee is elected in April for a two-year term by the members of the Committee.

- C. Appointment and Notification of the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) — In April, the Department Chair will appoint a SAC Chair and SAC committee, consisting of three graduate student members (including the SAC Chair), and will give a list of all faculty being reviewed to the SAC Chair. SAC members are to interview at least ten graduate and/or undergraduate students who have had important contact with each candidate, using the Student Advisory Committee Faculty Evaluation Report. The responsibility of the SAC Committee is to address the teaching contributions of the faculty member, not only in terms of classes taught but in terms of advising, mentoring, and otherwise instructing students. Interviews may be over the phone, on email, or in person. The

completed report for each candidate must be returned to the Department Chair (or designee) for inclusion in the faculty member's file by August 31.

D. Notification of Relevant Academic Program—If a faculty member being reviewed holds a joint appointment with another academic program, the Department Chair shall notify the relevant program in writing by April 30 of the upcoming review.

E. External Reviewers

1. The Department Chair (or designee) shall ask the candidate being formally reviewed in her or his third, fifth, and seventh years to complete an External Reviewer's Form (available from the Department's Administrative Assistant). This form should include a list of authorities in the field (outside the University) who might serve as reviewers or nominate other reviewers. The external reviewer form should also indicate the candidate's professional and personal relationship with each of the proposed reviewers, as well as a summary of their professional qualifications. The faculty member's dissertation chair should not be included; co-authors are discouraged.
1. The External Reviewer's Form should be submitted to the Chair (or designee) by April 1. For the third year formal review, five reviewers should be listed on the External Reviewer's Form. For each subsequent review, the Department Chair will ask the faculty member being reviewed to add to their list of external reviewers a minimum of three additional authorities in their field (outside the University) who might serve as reviewers or nominate other reviewers. Reviewers may not serve as an External Reviewer more than once for any given candidate.
3. In conjunction with the Department Chair, the RPT Chair will determine, select, and contact a minimum of three reviewers for all formal reviews. Two of the reviewers listed on the External Reviewer's form submitted by the candidate will be contacted for a review. A third reviewer will be selected based on recommendations solicited from one or more of the remaining reviewers on the list. The candidate may request *in advance* that particular authorities not be contacted. Potential reviewers will be asked to specify the nature of their professional and personal relationship with the candidate and to provide copies or summaries of their vitae.
4. External reviewers will be asked to evaluate the candidate in four specific areas: 1) the quantity and quality of the candidate's scholarly work and achievements, based on the candidate's vita, statement, and the materials included; 2) the quality of journals in which the candidate has published; 3) the significance and national impact of the candidate's work; and 4) an assessment as to how the candidate's record compares with other faculty

with the same time in rank in the same field.

5. Unless otherwise specified, all external letters are to be kept confidential and used only as part of the RPT process. Letters written and submitted by committees taking part in the RPT process should not include the names of reviewers or their institutions. Quotations of reasonable length may be included in committee documents, either as an illustration of the reviewers' summary views or as a way to provide blind feedback to the candidate.
6. By May 31, the faculty member must submit her or his personal statement, up-dated vita, and copies of three of her or his strongest pieces of published research to the RPT Chair to forward to the external reviewers.
7. The RPT Chair will contact external reviewers before the end of May and ask them to return their evaluations by September 1st in order to provide sufficient time for the RPT Committee to review the materials and, in the case of joint appointments, to allow the relevant academic program to review the materials prior to the Department review.
8. Prior to the submission of the file, the candidate will meet with his or her faculty mentor (see p. 3). The mentor will help the candidate organize his or her file (see below), including the preparation of the vita and personal statement.

Autumn Semester

A. Candidate's File

The candidate compiles a file to be submitted as documentation for her or his formal review. Proper preparation and completeness of each candidate's file is essential for the uninterrupted progress of a formal retention/promotion/tenure review through all the stages of the review process.

1. Candidates must submit their complete file to the Departmental Chair no later than August 31. The complete file (clearly organized and usually submitted in one or more ring binders) is expected to provide: a) a personal statement that describes the candidate's scholarly growth and development and highlights their major contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service; b) a current and complete curriculum vitae organized according to the Department format, with appropriate dating of items and logical groupings or categories related to the Department's retention/promotion/tenure criteria; and c) copies of all published work, syllabi, and supporting documentation (e.g., formal letters accepting an as-yet unpublished paper for publication, awards letters, etc.), as well as

any significant presentation papers or other written work that the candidate wishes to submit as part of the file. The file should include in the following order:

Dept. RPT Guidelines
*RPT Summary Form
Personal Statement
Vita
*External Review Form
*External Review Letters
*Teaching Evaluations
*SAC Faculty Evaluations
*†Academic program RPT Committee Recommendation
*Dept. RPT Committee Recommendation
*Chair's Recommendation
*College RPT Committee Recommendation
*Dean's Recommendation

* = Documents added to the file by Department Chairperson or other persons responsible for recommendations.

† = For faculty joint appointed in the Ethnic Studies or other academic programs.

2. Supporting documents for scholarship, teaching, and service should appear in appendices A, B, and C. Any other written statements — from the candidate, faculty members in the Department, the Department Chairperson, the College dean, the Department student advisory Committee, or interested individuals — that are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate should be placed in the file before the Department RPT Committee meets to consider the case
3. Documentation in scholarship should include all published work, letters of acceptance or intent to publish for forthcoming work or work in press, and any other scholarly commendations.
4. Documentation in the area of teaching should include a course syllabus from each course taught at the University. In addition, the Department Chair will add a list of all courses taught by semester, with student global item ratings. Students' comments from end-of-term evaluations for all courses will be included as well. For joint-appointed faculty, the Department Chair will also ask the relevant academic program for course evaluations.

5. Documentation in the area of service should include a list of all pertinent service activities by date and a brief description of the contribution made. Service activities should reflect long-term, consistent efforts. Listing short-term, one-time meetings is discouraged. Paid consultantships should be listed separately and differentiated clearly from other service work.
-
- B. Complete Candidate Files — Once the candidate has submitted her or his completed file to the Department Chairperson, the Chair adds all collected materials (external review letters, faculty letters, SAC evaluations, etc.) as well as the recommendations of all previous formal and informal reviews to the file. The Department Chair (or designee) will send completed files for any joint appointed faculty member to the relevant academic program by September 1; files will be returned to the Department by the third week of September. Completed files are kept by the Department administrative assistant in the main office and may be checked out by members of the RPT committee for review and reading. Files should not leave the building.
 - C. Candidate Access to Completed File — The candidate is entitled to see his/her review file (including the SAC report and, for faculty with joint appointments, any program recommendation) at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation obtained from outside the University, if she or he has waived the right to see these letters. The candidate may add responses to the contents of the file except for external review letters if the right to see them has been waived. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in her or his initial formal review file, the candidate's written statement must be added to the file before the RPT advisory committee meeting is held.
 - D. Staff and Faculty Letters —By September 1, the Department Chair invites all staff and faculty in the Department to submit letters relative to the review of a candidate. Any letters should be submitted to the RPT Chair for inclusion in the candidate's file at least three weeks prior to the Departmental RPT meeting.
 - E. Announcement of RPT Committee Meeting — The RPT Chair will notify all members of the RPT Committee at least three weeks prior to the RPT Committee meeting, which normally takes place the second Monday in October. Faculty entitled to participate in the review process are members of the Department RPT Committee.
 - F. Readers — Three weeks prior to the scheduled Department RPT Committee meeting, the RPT Chair will appoint two members of the RPT Committee to serve as reader/secretary and secondary reader for each formal review candidate. After a complete reading of the file, the reader/secretary will be responsible for presenting a summary evaluation of the candidate's file, taking notes of the recommendations of the RPT Committee, and writing the Department RPT letter.

H. Joint Appointments — Joint appointed candidates are reviewed both by the relevant academic program and by the ECS Department RPT Committee. The academic program writes a separate letter that appears in the candidate's file and is consulted by the Departmental RPT Committee in its deliberations. (Tenured faculty who serve on both Committees evaluating a candidate may vote on only one of these Committees. Normally, faculty will vote on the Education, Culture and Society RPT Committee only. If a faculty member chooses to vote on the other Committee, she or he may be present during the discussion of the Education, Culture and Society RPT Committee, but may not vote.)

I. Action by RPT Committee

1. Committee Report — For the RPT Committee's discussion of a candidate, both the reader/secretary and the secondary reader should be prepared to summarize the essentials of the file. They should also take notes of the discussion for use in preparing the letter regarding the candidate. After due consideration, a vote will be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure. At least two-thirds of the Committee should be present to form a quorum. Members who will be absent should nevertheless study the candidate's file and submit an absentee vote. These votes are to be recorded together with the other votes at the time that the RPT Committee votes. There should be no separation of absentee votes from the other votes. The secretary will make a record of the votes (number voting for, number voting against, and the names of all those voting) and will prepare a summary of the meeting that includes the substance of the discussion, as well as the findings and recommendations of the RPT Committee. A draft of this letter will then be submitted to the other members of the Committee for possible changes or corrections, allowing not less than two days or more than five days, for their review. After modification as approved by the Committee, the summary report of the meeting, signed by the secretary and bearing the written approval of the RPT Committee Chair, will be forwarded by the secretary to the Department Chair. This letter should include a list of all faculty members present at the meeting or absent but voting. The Summary Report of the meeting must be extensive enough to cover all essential elements of the discussion. It should be submitted to the Chair by the end of the third week of October.

The minutes of the meeting should adequately cover the content of the discussion but should not attribute comments to individual participants. If the candidate waives the right to see external letters of evaluation, a brief summary of the contents of these confidential letters, along with brief but significant quotations from the letters, should be included in the RPT Committee's letter. No material should be included that allows an identification of the external reviewers. For joint appointed faculty, a summary of the contents of the letter of the relevant program must be included in the RPT Summary Report.

2. RPT Committee decisions with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion will be based only on those criteria that are appropriate as the basis of such decision making. These criteria are those which are related in a demonstrably reasonable way to successful performance of academic responsibilities and which neither discriminate on racial, sexual, or religious grounds nor inhibit the exercise of Constitutional rights. The criteria used in evaluating the academic performance of the individual under consideration should be in harmony with the criteria content in the Department policy on Retention, Tenure and Promotion.

J. Action by Department Chair

1. Recommendations — After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Department Chair prepares her or his written recommendation to be included in the RPT file. Specific reasons for these recommendations should be included in the Chair's letter.
2. Notice to candidates — Before forwarding the file to the Dean's Office, the Department Chair will send an exact copy of her or his evaluation to the faculty member being reviewed, a copy of the Department RPT Committee's letter, and, for joint appointed faculty, a copy of the letter from the relevant academic program.
3. Candidate's right to respond to an adverse recommendation — Upon receipt of the Chair's and the Committee's letters and, for joint appointed faculty, the letter from the relevant academic program, the candidate will have the opportunity, though not the obligation, to add a written statement in response to one or both of these letters to her or his formal review file. Written notice of this option is to be included with the copy of the Chair's evaluation that is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, it must be submitted to the Department Chair within seven days of the date upon which the Chair's evaluation was delivered to the candidate. Any written response or statement submitted by the candidate within this time limit will be added to the review file without comment by the Chair.
4. Forwarding files — By the end of the first week of November, the Department Chair forwards the entire file for each individual to the Dean of the College of Education.
5. Meeting with the candidate — After the review process at the department level is complete, the Department Chair together with the Chair of the Departmental RPT Committee will meet with each candidate to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Committee's and the Chair's

reports.

VII. Summary Timeline for RPT Procedures

Faculty to be reviewed are notified **March 1** of the preceding academic year.

The Chair of the **RPT** Committee should be elected in **April**.

Candidates should submit a list of five recommended external reviewers to the Department Chair by **May 1**.

In conjunction with the Department Chair, the RPT Chair will determine, contact, and select a minimum of three external reviewers. Solicitation of external reviews should begin in **May**. External review letters are due **September 1**.

The candidate must submit her or his personal statement, vitae, and two or three pieces of her/his strongest work to the Department Chair by **May 31** to be sent out to the external reviewers.

The SAC Committee, together with the SAC Chair, should be selected and begin its review of the candidate in **April**. The final report is due to the Department Chair by **August 31**.

The candidate must submit her or his complete file to the Department Chair by **August 31**.

Complete files for any joint appointed candidate will be sent to the relevant academic program on **September 1**.

The relevant academic program RPT letter for each joint- appointed candidate is due to the ECS Department **the third week of September**.

By **the third week of September**, a reader/secretary and secondary reader must be appointed for each candidate. The appointments are made by the RPT Chair in consultation with the Department Chair.

The RPT Committee meets on the **second Monday of October**.

Within a week of the meeting on which the decision was made for a candidate, the draft of the letters for that candidate should be submitted to the Committee for review.

By **the end of the third week of October**, the Secretary for the candidate submits the

Department RPT Committee's letter to the Chair of the Department, along with a signed copy for the candidate (to be forwarded with the Chair's own letter; see below).

By **the end of the first week in November**, The Chair of the Department submits her or his review letter to the Dean, along with a copy of the Departmental RPT letter. Copies of both letters are sent to the candidate at the same time.

VIII. Informal Reviews for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Informal reviews concerning retention, tenure, and promotion are conducted in a candidate's 2nd, 4th, and 6th years. The purpose of the informal review is formative and educative based on recommendations from the prior formal review. Faculty members being reviewed are encouraged to use this review to clarify questions or concerns they might have about the review process or about recommendations from the prior formal review. The basic standard for review is progress towards promotion and tenure based on the specific criteria outlined in this document.

Informal reviews require a brief personal statement from the candidate (not more than two pages) that describes the candidate's work since the last formal review (or since her or his appointment if no formal review has been conducted) and that outlines the faculty member's plans for the next year, teaching evaluations (to be included by the Department Chair), and a current vita, but no external review letters or other supporting documentation. The candidate is notified by the Department Chair by May 31st that an informal review is to take place in October. The faculty member's materials for the informal review are due by September 1. Joint appointed faculty are also reviewed by the relevant academic program.

Prior to the informal review, the faculty member's materials are reviewed by the Informal Review Committee, which consists of the Department Chair, the RPT Chair, and the candidate's faculty mentor (see p. 3). The review consists of an evaluation on the part of the Informal Review Committee and a meeting between the faculty member and the Informal Review Committee. This meeting is based on the materials submitted by the faculty member, the recommendations of the RPT committee from the prior formal review (if one has been conducted), and any questions that the faculty member might have about the Department's expectations regarding the criteria for teaching, research, and service outlined in this document.

Within one week after the meeting of the faculty member and the Informal Review Committee, the Chair (or designee) in consultation with the other members of the Informal Review Committee will write a report of the meeting. Upon receipt of the

report, the faculty member may within seven days make a written response for inclusion in the file. The report and the response, if any, are subsequently forwarded to the Dean's office. In cases where good progress toward promotion and tenure is not being made, the Department Chair in consultation with the other members of the Informal Review Committee may ask for a formal review in accordance with University procedures (PPM 9-5.1 Section B1). This formal review may result in termination of the faculty member's appointment at the University.

Revised January-August 2005
Approved by the faculty on August 18, 2005
Revisions 11/14/05