Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement for Tenure-line Faculty
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Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on May XX, 2015 and the Senior Vice President on October 1, 2015 for implementation on July 1, 2015.

This document serves as the Department of Family and Consumer Studies’ Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures required by University Policy. This statement is governed by the relevant University Policies, Policy 6-303, found at http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php, and Policy 6-311, found at http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php.

Mission of the Department of Family and Consumer Studies

The mission of FCS is to communicate, integrate, advance, and apply knowledge regarding human development and family relationships across the life span and within community, national, and international contexts.

As an interdisciplinary unit, we value diverse forms of scholarship as well as diversity in theoretical approaches and scientific methods. Whereas some discipline-based differences may exist in the criteria by which individual faculty activities are evaluated, all faculty members will be evaluated in terms of their contribution to the goals and development of our interdisciplinary department.
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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, 2015. 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 of Family and Consumer Studies will conduct either informal or formal reviews of its tenure-track candidates in each year of their probationary period as indicated in Table 1 below.

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

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

Table 1. Normal Review Schedule

<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>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (appointed without tenure)</td>
<td>1st, 2nd, 4th</td>
<td>3rd, 5th</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 Department Chair, in accord with 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, and based on the procedures, described in University Policy. Because early review cases require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress, few requests are made and few are granted. Candidates are
therefore encouraged to consult with the Department Chair, 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; teaching; and service to the profession, university, and community.

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 votes to conduct a formal review, a “triggered” 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 is not at issue in the review.

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

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

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

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

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member’s stature is based on the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research/other creative activity (hereafter referred to as “research”), (2) teaching, and (3) service. Performance in each of these three areas serves as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: excellent, effective, and not satisfactory. These standards will guide the FCS in evaluating candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure.

Faculty performance will be judged in the three areas of research, teaching, and service. Separating performance in these three areas is especially helpful in applying standards consistently across candidates. Nevertheless, the
three areas of performance are often closely linked. For example, research frequently serves community needs and addresses problems; similarly, teaching methods can be the subject of written scholarship. The department RPT Advisory Committee and Department Chair shall therefore attempt to balance the need to separate areas of faculty performance and the need to acknowledge their possible linkages.

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 described in this document. 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, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

The extensive list of performance indicators provided below in no way implies that every faculty member must perform at a specific level on all indicators. Rather, the list illustrates the kinds of indicators that may be appropriately applied in a given case.

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. In addition, our faculty members belong to a variety of professional associations and will be guided by the appropriate codes of professional conduct for the organizations to which they belong (e.g., American Psychological Association’s Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct).

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A decision to retain an untenured faculty member during a formal review will occur in cases where the candidate shows evidence of reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. That is, there is a reasonable expectation that the faculty member will achieve excellence in research and effectiveness in teaching and service by the time of the tenure review. For the first few years as an assistant professor it is important to establish an independent research program that shows evidence it will achieve high quality, sustained quantity, and a programmatic nature over time. In teaching, it is important to develop a range of classes that serve departmental needs and show evidence of effectiveness. During the pre-tenure probationary period, faculty members are discouraged from excessive levels of service; substantial levels of service by non-tenured faculty should be undertaken only when the service also adds strength to the faculty member’s teaching and/or research portfolio.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of excellent in research and at least effectiveness in the areas of teaching and 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 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, with a requirement that one’s departmental service be excellent. A Professor is expected to have achieved significant recognition and prominence as a scholar, educator, and member of the University of Utah community. Time in the rank of Associate Professor is not a factor in consideration to promotion to Professor.
3.2 Evaluation of Research

In fulfilling its mission of understanding individuals, households, communities, and society and improving quality of life, the Department encourages a diverse range of scholarly products. More traditional scholarly products include: publication of original research papers in refereed journals and conference proceedings; publication of research monographs, book chapters, and book reviews; presentations at conferences, workshops, colloquia, or seminars; and research grants and contracts sought and obtained.

Some forms of scholarship encouraged by the Department (e.g., policy analysis, program evaluation, translational research, participatory action research, or community-engaged research) may yield innovative and high quality scholarly products that go beyond traditional research outlets. To enhance engagement and impact, scholars may also create multimedia products or technological innovations (e.g., software, videos, and exhibitions with associated commentary) or contribute to entrepreneurial activities (e.g., partnering with non-profit organizations to advance scholarship or scholarly products).

As well as diversity in the types of scholarship produced, the Department encourages use of the full range of quantitative and qualitative scholarly methodologies and diverse data sources. For example, some approaches will emphasize nationally representative data sets and prioritize generalizability of findings. Other research approaches will examine small, strategically-selected populations in search of deep understanding of social processes. Still other research will focus on the needs of particular communities and evaluations of community-level interventions. Assessments of faculty research in the RPT process should reflect the professional context of the candidate.

a. Dimensions of research.

The Department of Family and Consumer Studies expects candidates to contribute significantly and distinctly to the development and dissemination of new knowledge through research and publication of research results. Performance in terms of research will be evaluated along four essential dimensions. These dimensions refer to the sustained, quality, programmatic nature, and intellectual independence of a candidate’s work. As indicated above, a finding of excellence requires that research is: (1) sustained, with products at multiple stages of the research process; (2) high in quality; (3) programmatic, in the sense that research efforts are focused on a coherent set of issues and result in cumulative knowledge; and (4) strongly indicative of intellectual independence. With respect to intellectual independence, the interdisciplinary nature of the Department ensures that faculty members are often engaged in collaborative scholarship that tackles complex issues and employs diverse methodologies. Accordingly, intellectual independence is assessed within a context that values effective teamwork and collaboration with colleagues and community partners.

When considered for tenure, the sustained pattern of research needed to demonstrate excellence in research can be achieved through a series of shorter publications (e.g., journal articles and book chapters) over time or an extended contribution, such as a book. If a faculty member has adopted more than one thematic line of research, each thematic line will be evaluated in terms of its overall contribution to a high-quality program of research. The establishment of independence in research is essential, but because of the interdisciplinary nature of the FCS department, the faculty also strongly encourages collaborative work. Developing external funding for research – whether from governmental agencies, foundations, public-private partnerships, or private sources – is highly desirable for its ability to enhance a faculty member’s productivity. Although securing external funding for research is not an essential prerequisite for tenure or promotion, applying for funding is strongly encouraged. Both seeking and achieving funding will be positive considerations for tenure and promotion. At the point of promotion, the expectation is that faculty will be supervising undergraduate and/or graduate student projects (e.g., non-thesis projects, theses, dissertations) as well as assisting on graduate student committees.
As a candidate’s career progresses in the post-tenure period toward the rank of Professor, there is an increasingly strong expectation that the candidate’s research will have a positive and documented impact on his/her fields of specialization as well as significant recognition at the national and or international level. Impact and recognition appropriate to the rank of Professor can be reflected in numerous and diverse activities/accomplishments. Examples may include: regular publications of important articles in major journals and/or research monographs; research-related service on community, national, or international boards; significant translational or community-engaged research products; invited chapters in important scholarly books; high citation frequencies; external grants, contracts, or foundation awards or support for research through private or entrepreneurial sources; appointment to editorships or editorial boards of major journals; service on grant review panels; and/or other leadership contributions to the community or profession.

b. Indicators of research performance:

The following indicators are used to determine whether performance with respect to research is excellent, effective, or not satisfactory. A determination of excellence does not require that a candidate excel in along all of the indicators. Rather, an overall pattern of excellence must be demonstrated.

1. Professional judgment of research by department colleagues; this judgment may arise from reading publications, hearing presentations of research within classes, seminars, or public venues; and collaborative relationships. All faculty are invited to submit a written assessment of the candidate’s qualifications to be included in her/his file.

2. Professional judgment by experts in the field outside of the Department and University in the form of:
   a. letters of reference from colleagues, community partners, and, especially, those from external evaluators,
   b. published reviews of candidate’s publications,
   c. citations or other uses of the candidate’s work,
   d. special awards/honors in recognition of scholarly contributions and,
   e. invitations or elections to serve in professional “gatekeeper” positions, such as being a journal editor, a member of an editorial board, grant review panel member, or a conference organizer;

3. Quantity and quality of published work, such as journal articles, book chapters, and books. It is not expected that every faculty member will publish in all types of outlets or that all publications will appear in outlets of the highest quality. There must be, however, a significant amount of published work with enough appearing in high quality outlets to demonstrate excellence in the totality of a faculty member’s scholarship.

Quality indicators for publications may include, but are not limited to: the reputation, visibility, and impact of publication outlets. For example, high quality publication houses for books and chapters; part of a series of established high-impact publications, such as a handbook series; journals associated with high impact scores and/or well-respected professional associations; journals with high ranking within the specialty, regardless of impact scores; and quality of the editorial board may be used to assess the quality of published work.

4. Applied/community-based products. The value of this type of work may not be sufficiently captured through publication in traditional journals, chapters, and books. Therefore, faculty members are encouraged to document additional products of their scholarship (e.g., technical reports) that demonstrate scholarly excellence.

Translational scholarship may be co-created and disseminated in various ways and positive impact may be conveyed by, for example, page views, citations, or downloads of creatively disseminated scholarly products. Quality indicators of applied and/or community-based scholarship may include, but are not limited to, programmatic adoptions of innovative community interventions; outcomes of effective community interventions (e.g., sustainable tutoring programs, enhanced graduation rates); development/adoptions of sustainability standards for an organization; enhanced fund-raising as a result of an evaluation; commitments by
governmental agencies to address community problems identified by the research; reviews of multimedia products or technology innovations (software, videos, exhibits with associated commentary) that advance scholarship; and entrepreneurial activities that advance scholarly goals.

5. Presentations, lectures, and addresses at international, national, regional, and local conferences, including invitations to be keynote or plenary speakers;

6. Extramural and intramural research grants or contracts, both funded and unfunded; and

7. Work in progress, working papers, and other unpublished work.

These general indicators of scholarly performance are not listed in order or importance. Nor are they necessarily weighted equally. Most of them will be relevant, however, in the assessment of any given faculty member’s level of research performance.

With respect to the indicators listed above, the significant scholarly recognition and impact expected at the Professor level can be reflected in numerous and diverse activities/accomplishments. Examples may include: regular publications of important articles in major journals and/or research monographs; research-related service on community, national, or international boards; translational or community-engaged research products; invited chapters in important scholarly books; citation frequencies; external grants, contracts, or foundation awards or support for research through private or entrepreneurial sources; appointment to editorships or editorial boards of major journals; service on grant review panels; and/or other leadership contributions to the community or profession.

**Summary Rating Scale for Research.** Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research as described above.

**Excellent:** The candidate has made important contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent and substantial agenda in at least one topic area. A finding of excellence requires that research is: (1) sustained, with products at multiple stages of the research process; (2) high in quality; (3) programmatic, in the sense that research efforts are focused on a coherent set of issues and result in cumulative knowledge; and (4) strongly indicative of intellectual independence. When one is considered for tenure, a finding of excellence requires research that is (1) sustained, with products at multiple stages of the research process; (2) high in quality; (3) programmatic, in the sense that research efforts are focused on a coherent set of issues and result in cumulative knowledge; and (4) strongly indicative of intellectual independence. When considered for Professor, sustained excellence in research requires that a candidate has an original and productive research program supported by sustained and high quality publications. In addition, sustained excellence entails achieving favorable recognition and impact as a scholar at the community, national, and/or international level.

**Effective:** The candidate has made good initial 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 few meaningful contributions.

### 3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

#### a. Dimensions of teaching.

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

Because there is substantial diversity in ways of learning, student talents, and faculty styles, there is no single formula for demonstrating effective teaching. In addition, the needs of undergraduate and graduate students vary. Nevertheless, the determination of the level of teaching effectiveness will typically examine the following aspects of teaching performance to determine whether there have been substantial contributions in instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring:

1. ability to communicate knowledge;
2. maintenance of rigorous standards of course content and student performance;
3. stimulation of student interest, ability to apply knowledge, critical thinking, and life-long learning;
4. incorporation of scholarship, both classic and recent, into coursework;
5. promotion of interaction with and among students, both inside and outside the classroom;
6. provision of timeliness and thorough feedback on written work;
7. ability and willingness to offer a variety of student classroom experiences that meet student and departmental needs, such as large introductory classes and small specialized classes, online or hybrid courses, face-to-face classes, community-engaged research classes, classes built around community-engaged learning, and classes that meet university criteria for graduation (e.g., international, diversity, quantitative, communication/writing);
8. supervision of undergraduate independent study and internship projects and/or student signature experiences;
9. service on graduate student committees, serving as members of graduate committees, mentoring graduate students with teaching responsibilities, and informal guidance and mentoring of students;
10. articulation and implementation of a coherent teaching philosophy;
11. contribution to non-departmental, educational programs (e.g., Honors; Health, Society and Policy; Gender Studies; Ethnic Studies; Environmental and Sustainability Studies; Master’s in Public Policy and Masters in Public Administration) and professional teaching forums; and
12. pursuit of improvement and innovation in teaching and assistance in the improvement of peers (e.g., participation in continuing education concerning teaching, inviting peer teaching assessments).

b. Indicators of teaching performance:

It is important that there are multiple indicators of the quality of a candidate’s teaching. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate’s course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy and/or accomplishments 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.

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. When considered for Professor, sustained effectiveness requires responsiveness to departmental needs and sustained mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made few meaningful contributions in teaching.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

a. Dimensions of Service

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) community or 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. Evaluation of service reflects the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas listed above.

Professional service 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 attending 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.

University service takes place at the levels of the Department, College 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. Given that the Department of Family and Consumer Studies is a small academic unit, department service is especially important. Additionally, service activities that involve the administration and governance of departmental programs, the Department as a whole, and the University are highly valued.

Community or public service typically applies a candidate’s scholarly expertise in various local, regional, national, and international community settings. This type of service 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). Service commitments that are unrelated to a candidate’s scholarly expertise, regardless of their duration or impact, are not deemed relevant to the evaluation of a candidate’s performance as a faculty member.

When viewed in their entirety, candidates are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in the breadth and depth of their service activities. Breadth involves blending contributions to internal constituencies (Department, College/University) and external ones (profession and community). Depth refers to the intensity, quality, and impact of a candidate’s involvement in any particular service activity.

b. Indicators of service performance:

1. Professional judgment by department colleagues based on:
   a. statement of service philosophy,
b. evidence of effective participation and leadership in service roles,
c. evidence of results and products of service activities, and
d. peer review of service activities.

2. professional judgment by outside experts expressed by:
   a. letters of reference,
   b. publications and presentations on the subject of service,
   c. evaluations of products of service activities, and
d. honors and awards.

3. indicators to be described in the review file or service statement that detail service to the Department, College/University, community, or profession:
   a. reviews submitted to journals and/or summary statements of the extent of review work,
   b. service on grant review panels,
   c. membership and duties for community or professional organizations,
   d. administrative service (committees, task forces, special assignments),
   e. leadership in service (elected and appointed positions, memberships, chair positions),
   f. membership on editorial boards or editorships; editing books,
   g. participation in university-related committees,
   h. unpaid consultation to community boards, bureaus, agencies, etc. that draw upon a faculty member’s scholarly expertise, and
   i. community outreach activities that evidence professional expertise, such as op-ed articles, television interviews, blogs, public lectures, participation in discussion panels.

**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, important, and 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. When considered for Professor, in order to demonstrate sustained effectiveness, one’s service contributions should grow toward increasing responsibility, involving important contributions to departmental/college/University service needs, external agencies (e.g., community, national, or international agencies or organizations), and/or professional organizations. Because substantial service within the Department is essential to departmental functioning, excellent departmental citizenship is a prerequisite for promotion to professor.

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made few meaningful 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. **Student Advisory Committee (SAC).** The SAC is a committee made up of a mix of undergraduate and graduate students in the FCS Department. At the request of the SAC, separate reports may be submitted for an undergraduate and graduate SAC.

c. **Peer Teaching Reviewers.** Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching.

d. **External Evaluators.** These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and 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, or the advisor or mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

e. **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.

f. **RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson.** The Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the FCS faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.

g. **Dean.** The Dean is the administrative head of the College of Social and Behavioral Science.

4.2 **Informal Review Procedures**

Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place during the Spring Semester in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted. The first year informal review is typically devoted exclusively to matters of effective file preparation. The following procedures apply for all informal reviews.

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, 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 February 1.

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 January 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
Department prior to March 1. 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 academic institutions may 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 a secretary to review the candidate’s file and meet with the candidate to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the review file. The entire RPT Advisory Committee then meets and discusses the candidate’s file, after which the secretary summarizes the Committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s 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 Department Chair, after studying the candidate’s record, report of the RPT Advisory Committee, and any response from the candidate, shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, the Department Chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Department Chair or members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format. Many of the procedures described below include deadlines. Although we expect all parties in the formal review to meet their deadlines, small deviations from these deadlines are unlikely to constitute errors in the formal review process.

a. Department Chair and Candidate Responsibilities.

By March 15, the department faculty will elect a Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee for the coming academic year. All tenure-line members may vote, and the vote shall be by secret ballot.

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.

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 30 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 September 15. The unit will have access to the candidate’s file of research, teaching, and service materials by August 15. 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(s) of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30 and ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation. The RPT Advisory Committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that the SAC report will be finished and delivered to the
Department Chair by September 22. The Department Chair or Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee must provide the candidate’s relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than September 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 in written form.

By May 1, the Department Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered. Any submissions must be received by August 15.

b. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chair shall ensure that the 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. These reviews will follow the department protocol.

c. External Evaluators. For each candidate being reviewed, the Department Chair will request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters. The candidate’s list of potential reviewers should provide contact information for the evaluators, detail the qualifications of the evaluators, and describe their relationship, if any, to the candidate. The list should identify five potential reviewers. Receipt of these nominations and the signing of the form by the candidate should take place by May 15. At this time, the candidates should also provide the Department Chair with a current vita; a professional statement describing current activities and future plans with respect to research; and copies of published research and major work in progress. This file is the “preliminary research file.”

By May 15, the Department Chair shall request the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee to provide a list of at least five potential evaluators of the candidate’s research. This should be compiled in consultation with all members of the RPT Advisory Committee. The list of potential reviewers should provide contact information for the evaluators, detail the qualifications of the evaluators, and describe any known relationships to the candidate. The list should be provided to the Department Chair by June 1. The Chair and members of the RPT Advisory Committee may examine the candidate’s vita, professional statement, and published work in determining appropriate outside evaluators.

Using the lists provided by the candidate being reviewed and the RPT Advisory Committee, the Department Chair will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. The Department Chair should endeavor to obtain at least one external evaluator from the candidate’s list and at least one external evaluator from the RPT Advisory Committee’s list. By July 1, the Department Chair will send potential external evaluators a solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has waived the right to see the evaluations. In soliciting letters of evaluation and when the candidate has waived his or her right to see the letters, the Department Chair must describe to the evaluators the Department’s intent to share with the candidate, to the maximum extent consistent with the preservation of reviewer confidentiality, the contents and exact wording of letters. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations, along with their vita, no later than September 15.

c. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate’s file will close no later than August 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the RPT Advisory Committee meeting). The file is kept in the Department’s main office under the supervision of the Administrative Assistant or in the secure electronic system provide by the university. Hard copies of the confidential parts of the file, such as the signed external evaluator letters, are kept in a locked file by a departmental staff person. No additions to the file may be made by the candidate after this time without the written permission of the Chair of the department RPT Advisory Committee after consultation with the Associate Vice President for Faculty.
1) **Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents.** Prior to August 15, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson the “final file.” This file should contain: (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, teaching, and service), and (iv) any additional material that the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation of his/her performance with respect to the criteria, dimensions, and indicators described in this document. The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

2) **Department Responsibilities for File Contents.** By September 22, 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.

d. **Candidate’s Rights to Comment on File.** Starting September 23, the candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of his or her file contents – including the SAC report – no later than five business days after the file has been made available (generally by October 1). The candidate does **not** have access to any external evaluator letters to which access has been waived via the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

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

**Department RPT Advisory Committee Action.** The RPT Advisory Committee consists of all department faculty members who have attained a rank above the current rank of the person being reviewed. A quorum of the RPT Advisory Committee meets on one or more occasions to decide the reviews; a quorum is two-thirds of the eligible members, excluding those on leave or with disabilities that preclude attendance.

The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet 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, 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 separate secret ballot on any recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and tenure (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, other parties in the review process 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 made available by the Committee Secretary for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days but no more than five business days,
and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall obtain the signatures of all faculty members participating in the vote. Once this is complete, the RPT Advisory Committee Chair will forward the summary report to the Department Chair and the candidate. This should occur no later than November 1.

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. Similarly, candidates should not ask questions about the Committee’s deliberations of individual members of the RPT Advisory Committee.

**Department Chair Action.** After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Department Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation by November 15. An exact copy of the Department Chair’s recommendation, including specific reasons for the recommendation, will be provided to the candidate and included in the candidate’s file. When the right to see the external evaluators’ letters has been waived, the Department Chair will provide copies of the letters to the candidates after any potentially-identifying reviewer information has been redacted to protect reviewer privacy. Reviewers will be notified in advance of this practice. Candidates will receive these letters upon receipt of the letter from the chair.

Upon receipt of the Chair’s 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 and/or the recommendation of the Department Chair. By December 1, the file will then be conveyed to the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science.

**Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level.** Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy. These include, but are not limited to, action by the College RPT Advisory Committee, the Dean, the cognizant vice president, and President.
Appendices

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 you began your 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.
   e. All graduate student committees you have served on or chaired.
   f. Individual student research supervised.
   g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
   h. Service activities for the University, profession, and community.

2. **Personal Statement.** This document should detail your accomplishments as well as your future plans in research, teaching, and service, and include a description of your 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 as you choose. You should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and SAC(s) to use this material for their reports.

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

6. **Candidate response(s)** to any other file contents, if desired.
Department’s Responsibility

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

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

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

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

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

5. Copies of all prior years’ RPT files.

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

7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the 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 RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson)