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**A. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies**

The Department of History Retention, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures are subordinate to, and at all times shall conform to, University Regulations regarding RPT, primarily 6-303 and 6-311.

**1. General Philosophy**

The Department of History Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies and Procedures are intended to provide candidates for retention, promotion and tenure with the
standards that will be applied in reviews of their performance, as well as the procedures to be followed in these reviews.

The Department of History affirms the importance of a tripartite professional commitment to publication, teaching and service. It assumes that its faculty will strive for excellence in each category, while recognizing that only rarely will an individual attain equal distinction in all three. Rather, each member, possessing special commitments and talents, has unique and equally valuable contributions to make to the composite departmental achievement. Concerning retention, promotion and tenure, each member shall be judged on overall performance.

The department considers the adoption of a detailed set of inflexible standards concerning retention, promotion and tenure to be both unnecessary and unwise. Professional advancement is a highly individualized process in which many factors (some of which are subjective and intangible) are operative. Yet it is important for each member of the department to be apprised of the basic criteria by which his/her performance shall be judged and his/her progress determined.

Candidates for retention, promotion and tenure in the Department of History must meet the minimum standards of service, teaching, and publication set forth in this policy statement. However, minimal performance will not result in automatic promotion or tenure. Personal behavior will not be considered unless it becomes detrimental to effective departmental or university performance (in keeping with the expectations of responsible faculty conduct per University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b).

2. RPT Standards

a. Retention

Candidates for retention are expected to be making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion. In scholarship, candidates for retention should demonstrate good progress toward the publication of a monograph or five substantial refereed articles. The department also expects that candidates for retention will begin to develop a larger scholarly profile, as demonstrated, for example, by presenting scholarly papers, especially at national and international conferences and symposia; publishing book reviews and essays; and being
awarded grants for support of their scholarship. In teaching, the department expects candidates for retention to demonstrate emerging effectiveness in the classroom. In service, candidates for retention should be starting to make a contribution both to the department and in some larger context—either in the university, in the profession, or in the community.

b. Tenure and promotion to associate professor from assistant professor.

Candidates for tenure and promotion from assistant professor to associate professor are expected to have achieved scholarly excellence in their fields, especially through the preparation of a refereed book manuscript that has been accepted for publication by a reputable scholarly press or the publication of five substantial refereed articles. The department expects that candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor will also have developed a larger scholarly profile, as demonstrated, for example, by presenting papers, especially at national and international conferences and symposia; publishing book reviews and essays; and being awarded grants for support of their scholarship. In teaching, candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should have a demonstrated record of effectiveness in the classroom. In service, candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should have made significant contributions at the department level and have a maturing service profile in the university, the profession, and/or the community. As provided in University Policy 6-303-III-a-1-c: “Granting tenure is regarded as the University's most critical personnel decision. Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be awarded to faculty members prior to their advancement to the rank of Associate Professor.”

c. Award of Tenure to Candidate hired as Associate Professor or Professor

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 he or she 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. In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a professor.
d. Promotion to Full Professor.

While University Regulations do not specify a period, the History department considers five to seven years as the ordinary minimum time in the rank of Associate Professor before consideration for promotion to Professor. Applicants for promotion in less time than this must present an unusually strong case.

Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to demonstrate significant professional accomplishment beyond the level they had achieved for tenure in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. In scholarship, the emphasis at this level, even more than in tenure cases, must be on the quality and national recognition of published work. General expectations of the Department will be that the candidate will have published a monograph or a substantial number of articles while in the associate rank; that such publications will be of very high quality and represent original contributions to knowledge; and that such work will be able to gain the wide and strong support of representative colleagues inside and outside the University of Utah. In teaching, candidates for promotion to professor should have a sustained record of teaching effectiveness. In service, candidates for promotion to professor should have demonstrated leadership in the department, the university, the profession, and/or the community.

3. RPT Criteria

a. Research and Publication

Research and publication is expected of every member of the academic community. It is closely connected to decisions regarding retention, promotion and tenure. Candidates for these attainments are expected to produce scholarly articles and, ultimately, scholarly monographs. Quality is more important than quantity at all levels. Candidates are expected to give evidence of a profile of scholarship that will indicate an active, ongoing, and substantive commitment to research and publication. While no numerical statement regarding quantity can ever replace the emphasis on quality, the department affirms normally a base level of five articles or one book as a minimum effort to warrant consideration for the award of tenure. For purposes of evaluating publications, a book shall be defined as a monograph (anthologies which consist of edited collections of articles, reprints of documents or essays, and textbooks shall be considered as supplemental
publications); an article shall be defined as an essay that appears in either an edited collection of original writing or a publication whose contributions are scrutinized by an independent board of editors. Evidence of final acceptance of a manuscript by a press or journal shall be deemed the equivalent of publication. Publications must represent significant contributions to historical knowledge and demonstrate professional skills of a high order.

The History Department recognizes that, in some cases, candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure may make significant scholarly contributions through electronic publication. The Department will accept electronic books and articles as part of a candidate’s retention, promotion, and tenure file when the candidate can demonstrate that those publications have been subjected to peer review.

b. Teaching

The department affirms the importance of teaching in both the undergraduate and graduate programs; it recognizes that effective instruction is vital not only to the academic community but also to society as a whole. It has been and shall continue to be the policy of the department to give careful consideration to instructional performance in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure. Effective teaching across the undergraduate and graduate curriculum is a sine qua non for membership in the department and advancement through the professional ranks.

In order to create a profile on the teaching of a given instructor, information should be gathered from as many sources as possible. The student course evaluations conducted by the University are but one assessment. Other important sources are course syllabi, the reports of the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Advisory Committees, reports from Undergraduate Studies and the Honors Program (when appropriate or when applicable), and the judgment of other faculty members who have formally visited the classroom as expressed in peer visit reports from the Department Teaching Committee and the ad hoc committee.

c. Service
The History Department considers service to be an integral part of one's professional growth, and it urges members to seek and accept opportunities to serve the department, the university, the community, and the historical profession. The following guidelines shall be used to evaluate service as it relates to retention, promotion and tenure:

1. Routine service on departmental, college and university committees and other support activities such as student advising are expected of every faculty member. It is hoped that members will render service above and beyond routine committee assignments. Performance of a variety of services in several areas of departmental and university administration shall be given due consideration in matters of retention, promotion and tenure.

2. As professional historians, faculty members are expected to perform duties essential to the growth of their profession such as writing book reviews, participating in conferences and conventions, rendering advisory or editorial services to journals, and holding office in professional organizations.

3. Academically related service to the wider community can also be a significant part of a candidate's service profile.

4. Although service alone shall not be sufficient to warrant retention, promotion or tenure, it shall be considered as an important dimension of the candidate's composite record.

**B. RPT Procedures**

1. **Participants**

   The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews conducted by the Department of History

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

   b. RPT Advisory Committee. Membership in and voting on the RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy 6-303-III-A-3. Only members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend and participate in its meetings.
c. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee shall be elected annually during the Spring Semester from the ranks of the tenured full professors of the department.

d. ad hoc committee. A committee of three members, all of whom are eligible to vote on the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure, appointed by the elected Chair of the RPT Advisory committee in consultation with the candidate. One member of the ad hoc committee shall be designated as its chair by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair.

e. Department Chair. The administrative head of the Department of History.

f. Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee. A Committee made up of representatives of undergraduate History majors.

g. Graduate Student Advisory Committee. A committee made up of representatives of graduate History students.

h. Department of History Teaching Committee. The Teaching Committee of the Department of History, elected in conformity with Department Procedures.

i. External Reviewers. The scholars selected by the ad hoc committee, the Department Chair, and the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, in consultation with the candidate, to provide reviews of the candidate’s scholarly work.

2. Probationary period and reviews schedule.

All nontenured tenure-track faculty shall be reviewed for retention annually, either by a formal or an informal review. In the third, fifth and seventh years, formal review is mandatory; "tenure review" must be held in the seventh year of service for an Assistant Professor, or the fifth year of service for an Associate Professor.

There is no automatic conferral of tenure in cases of promotion to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor; whenever a candidate is being considered for both promotion and tenure, separate votes are taken on each action, with the vote for promotion preceding that for tenure. In order to be considered for promotion, all candidates must apply to the chairperson of the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee.
According to University Policy, “The probationary period may be shortened under those unusual circumstances in which the University determines that it can assess the individual's qualifications in a shorter period of time.” (University Policy 6-311-4-B) Such a situation can occur in two ways: (1) when the candidate has demonstrated relevant accomplishments through prior service elsewhere or (2) when the candidate demonstrates the required achievements in less time than the normal review period. In either case, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the pertinent RPT criteria. Candidates shall serve a minimum of one year before being considered for tenure unless granted tenure at the time of appointment. Detailed information about shortening the probationary period is contained in University Policy 6-311.

The probationary period may be lengthened in conformity with relevant University policies (See Policies 6-311, 6-314, 6-315).

3. Informal Reviews.

Informal reviews of tenure-eligible faculty shall normally take place in the first, second, fourth, and sixth years of the probationary period (except in the case of a request for early tenure).

a. The file for an informal review shall ordinarily consist of an up-to-date vita and a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas. These should be submitted by the candidate to the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair prior to the close of files on September 30, and should reflect progress as of September 30. The candidate may also submit relevant supplementary material at that time.

b. In the case of joint appointments, program directors shall be notified in writing of the informal review by April 10 and invited to submit a letter from the director or a program report on the candidate's progress toward tenure. Program materials should also be submitted to the department prior to the close of files on September 30.

c. The History Department RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15 to consider informal reviews. Each member of the committee is responsible for reviewing the
files before the meeting. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention. The secretary, who is to be designated by the RPT Advisory Committee chair, shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare minutes of the meeting reflecting the nature of the discussion.

d. After studying the candidate's file, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. The department chairperson shall meet with each candidate under informal review prior to December 1 to discuss the candidate's progress and the contents of the RPT Advisory Committee report and the chair's letter.

e. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her informal review file in response to the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee and/or the chairperson's letter. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation. If the candidate chooses to respond, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.

f. The informal review materials shall be delivered to the dean no later than January 31. The informal review concludes at this point.

g. Triggering formal retention reviews. In conformity with University Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, "if a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the Department Chair or department RPT Advisory Committee … may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following academic year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate."

4. Formal Reviews – Candidate, Department Chair, RPT Advisory Committee Chair and Ad Hoc Committee Responsibilities
a. Procedures to be followed for third-year, fifth-year, tenure, and promotion (both to Associate Professor and Full Professor) reviews will follow the same format, except that in a third-year review the evaluation of the candidate's performance and work will be done in-house and will not involve solicitation by the ad hoc committee or Department Chair of external reviews. External evaluations may be solicited by the candidate; these evaluations, however, will be selected and solicited solely by the candidate, and will not be considered confidential.

b. By April 1, the Department Chair shall determine the obligatory RPT Reviews for the upcoming academic year and shall notify, by letter, faculty required to be reviewed. The chair shall also request nominations for internal and external reviewers from the faculty being reviewed as appropriate and request that they sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of evaluation letters. (see Appendix A and B)

c. By March 1, the Department Chair shall notify the faculty, by letter, of the upcoming RPT reviews and invite tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Department Chair by March 7. (see Appendix C)

d. If a faculty member being reviewed holds a joint appointment in another academic program such as Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies or the Middle East Center, the Department Chair shall notify said program in writing no later than April 10. (see Appendix D)

e. The Department Chair shall notify the History Undergraduate and Graduate Student Advisory Committees of faculty undergoing formal review by April 10. (see Appendix E) These reports should be based on the guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson (University Policy 6-303-III-C-3). The SAC reports shall be due to the elected chair of the RPT Advisory Committee no later than September 15. If the USAC or GSAC fails to provide a report by the deadline, it will be deemed to have waived its right to make a recommendation. The absence of a SAC report shall not be deemed prejudicial to the candidate by the RPT Advisory Committee, nor may it be the basis for a complaint by a faculty member appealing an adverse decision by the RPT Advisory Committee.
f. Ad Hoc Committees. By April 15, the elected chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint an ad hoc committee of three members (in the candidate’s special field where possible), all of whom are eligible to vote on the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure. No faculty member shall chair more than one ad hoc committee per year.

g. Prior to the end of spring semester the chair of the RPT Advisory Committee shall call a meeting of the department chair, heads of the ad hoc committees and the candidates for formal review and promotion to clarify procedures to be followed, the responsibilities of the candidates and of the committees, and to assure that all committees will act in a uniform manner.

h. The ad hoc committees shall meet with the candidate at least twice, once before the end of spring semester at the beginning of their review, and once at the end. At the first meeting the candidate and the committee will discuss the list of outside reviewers in his/her field generated according to the procedures outlined in section "i" below. The committee will be responsible for providing a statement describing the qualifications of the reviewers, their relationship to the candidate and methods of selection. A second meeting between the ad hoc committee and the candidate is required no sooner than two days after the Ad Hoc Committee Report has been drafted and shown to the candidate and at least 2 working days prior to the closing of the file. At this meeting, the ad hoc committee will discuss the report with the candidate. The ad hoc committee may consider changes to the report at this time, but is under no obligation to alter the report prior to its being placed in the file.

i. External Evaluators.

The ad hoc committee, department chair and department RPT Advisory Committee chair shall generate, in consultation with the candidate for formal review, a list of potential reviewers of the candidate’s work. Some of the reviewers selected should be persons who have no direct association with the candidate. All reviewers selected should be persons who 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. Normally, no reviewer will be asked to assess a candidate's file more than once during his or her probationary period. The reviews solicited by the committee shall be limited to names from that list. All letters
evaluating the candidate's work shall be solicited by the committee using a standard solicitation letter. All evaluators will be supplied with a standard form on which the evaluation is to be written (see Appendix F, G, H). External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 1.

If one or more prospective reviewers decline to evaluate the candidate's file, the committee chair will proceed down the list of potential reviewers. If the entire list is exhausted before the specified number of reviewers has agreed to serve, the ad hoc committee, the candidate, the RPT Advisory Committee chair, and the department chair will reconvene to expand the list as necessary.

The basic and ultimate evaluation of the candidate is made in-house, but these external evaluations provide necessary supplemental information upon which the RPT Advisory committee will, in part, base its decision.

(1) There are no external reviewers used in third year reviews.

(2) During the fifth year review the list shall include names of nine individuals, three of whom will be chosen by the ad hoc committee to review the candidate's file.

(3) During the tenure review the list shall consist of 12 names, four of whom will be asked to submit reviews.

(4) For promotion to full professor, the list shall include names of 15 individuals, five of whom will be asked to review the candidate's file.

j. Teaching evaluation.

The Department of History staff will provide both the Department Teaching Committee and the ad hoc committee with a statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate’s most recent previous formal review.

The Department Teaching Committee shall prepare a report that shall include the statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate’s most recent previous formal review (provided by the Department staff); a summary of written comments from student evaluations generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review; and a peer classroom visit report prepared by a member of the Teaching Committee.
The ad hoc committee shall gather all pertinent data on the candidate’s teaching performance, including any materials the candidate wishes to submit; the statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review; a summary of written comments from student evaluations generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review; and a peer classroom visit report prepared by a member of the ad hoc committee.

k. Candidate Responsibilities

Prior to the end of spring semester, the candidate is obligated to supply the ad hoc committee with a current vita, copies of publications and papers, reviews of published work, and any additional relevant material. The candidate’s vita should list all courses taught with course numbers, titles, and credit hours. Prior to the preparation of the ad hoc committee report, the candidate shall submit a personal statement for inclusion in the file that includes a summary of the candidate’s progress to date in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas.

l. RPT File contents

University requirements for the structure and contents of a candidate's file are detailed in University Policy 6-303. In addition to the contents therein specified, History candidates' files must contain a report from the Department Teaching Committee, a personal statement prepared by the candidate, and a summary report on the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service prepared by the ad hoc committee.

m. Ad Hoc Committee Report.

The ad hoc committee will as a whole make a report summarizing its findings. The report will summarize the candidate's record in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service and will include a report of a peer classroom visit by a member of the ad hoc committee. This peer visit is separate from, and independent of, the peer report prepared by the Department Teaching Committee. The report will be fact-finding in nature only; it should be neither advocatory nor adversarial. An appearance of bias destroys its value. This report and all other data of pertinence to the formal review shall be placed in the file before the closing date set by University regulations.
n. Joint Appointments.

When a candidate is jointly appointed in an academic program, the department chair, prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered. Academic program faculty as defined by procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation that shall be sent to the department chair, along with any candidate response, prior to the closing date of the file set by University regulations.

The recommendation of the academic program will be included in the candidate's file, which will then be reviewed by the department according to its established procedures. In accordance with University Policy 6-303, the department RPT Advisory Committee shall discuss and consider the program report as part of its deliberations.

o. Candidate’s Rights to Comment on File.

The candidate is entitled to see his/her review file, including the ad hoc committee's report, upon request, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department. The chair of the ad hoc committee is to convey to the candidate the sense of the outside evaluations. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the file is officially closed.

It is the ad hoc committee chair's responsibility to consult with the candidate about the completeness of the file prior to the closure of the file.

p. File Closing Date

The file shall be completed for review by the department RPT Advisory Committee no later than September 30. No additional materials may be added after that time, except in accordance with University Policies.

5. Promotion to Full Professor

Procedures for promotion to full professor shall follow the same procedures as described in 4 a-p above.
6. Action of the RPT Advisory Committee

a. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15, hear the report of the ad hoc committee, debate and vote orally. Each member of the committee is responsible for reviewing the files before the meeting.

b. Wherever practicable, the RPT Advisory Committee chair, acting on behalf of the department chairperson, shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent, of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

c. Individual members must state the reasons for either positive or negative votes. The votes and justifications will be recorded, with no identification of specific voters.

d. Only eligible members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee, in conformity with University Policy 6-303-III-A-3, may participate in the discussion. The department chairperson may attend, but should abstain from participation unless upon invitation by a majority vote of the committee. The Department Chair cannot vote. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded.

e. After due consideration, a vote of all eligible members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion or tenure. The secretary, who is to be designated by the RPT Advisory Committee chair, shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare minutes of the meeting reflecting the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. In cases of joint appointments with academic programs, in accordance with University Policy 6-303, the minutes shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the program's report and recommendation. The minutes, signed by the secretary and approved by the committee chairperson, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two days nor more than five days, and after such modifications as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary
report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

f. The candidate is to be informed of the results by the RPT Advisory Committee chair as soon as possible. Members of the RPT Advisory Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University policy and state and federal law.

7. Action of the Department Chairperson

a. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.

b. In conformity with University Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, and as provided for in Section 3 (g) above, "if a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate adequate progress … in an informal review, the Department Chair or the Department RPT Advisory Committee … may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following academic year or as soon as the file is completed (including solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate."

c. Prior to forwarding the file, the department chairperson shall send an exact copy of the chairperson's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member.

d. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his or her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department faculty advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the
department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate’s statement shall be added to
the review file without comment by the chairperson.

e. The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the
dean of the college.

f. Actions and appeals procedures beyond the department level.

Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G,H,J (action by dean
and college advisory committee, action by cognizant vice president and University
Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, final action by president).
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Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate

Date

Professor __________

Department of History
University of Utah
Campus

Dear __________:

The coming academic year will mark your __________ year of service to the University. By University and Department regulations you are scheduled for a __________. This process is described in the University Policy 6-303. I have enclosed a copy for your information, as well as a copy of the department procedures and set of criteria. Pertinent University Policies may be accessed at the Regulations Library website.

So that we may begin the process before the end of Spring semester, I ask that you consult with Professor __________, chair of the Department RPT Advisory Committee for __________, by __________, about the formation of an ad hoc committee (see departmental statement of RPT policy, III, B. 4, i-k). You should also begin assembling material for a file, as described in University Policy 6-303 and Department of History RPT policy III, B. 4, k. You are required to provide us a current copy of your curriculum vitae. You may also provide a personal statement of your goals and accomplishments in relation to the department criteria for retention.

At your earliest convenience, and no later than __________, you should also supply me with the names of __________ individuals from outside the University who you believe would be able to judge your professional accomplishments and progress. Please indicate what professional relationship, if any, you have had with them in the past (thesis advisor, co-author, etc.). Other department members and I will also nominate individuals, and from these lists, in consultation with you, a final list of __________ potential reviewers will be compiled. Your RPT Ad Hoc Committee, in consultation with the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee and the Department Chair, will then select __________ individuals from that list who will be asked to provide review letters, as described in our departmental procedures.

Also included is a statement which you must sign and return to me indicating whether or not you wish the review letters to be confidential or not. This is entirely your decision. Please return this statement along with your list of potential reviewers to me no later than __________, so that the process may begin in a timely manner. The file will be closed on
September 30, __________, and no materials may be added after that time. If you wish to take exception to any part of the file contents, such a statement should be added by that time.

Please also be advised that you have the privilege to inspect your entire file, minus any confidential review letters, at any time during the review process. Indeed, it is your responsibility to make certain that the correct materials are in the files as it proceeds through the review process. Further privileges and rights are spelled out in the accompanying section of the University Regulations, which I alluded to before and which is enclosed.

Please feel free to consult with me at any time during the review process.

Sincerely,

_____________________

Chair

Department of History

Appendix B. Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters

University of Utah
Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters

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

signature _______________________________

date ___________________________________

OR:

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

signature _______________________________
Appendix C. An official announcement to all History Faculty

Memorandum to: History Faculty

From: ___________________, Chair

Date: __________

Subject: RPT Review Process for __________

This memorandum serves as the official announcement that in the coming academic year we will be conducting RPT Reviews for the following faculty as indicated below. Please notify me immediately if there are any discrepancies in this list.

Informal Retention Review: _

Third Year Formal Review: ____________________

Fifth Year Formal Review: ____________________

Final Tenure Review: ____________________

I would appreciate receiving from you the names of appropriate outside reviewers for Professors __________ (Fifth Year Formal Review) and __________ (Final Tenure Review). If you wish to nominate potential reviewers, please give me their names no later than __________ so that a final list of prospective reviewers can be developed according to our departmental guidelines.

University Regulations note that comments from all faculty are specifically invited, whether or not you are qualified to vote. Please provide any such comments to me for inclusion in the file no later than __________.

Any individuals wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion or tenure (other than those above) should let me know as soon as possible. A brief memo indicating your desire to be reviewed for either promotion or tenure will suffice.

Thank you.
Appendix D. Letter to the Program

Dr. Director Program
Program Name
Campus

Dear Dr. Program:

Facull T. Member will be formally reviewed in the next academic year for retention in our department. According to University Regulations 6-303 III.B.C.4. (attached), you have the privilege to review the faculty member, using your program criteria.

We must have the report at the department no later than September 30, at which time the file will be closed and available for eligible department faculty to read in preparation for the Department RPT Advisory committee meeting.

Thank you for your timely response to this request.

Sincerely,

____________________
Chair
Department of History

Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC

15 September 1999

Mr. Stew Dente, President, Student Advisory Committee
Department of Ballistics
University of Utah
Campus

Dear Mr. Dente:

This academic year marks the third year of service to the University for Dr. Facull T. Member. By University and department regulations this is the obligatory year to have a
formal retention review of Dr. Member's accomplishments in our department. This process is described in the University Regulations 6-303. I have enclosed a copy for your information, as well as a copy of the department procedures and set of criteria. Also enclosed is a description the University of Utah’s approved “Guiding Principles for Student Advisory Committee Evaluations of Faculty Members.”

The Student Advisory Committee is asked to evaluate Dr. Member. Enclosed is the standard form, which must be filled out. It asks that certain information be collected and included in the RPT review file of Dr. Member. This information is:

1. A summary recommendation as to whether, in the students' opinion, Dr. Member ought to be retained as a member of the faculty.
2. A description of the sources and methods used to collect your student information.
3. A narrative evaluation of Dr. Member’s teaching performance.
4. The reasons for the specific recommendation to retain or not to retain Dr. Member on the faculty.
5. Names of the SAC officers.
6. A tally of the actual vote: _____ For _____ Against _____ Abstaining.

This information is not only required for the RPT file, it is also extremely important information that will be used at all levels of review, including that of the President. I urge you to conduct this review in as expeditious way as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation. If I can be of any help in the process, do not hesitate to contact me. I remain,

Sincerely,

___________________________
Chair
Department of History

Appendix F. Request for assistance from outside the U of U community

Date
Dear Professor:

__________, an untenured assistant professor in our department, is currently undergoing a formal _______________ review. Our review procedures involve obtaining written critiques of his/her scholarly work by authorities in his/her field outside the University of Utah community.

My purpose in writing is to request your assistance by evaluating a body of Professor ___________'s work, specifically _________________________. Your critique need not be elaborate, but we would appreciate your candid assessment of the strengths and weakness of each piece as well as your impression of __________ scholarly promise derived from your reading of the material.

If applicable: [Your critique will be confidential. __________ will be apprised of the substance of the external reviews, but has signed a waiver relinquishing his right to see the reviews or to know the names of the reviewers.]

In order for the department to complete its review in a timely fashion, we will need to have your review no later than September 1, __________. Upon receipt of the review, the department will send you a modest honorarium of $ in appreciation for your assistance.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience as to your ability to review __________'s written work.

Sincerely,

_______________________
Chair

Department of History

Appendix G. Letter to the Reviewer
Date

Professor

Department

University

City

Dear Professor:

Thank you for indicating your willingness to assist us in our formal review of __________ for __________ (promotion) to __________. We are most interested in your opinion of the enclosed works by the candidate--your evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of each piece and your impression of the quality of the author's scholarship derived from a reading of this material. A recent vita is also enclosed so that you may see how the items you are reading fit within his total professional contribution to date. Your critique need not be elaborate (a special form is enclosed although you are not required to use it), but we would appreciate any reactions you might have.

It would be especially helpful to our committee if your review were to reach us no later than September 1st. Although the candidate will be permitted to examine the substance of the review, he/she has waived the right to know the reviewers' names and your identity will remain confidential.

A copy of University of Utah and Department of History policies regarding faculty reviews is enclosed.

Our University Procedures ask that external reviewers provide a brief statement of their credentials and indicate how they know the candidate. If you prefer, a copy of your curriculum vitae would suffice.

You will receive a $ honorarium for your evaluation. Please send us your social security number so that we are able to process your remuneration.

Thank you for your assistance in this important work.

Sincerely,
Appendix H. Evaluation of Scholarly Research and Publication

Evaluation of Scholarly Research and Publication

Author:
Works Reviewed:
Comments Concerning:

A. Significance of Contribution
B. Use of Source
C. Reasoning and Analysis
D. General Comments and Overall Evaluation
E. Nature of personal acquaintance with the candidate

(Please feel free to attach additional pages if needed)

Reviewer's Name
Position
Home Address Zip Code
(for accounting purposes for payment of honorarium)
Social Security Number
(for accounting purposes)
TO: Lincoln L. Davies  
Chair, Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee
FROM: Eric Hinderaker  
Chair, Department of History
DATE: May 17, 2017
RE: Request for expedited review of RPT change for the Department of History

Proposed Change: The Department of History has voted to change our RPT review schedule for candidates hired at the rank of Assistant Professor to be consistent with the Standards Committee recommendation that only one retention review with external reviews be performed before tenure consideration. By reducing the number of retention reviews from two to one, we believe we will have less trouble identifying and securing quality external reviewers, particularly at the time of tenure.

Our proposal is to have only one formal retention review in the 4th year of candidacy for those hired at Assistant Professor. This would result in a 4/7 schedule, i.e., a 4th year retention review and a 7th year review for promotion and tenure.

Effective Date: July 1, 2017 (for the 2017-18 cycle).

Approval Vote: The Department RPT Advisory Committee voted 18 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions to change the guidelines on April 19, 2017.

Ed Davies, RPT Chair  
Department of History

Eric Hinderaker, Chair  
Department of History

Dianne Harris, Dean  
College of Humanities

Lincoln L. Davies, Chair  
Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee

Amy J. Wildermuth,  
Associate Vice President for Faculty  
Academic Affairs

Date: 5-17-17

Date: 5-17-17

Date: 5-24-17

Date: 5/30/17

Date: 6/1/17