

Department of Mining Engineering, Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures

Approved by Department Faculty _____ November 8, 2013

Date

Approved by Dean _____ November 22, 2013

Date

Approved by University RPT Standards Committee on _____ for implementation as of July 1, 2014.

PROVISIONAL ACCEPTANCE DEC 10, 2013

Contents

A. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies	4
1. General statement	4
2. General Philosophy.....	4
3. RPT Criteria and Standards.....	4
a. Overview	4
b. Retention.....	5
c. Tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	6
d. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.....	7
e. Award of Tenure to Candidate Hired as Associate Professor or Professor	8
f. Appointment to ranks of Distinguished, Presidential, and University Professor.....	8
4. Evidence for and evaluation of criteria.....	8
a. Teaching.....	8
b. Research and Publication	11
d. Institutional, Professional, and Public Service	16
2. Performance Standards for Service.....	17
a. Effectiveness Standard in Service.....	17
b. Meritorious Standard in Service	17
c. Excellence Standard in Service	17
5. Triggering Formal Retention Reviews	18
B. RPT Procedures	18
1. Small Unit Rule	18
2. Participants	18
a. Candidate.....	18
b. Department RPT Advisory Committee	18
c. Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair.....	19
d. Department Chair.....	19
e. Ad Hoc Committee	19
f. Student Advisory Committee	20
g. External Evaluators	20
2. Probationary Period and Review Schedule	20
3. Informal Reviews	21
4. Formal Reviews – Candidate, Department Chair, Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and Department RPT Advisory Committee Responsibilities	22
a. Procedures and Schedule.....	22

b. External Evaluators.....	23
c. Teaching evaluation.....	24
d. Candidate Responsibilities.....	24
e. RPT File Contents.....	25
f. Department RPT Advisory Committee Report.....	25
g. Joint Appointments.....	25
h. Candidate’s Rights to Comment on File.....	25
i. File Closing Date.....	25
5. Promotion to Full Professor.....	25
6. Action of the Department RPT Advisory Committee.....	26
7. Action of the Department Chair.....	26
8. Actions and Appeals Procedures beyond the Department Level.....	27
C. List of Appendices.....	28
Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate.....	29
Appendix B. Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters.....	31
Appendix C. Official Announcement to all Mining Engineering Faculty Members.....	32
Appendix D. Letter to the Program.....	33
Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC.....	34
Appendix F. Request for Assistance from Outside the University of Utah.....	35
Appendix G. Letter to the Reviewer.....	36
Appendix H. Approval of RPT Statement.....	37

Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

These standards, criteria, and procedures will be effective as of July 1, 2014. All RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under these new RPT standards. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for promotion with granting of tenure (assistant to associate level) will have the option of choosing the old RPT requirements or the new RPT requirements. Previously appointed candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor may choose the old requirements for reviews completed in or before the 2016-2017 academic year. In each case, the new requirements will apply unless the candidate’s choice of the old requirements is communicated to the Department chair by signed letter before review materials are sent to reviewers for external evaluations.

A. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Policies

1. General statement

Criteria and evidence for retention, promotion and tenure reviews adopted by the Department of Mining Engineering have been developed consistent with University Policy governing these matters. Readers should consult the contents of relevant University policies, which are neither repeated nor paraphrased here to obviate the possibility of misinterpretation. University regulations concerning retention, promotion, and tenure are contained in the University of Utah Policy 6-303, Rev. 20 (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html>) and University of Utah Policy 6-311, Rev. 15 (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html>). *It is the responsibility of each faculty member to be familiar with all RPT policies and procedures contained in the University of Utah Regulations (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu>).*

2. General Philosophy

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

The Department of Mining Engineering affirms the importance of a commitment to research, teaching and service, and in addition believes that its faculty should enjoy a high professional reputation. Departmental faculty should strive for excellence in each category, but an individual need not attain equal distinction in all three. 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 unnecessary and unwise. This document informs each faculty member in the department of the criteria and evidence by which performance shall be judged and progress determined.

Candidates for retention, promotion and tenure in the Department of Mining Engineering must meet the minimum standards of teaching, research, and service set forth in this policy statement. Personal behavior 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) may be considered.

3. RPT Criteria and Standards

a. Overview

The performance of a faculty member being considered for retention, promotion, or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, service and professional reputation. Evidence of competence and a commitment to achievement in all areas is required. Indications of originality and leadership by the candidate in these areas are important. Teaching, research and

scholarship, and service will each be evaluated as effective, meritorious, or excellent, (as defined in Section 4, below).

Each candidate must be accorded due process, which in turn requires that criteria be considered, weighed carefully, and commented upon in any report by a review committee.

Quantitative, objective assessment of a candidate under the above criteria is extremely difficult to establish. Rather, candidates are evaluated in regard to three criteria: teaching; research and publication; and institutional, professional, and public service, based on the guidelines elucidated in Section 4 below.

The appropriate review committee is required to draw upon letters of recommendation and documents of evaluation provided by students and colleagues; however, in addition, the Department RPT Advisory Committee, in cooperation with the chair of the department, will solicit letters of reference from qualified peers knowledgeable about the candidate and his or her activities.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee is strongly encouraged to solicit written comments regarding the candidate's teaching ability from alumni who have graduated within the last two to five years, in addition to the evaluations of current students.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee is charged with the responsibility for assuring a fair, objective evaluation, free of prejudice. In addition, the committee is required to destroy all drafts of reports before the report is forwarded to the department chair and the candidate.

It is essential that all faculty members be made aware of the levels of achievement expected for tenure and promotion. The three basic criteria listed above provide the basis for judgment.

Information regarding the beginning and ending of the pre-tenure probationary period, credit for prior service, waiver of pre-tenure probationary service, or extension of the pre-tenure probationary period can be found in the University's Policy 6-311, Faculty Retention and Tenure (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php>) and are covered in Section B, below.

b. Retention

Candidates are expected to be making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion as described below. At a minimum, candidates for retention must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service.

A candidate for retention should demonstrate good progress toward publication of refereed articles. The department expects that candidates for retention will begin to develop a larger scholarly profile, by such activities as presenting scholarly papers at national and international conferences and symposia, and receiving support (financial or otherwise) for their scholarly

activities. In teaching, the department expects candidates for retention to demonstrate emerging effectiveness in the classroom. In service, candidates for retention should be making a contribution to the department and in some larger context—the university, profession, or community.

University policy requires that annual retention reviews be conducted during the tenure-eligible faculty member's probationary period (U. Policy 6-303-III-B). These may be formal or informal. Formal reviews are required in two instances: for recommendations of termination, and during the third probationary year for all tenure-eligible faculty members. For assistant professors, one additional formal review is required in either the fifth *or* the sixth year. Although it has been customary in the College of Mines and Earth Sciences to conduct the second formal review during the sixth probationary year, the year in which a faculty member's second formal review occurs is to be chosen by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair and members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee. A decision to retain a faculty member after his or her formal review conveys a message that the individual is performing well, is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for promotion or tenure, and is meeting the goals of the department, college and university. The individual should, however, seriously consider concerns, deficiencies, or suggestions for improvement noted by each level of review. The candidate should carefully review these with the department chair and identify what accomplishments are necessary prior to obtaining promotion or tenure.

c. Tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

For promotion to associate professor, an individual must show demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The candidate's file should state what has been done to address previously noted concerns, and tangible signs of progress must be apparent. It is the responsibility of the faculty member and the department chair to document this progress and these accomplishments. To achieve the rank of associate professor, the candidate should have a reasonable number of publications as outlined below and have started the process of establishing a national reputation for quality research work.

Tenure is recommended only for individuals of substantial past achievement and future promise. Awarding of tenure carries an obligation on the part of the candidate for continued excellent performance for which the university in turn offers a stable environment. Early tenure recommendations will be considered only when unequivocal evidence is provided of the candidate's advanced professional development.

For granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate must provide evidence of a cumulative record demonstrating sustained achievement in one of the following combinations of standards:

1. Excellent in research and at least effective in teaching and service,
2. Meritorious in research, teaching, and service, or

3. Excellent in teaching, and meritorious in research and at least effective in service.

d. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

For promotion to professor, an individual should be a widely recognized contributor in his or her own field of research and an outstanding teacher, with a solid record of achievement and influence in the lives of students and colleagues. A faculty member must have established one or more areas of specialization in which he or she is making a major contribution to the department. Prior to advancement to the rank of professor, there should be persuasive evidence that the candidate's scholarship reputation has been established as demonstrated by activities such as publication of original papers in recognized technical publications; publication of monographs, patents and textbooks; development of publicly released software; establishment of a professional reputation through publications, invited lectures at significant meetings, publication of reports and papers in conference proceedings; and participation in the work of technical committees of professional societies.

The Department of Mining Engineering 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 before the fifth year 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 research, teaching, and service at the time of consideration for advancement. In research, the emphasis at this level, even more than in tenure cases, must be on the quality and national or international recognition of published work. General expectations of the department will be that the candidate will have regularly published technical articles while in the associate rank, that such publications will be of 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, or the community, for example by serving as an officer in a professional society; organizing technical meetings, conferences, or symposia; chairing sessions at professional meetings; and serving on and leading college and university committees.

For promotion to professor, a candidate must demonstrate continued quality and growth in research, teaching, and service. A candidate's record since tenure and promotion to associate professor must, as a threshold, continue to satisfy the requirements for tenure, and also be:

1. Excellent in one or more areas of research, teaching, or service, and meritorious in the

others, or

2. Consistently meritorious in research, teaching, and service.

e. Award of Tenure to Candidate Hired as Associate Professor or Professor

For a person 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.

Candidates for tenure who hold the rank of associate professor or professor are expected to have achieved scholarly excellence in their fields, especially through regular publication of refereed articles. The department expects that such candidates for tenure will also have developed a larger scholarly reputation in mining engineering, and in the candidate's areas of specialization, as demonstrated, for example, by presenting papers at national and international conferences and symposia and having been awarded grants for support of their scholarship. In teaching, such candidates for tenure should have a demonstrated record of effectiveness in the classroom. In service, these candidates should have made significant contributions at the department level and have a maturing service profile in the university, the profession, or the community. As provided in University Policy 6-303-III-A-1-c: "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."

f. Appointment to ranks of Distinguished, Presidential, and University Professor

Promotion to the ranks of distinguished professor, presidential professor, and university professor is reserved for selected individuals whose achievements exemplify the highest goals of scholarship. The definitions of these ranks and procedures for nomination of faculty members to these ranks are outlined in University Policy 6-303-III-B-3-d-i, ii, iii.

4. Evidence for and evaluation of criteria

a. Teaching

1. Overview

Because education of undergraduate and graduate students is a primary function in a university, excellence in teaching at all levels should be ensured. Five major factors in good teaching are course content, depth of knowledge of subject, logical organization, originality, and presentation. The classroom is a place for transfer of information to the student, and the level of presentation should match the expected student achievement level at that point in each student's academic careers. Teaching will be judged as effective, meritorious, or excellent, as defined below.

During all phases of the academic program, the student should be encouraged to think and apply his or her skills. Problem solving should be an important part of this activity. Familiarity with current research should be expected of those faculty members teaching senior undergraduates and graduate-level courses.

Formal classroom teaching is but part of the overall teaching function. Active participation in tutorials, thesis direction, group discussions, seminars, etc., should also be part of the teaching activities of a faculty member.

2. Performance Standards for Teaching

i. Effectiveness Standard in Teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is the minimum acceptable performance standard for granting of tenure, and will be determined based on evaluations of course preparation and delivery, directing student research, and advising students in general.

Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in course preparation and delivery will consist of:

1. Peer evaluation both on and off campus.
2. Student evaluation, departmental and university-wide, the latter obtained through the university's official course feedback report (U. Policy 6-100-III-N).
3. Documented, written reports prepared by members of the Student Advisory Committee.
4. Exit interviews with graduating seniors, conducted by the department chair.
5. Alumni comments.
6. Receipt of outstanding teacher awards.
7. Number and quality of M.S. and Ph.D. theses supervised.
8. Demonstrated ability to provide a stimulating learning environment for students.

Student course feedback scores in which more students agree than disagree that the course and instructor were effective are necessary to establish effectiveness in teaching. Candidates are also expected to arrive for class promptly and to communicate and hold regularly scheduled advising times for students outside of class contact hours, and evidence on these matters will be obtained through the official student course feedback reports, and from student reporting to the department administration.

All candidates for tenure will have their teaching evaluated by a member of the Department RPT Advisory Committee through in-class evaluations at least twice during pre-tenure probationary period. The first evaluation must be conducted prior to the fourth-year formal review. The second evaluation must be conducted no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration for promotion to associate professor, with tenure. Candidates with a probationary period shortened so that having two or more evaluations is impractical must undergo at least one such evaluation no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration for promotion and tenure. The relevant Department RPT Advisory Committee chair will produce a

peer observation report after each classroom visit and meet with the candidate in a timely fashion to discuss the substance of the report. Faculty peer observation reports will be submitted to the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair and included in the RPT file for each formal review.

Candidates for tenure are strongly encouraged to use the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) for additional classroom teaching evaluations and overall teaching advice. Candidates for tenure may include a section in the personal statement in their RPT files explaining how they are utilizing faculty peer observation reports and CTLE consultations.

Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in directing student research, and advising students may include:

1. Serving on comprehensive exam, M.S., or Ph.D. committees.
2. Advising on M.E. reports.
3. Advising on Honors theses or other undergraduate research.

Contributions to thesis and dissertation committees are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality of advising committee service. The quality of the advising by the candidate will be determined by considering SAC reports, the evaluations of other faculty committee members, surveys of students or the departmental staff who serve them, and recognition received by student projects.

ii. Meritorious Standard in Teaching

To be considered a meritorious teacher, a candidate must meet the above standards for effectiveness in teaching with respect to course preparation and delivery, directing student research, and advising students in general.

In addition, the candidate must consistently satisfy either one or a combination of two criteria; namely, the candidate must meet or exceed the department's average course feedback scores for teacher and course effectiveness and other teaching measures with respect to course preparation and delivery criterion, or the candidate must make significant contributions to curriculum or program development.

Evidence considered for evaluation of such contributions may consist of:

1. Receiving grants for new course development or interdisciplinary teaching.
2. Developing innovative teaching methods.
3. Publishing on pedagogical practices or other teaching-related topics.
4. Developing educational materials that have an impact within or beyond departmental instruction, for example, textbooks, software, assessment measures, etc.
5. Providing new on-line course development.
6. Creating and overseeing new student programs.

7. Offering service learning courses.
8. Serving as an Honors thesis adviser.
9. Serving as a faculty representative accompanying students to professional meetings.
10. Giving talks or organizing colloquia or academic conferences about teaching or that systematically serve the educational needs of undergraduate and graduate students.
11. Publishing with graduate student co-authors.
12. Any similar activity that makes a significant contribution to teaching mining engineering at the university.

iii. Excellence Standard in Teaching

To be considered an excellent teacher, a candidate must have satisfied the standards of both effectiveness and merit in teaching as described above, and must also show evidence of significant and sustained impact in undergraduate or graduate education by:

1. Receiving a university, college, or student teaching award or similar public acknowledgment for superior teaching or student advising.
2. Showing a record of sustained success in receiving teaching grants or other similar forms of financial support for teaching activities.
3. Showing other evidence of distinguished contributions to teaching and student mentoring.

b. Research and Publication

1. Overview

Research and publication are closely connected to decisions regarding retention, promotion and tenure. Candidates for these attainments are expected to produce scholarly articles. Candidates are expected to give evidence of a profile of scholarship that will indicate an active, ongoing, and substantive commitment to research and publication. Evidence of final acceptance of a manuscript by a press, journal, or reviewed proceedings shall be deemed the equivalent of publication. Publications must represent significant contributions to knowledge and demonstrate professional skills of a high order.

Because a university is defined as a community of scholars, every faculty member is expected to engage in scholarly activities related, at least in substantial part, to his or her field of major interest. Scholarly activity may be expressed by the writing of papers in specific areas of endeavor; by the writing of textbooks wherein broad syntheses are made or where original ideas and concepts are displayed; by the presentation of papers at symposia, meetings of professional societies, and other venues; and by other means. Quality is more important than quantity at all levels. While no numerical statement regarding quantity replaces the emphasis on quality, the publication of eight or more articles is considered appropriate for the award of tenure and promotion to associate professor. An article is defined as a publication that appears in an edited collection of original contributions. In retention reviews conducted before the formal review for promotion and tenure, the number of published works will vary somewhat. In each retention review, the candidate is expected to demonstrate reasonable progress toward the level

of publications expected in the formal review for promotion and tenure.

The merit of the scholarly activities of those involved in research may be judged by the quality and quantity of published research articles, and by the significance and editorial standards of the publications in which they appear. Review committees should study the field of major interest, the complexities of problems attacked, and the publications in which articles are published, rather than study solely the number of articles published.

The Department of Mining Engineering recognizes that candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure may make significant scholarly contributions through electronic publication. The department will accept electronic articles as part of a candidate's retention, promotion, and tenure file, but the candidate must demonstrate that those publications have been subjected to peer review.

The department employs the standards of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in research, and at a minimum requires research at the standard of meritorious in a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Assessment of research includes five criteria: quantity, independence and contribution, purpose, quality of the publication outlet, and impact.

2. Quantity

The minimum quantity of publications needed for tenure and the rank of associate professor is eight reviewed articles in scholarly journals or society proceedings, or chapters in an edited book that has been subject to independent review. A larger number of publications, higher quality of publication outlet, and higher impact are needed to elevate a candidate's research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent. The department may take into consideration unusually long or unusually short publications in assessing quantity.

3. Independence and Contribution

To qualify for tenure and the rank of associate professor, candidates must demonstrate the ability to conceptualize, design, and conduct research independently. If many of a candidate's publications are co-authored, the department will, in consultation with the candidate and the respective co-authors, consider the candidate's role in the conceptual development and contributions to the actual research and writing of the body of academic work.

In assessing independence and contribution, the department may solicit letters from one or more co-authors describing the candidate's contribution. This is especially likely if co-authors have been mentors of the candidate. Candidates may also solicit such letters from co-authors for the file themselves. This information may also be solicited by e-mail, by telephone, or other means, as deemed appropriate by the RPT Advisory Committee. Because of the important value of mentoring students, the department recognizes publications with students as co-authors

as a contribution to teaching as well as research.

3. Purpose

The mission of the university, in part, is to create new knowledge. Consistent with this, scholarship is in part evaluated by the degree to which the work contributes to new understanding. Five categories of scholarship purpose are listed below, ordered generally from greater to lesser significance. All categories represent traditional forms of scholarship, but some scholarship purposes reflect to a higher degree the university mission of creating new knowledge, and the department recognizes the greater significance of these categories of scholarship.

1. Development of New Theories or Methodologies. Scholarly contributions that develop significant new theories or methodologies relevant to the field of mining engineering are highly valued. New theory refers to the elaboration of an original set of interconnected hypotheses with explanatory power, or the development of a new conceptual framework with interpretive significance. New theory provides novel ways of explaining, understanding, or critically appraising phenomena of significance to mining. New methodological contributions can take many forms but, to belong in this category, contributions must be novel and provide new insights into phenomena associated with mining engineering. Theoretical contributions are highly valued.
2. Advancement of the Knowledge of Existing Theories and Methodologies. Without rigorous testing of theories through experimental results, the theories may be of little value. Thus, scholarship that advances knowledge in mining engineering through the testing, application, or elaboration of existing theories with implications for future research, theory, or practice is also highly valued.
3. Production of New Evidence or Data. A third form of research of substantial significance to mining engineering is the production of new evidence or data concerning phenomena associated with this field. Such phenomena may include mine planning and production, mine finance and economics, mine stability and ground control, and others. Therefore publications that report significant new empirical evidence, but provide little or no development of new conceptual understanding, are still valuable, but less so than new theories or testing of those theories. These are empirical, analytic, or qualitative studies that describe phenomena without providing new theoretical ways of understanding the phenomena.
4. Literature Reviews. Literature reviews are also valuable scholarly contributions that summarize and analyze existing knowledge, methods, and significance of a particular field or branch of mining engineering, such as textbooks, and state-of-the-field summaries. These are principally of pedagogical importance, but may also suggest

directions for future research or practical application.

5. Comments, Editorials, and Book Reviews. While these are valid publications, are of limited scope, and are viewed by the department as less important to the growth of a faculty member than are publications described in the first three categories above (theory, testing, new observations). Hence publications of this sort are given less weight in RPT decisions.

4. Quality of Publication Outlet

Quality is the extent to which the research is consistent with the methods and goals of the field, shaped by knowledge that is current and appropriate to the topic, and well written. Quality is best judged by experts in the field, including peer reviewers for publications, external evaluators solicited for the RPT review, and University of Utah colleagues who have personally read the publications. The department recognizes the following distinctions among publication outlets, ranked from highest quality to lowest.

Reviewed scholarly books in highly regarded presses, reviewed articles in journals in the discipline, and reviewed chapters published in books are of highest value. These include peer-reviewed articles in professional conference proceedings and transactions.

Of lower rank are articles and chapters in journals and books that appear without peer review, abstracts, and books on mining topics for the general public.

Articles that appear without peer review and technical reports to governmental agencies or private business are of less value for RPT decisions.

Candidates are expected to cite evidence to support claims about the quality of publication outlets. Electronic publications count the same as traditional print publications if these indicators of quality are comparable.

5. Impact

Impact is assessed after publication and is the degree to which research has changed the way other scholars, other professionals, or the public thinks about a topic. The department recognizes that valuable scholarly work may be controversial.

Examples of measures of impact include:

1. Citations
2. Reviews
3. Conclusions from qualified external evaluators
4. Recognition such as awards and honors
5. Publicity in the general media
6. Invitations to give addresses or participate in symposia and workshops at prominent

- national/international conferences
7. Reprints of articles and subsequent editions of books
 8. Consulting (within limits of University Policy 5-204)

6. Research Grants and Fellowships

The extent to which a candidate has been able to obtain research grant funds and fellowships, thereby increasing the probability of research and scholarly publications, will contribute to moving a candidate's research record from effectiveness toward excellence. The department expects that faculty members will seek and obtain sufficient external research funding to sustain graduate students and necessary research expenses. Such efforts, and the success of those efforts, will be expected for the granting of tenure or promotion.

7. Patents and licenses

Development of new technology and dissemination of this technology for the betterment of humanity are important evidence for creativity of a faculty member. Licenses are evidence of the degree to which this creativity is put to use.

2. Performance Standards for Research

a. Effectiveness Standard in Research

Effectiveness in research means that a candidate has published in a quantity and at a level appropriate to the level at which the candidate is being evaluated, as determined by the professional judgment of the committee, and further that the candidate has demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field, that the scholarship is in categories such as testing and observational reports, that publication outlets are generally below the top rank, and that there is evidence in support of scholarly impact.

Ineffectiveness in research means that a faculty member has not met these minimum standards for quantity or quality.

b. Meritorious Standard in Research

Meritorious research (for tenure and promotion to associate professor) means that a candidate has met or exceeded the minimum quantity of publications; has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; has produced publications that describe theoretical, testing, or observational results in peer-reviewed media; and has shown clear evidence of scholarly impact.

c. Excellence Standard in Research

Excellence in research (for tenure and promotion to associate professor) means that a candidate has met or exceeded the minimum quantity of publications and has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field, that the publications describe theoretical, testing, or observational results well, that most publications are in peer-reviewed journals or

conference proceedings, or in books, and that there is strong evidence of scholarly impact.

d. Institutional, Professional, and Public Service

1. Overview

Each faculty member is expected to participate in the governance of the university. In addition, each faculty member is expected to respond appropriately to requests for his or her time by civic, state, federal, and service agencies. Adequate recognition of contributions in these activities is important to any university and is accordingly a factor in retention, tenure, and promotion deliberations. Service to scientific and professional societies, service in editorial functions, and related activities are also an important part of this criterion. The department employs the standards of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in university, professional, and public service. Public and professional service may include contributions to the nation, state, community, and profession. Activities included within institutional service are:

1. Service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc., beyond the minimum typical assignments of tenure-line faculty.
2. Service as a committee chair.
3. Service on hiring committees.
4. Elected positions, such as senate, college council, etc.
5. Service as a university representative to other universities, organizations, etc.
6. Administrative service to the department, college, or university.

Activities included within professional service are:

1. Service as editor of a journal or book series for a press.
2. Service on editorial boards.
3. Conference participation as a section chair or program committee member.
4. Conference participation as a panel chair or discussant.
5. Service on grant review boards, such as the National Science Foundation.
6. Offices in professional associations.
7. Participation in professional associations.
8. Invited addresses.
9. Refereeing articles for journals or book manuscripts for presses in the discipline.
10. Professional contributions to the print and electronic media.

Activities included within public service are:

1. Providing consulting services to bureaus, commissions, agencies, legislative bodies, etc., within limits established by University Policy 5-204.
2. Participation in special community projects and studies.
3. Service in professionally related community positions, such as school board memberships, participation in educational groups, professional advising to various groups, public service agencies, etc.
4. Contribution to the general educational community through lectures, workshops, etc.

The Department of Mining Engineering considers service an integral part of professional growth, and urges members to seek and accept opportunities to serve the department, university, community, and the mining engineering profession. The following guidelines shall be used to evaluate service as it relates to retention, promotion and tenure:

Routine service on departmental, college and university committees and other support activities such as student advising is 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.

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

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.

2. Performance Standards for Service

a. Effectiveness Standard in Service

Effective service means that the candidate has regularly attended faculty meetings, has regularly attended faculty recruitment candidate presentations, and has been conscientious in fulfilling departmental, college or university service assignments.

b. Meritorious Standard in Service

Meritorious service means that the candidate has fulfilled the above requirements for effective service and has also engaged in activities described above in the areas of professional and public service.

c. Excellence Standard in Service

For retention and for promotion to associate professor and granting of tenure, excellent service means that the candidate has fulfilled the requirements for both effective and meritorious service as described above, and has also conscientiously fulfilled additional institutional and professional service as an assistant professor. A candidate's professional reputation and abilities as a professional are an important indication of the candidate's service to the public the profession. As an example, consulting activities may be judged by the stature of the client for whom the consulting is performed. Letters of reference from peers frequently make reference to a candidate's professional reputation or ability. Promotion and special awards should be considered in this context. Relevant industrial experience may also offer evidence for an

individual's professional reputation and abilities.

5. Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

“If a tenure eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c). If the department chair or a majority of the Department RPT Advisory Committee members present at an informal review votes to conduct a formal review, the review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the committee votes again to proceed with the review in the current academic year. A triggered formal review may include external review letters if a majority of the committee votes that this information is needed.

B. RPT Procedures

1. Small Unit Rule

The Department of Mining Engineering has historically had a relatively small number of tenured faculty members. Under these conditions, it may be necessary at times for the department to invoke the small academic unit rule, as allowed for in University Policy 6-303: “Any department or division advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department or division chair must recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from appropriate emeritus faculty. In advance of the chair's contacting such faculty members, the chair shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a-iv)

2. Participants

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews conducted by the Department of Mining Engineering:

a. Candidate

The candidate is the faculty member under review for retention, promotion, or tenure.

b. Department RPT Advisory Committee

Membership in the Department RPT Advisory Committee as a voting member is determined by University Policy 6-303-III-A-3. Only members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend and participate in its meetings. Because the department faculty is small, the RPT Advisory Committee will normally function as a committee of the whole.

c. Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair

The chair of the RPT Advisory Committee shall be elected annually during the Spring Semester from the ranks of the tenured professors of the department. The chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will hold a rank at least equal to that for which the candidate is being reviewed.

d. Department Chair

The department chair is the administrative head of the Department of Mining Engineering.

e. Ad Hoc Committee

For the foreseeable future, the Department of Mining Engineering will be a small academic unit. In order to constitute the minimum size for the RPT Advisory Committee, it will be necessary to include additional members from allied departments. It is likely that these additional members may not be well acquainted with particular candidates or their fields of expertise. To increase the level of input from individuals familiar with the candidate's performance and value of scholarly activities and service, Ad Hoc Committees may be appointed to assist the RPT Advisory Committee in its evaluations.

1. Formation of the Ad Hoc Committee

A three-member Ad Hoc Committee will be formed for all third-year formal reviews, and annual informal reviews. In that external letters of reference from recognized authorities will be obtained for candidates seeking advancement and tenure, Ad Hoc Committees may not be needed in these cases. In so far as possible, mutual concurrence of the candidate, RPT Advisory Committee chair, and the department chair in selection of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee will be sought. If mutual concurrence is not reached, the candidate to be reviewed shall select one person to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee, the chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will select one, and the department chair will select one. All members of the Ad Hoc Committee must have knowledge of the candidate's performance and/or the candidate's area of specialization. Tenured and untenured faculty at any rank along with career-line and emeritus faculty may be called upon to serve on Ad Hoc Committees. Preferably, all members are to have appointments in the Department of Mining Engineering. If more qualified individuals (rank, knowledge of candidate's performance/area of expertise) reside within the College of Mines and Earth Sciences or other academic units at the University of Utah, they may be called upon to serve. The intent is to enlist the most qualified persons and maintain the objective of "*an in-house evaluation.*"

2. Selection of Ad Hoc Committee Chairs

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee will select one person to serve as chair. A report of the Ad Hoc Committee will be prepared under the direction of the chair. The chair will present the candidate's file at the meeting of the RPT Advisory Committee but shall not be a voting member of the RPT Advisory Committee

3. Duties of the Ad Hoc Committee

Each Ad Hoc Committee will have the responsibility of conducting the review—either formal or informal—of the candidate to whom it has been assigned. It will be the Ad Hoc Committee's task to prepare a written report of the record of the candidate, with particular emphasis on how the candidate's research, teaching, and service respond to the Department's standards and criteria for retention. The report of the subcommittee will focus on interpreting and presenting

the factual evidence documented in the file rather than being persuasive in tone. The written report will be submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee to the RPT Advisory Committee chair, and a copy placed in the candidate's file, *at least three days* prior to the RPT meeting. It will be the RPT chair's responsibility to ensure copies of the report are made for distribution and consideration at the RPT meeting.

The review will be conducted in consultation and cooperation with the candidate. More specifically, the subcommittee's report will be submitted to the candidate for his or her review and written comment on matters of fact, if desired, *ten days* before the report is submitted to the RPT chair. The candidate shall send written comments on matters of fact to the subcommittee chair *five days* before the report is submitted to the RPT chair. The Ad Hoc Committee chair shall make corrections to the report as necessary prior to submitting it to the RPT chair and adding it to the candidate's file.

f. Student Advisory Committee

A committee made up of representatives of undergraduate and graduate students in the Department of Mining Engineering.

g. External Evaluators

External evaluators are selected by the department chair and the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, in consultation with the candidate, to provide reviews of the candidate's scholarly work. The candidate will be asked to suggest names of external evaluators. The department chair and the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair will also prepare a list of names. The RPT Advisory Committee chair will then prepare a preliminary list of evaluators, for consideration by the department chair and the candidate. The candidate will have the right to request the removal of two of the listed evaluators. The numbers of external evaluators on the list, as well as the number of evaluators who will be asked to review the candidate's file, is determined by the purpose for which the candidate is being reviewed. Those numbers are specified in Section B.4.a, below.

Some of the evaluators selected should be persons who have no direct association with the candidate. All evaluators shall 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.

2. Probationary Period and Review Schedule

All tenure-eligible faculty members shall be reviewed for retention annually, either by a formal or an informal review. In the third, fifth or sixth, 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. To be considered for promotion, all candidates must apply to the chair 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. 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.” (U. Policy 6-311-Section 4-C-1).

The probationary period may also be lengthened in conformity with relevant university policies (see U. 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).

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 research, 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.

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.

The 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 Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare minutes of the meeting reflecting the nature of the discussion.

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

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

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

4. Formal Reviews – Candidate, Department Chair, Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and Department RPT Advisory Committee Responsibilities

a. Procedures and Schedule

Procedures to be followed for third-year, fifth- or sixth-year, tenure, and promotion (both to associate professor and 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 department chair of external evaluations. 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.

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 evaluators from the faculty being reviewed as appropriate and request that they sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of evaluation letters. (See Appendices A and B)

By May 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)

If a faculty member who is being reviewed holds a joint appointment in another academic program, the department chair shall notify said program in writing no later than April 10. (See Appendix D)

Prior to the end of spring semester preceding the review, the chair of the Department RPT Advisory Committee shall call a meeting of the department chair and the candidates for formal review and promotion. This meeting will 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.

“At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-2)

“Prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall notify the college's representative to the Student Senate and the department student advisory committee(s) (SACs) of the upcoming review and request that the department SAC(s) submit a written report evaluating teaching effectiveness and making RPT recommendations as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC evaluation and report should be based on guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson. The SAC shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its report, but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the reports, the SAC's recommendations shall be deemed conclusively waived and their absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-3)

The Department RPT Advisory Committee 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 evaluators in his or her field generated according to the procedures outlined above. The committee will be responsible for providing a statement describing the qualifications of the evaluators, their relationship to the candidate, and methods of selection. A second meeting between the committee and the candidate is required no sooner than two days after the committee report has been drafted and shown to the candidate and at least two working days prior to the closing of the file. At this meeting, the RPT Advisory Committee will discuss the report with the candidate. The Department RPT Advisory 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.

b. External Evaluators

The department chair and Department RPT Advisory Committee chair shall generate, in consultation with the candidate for formal review, a list of potential evaluators of the candidate's work. The procedures for generating this list are described in Section B.1.f, above. 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 Appendices F, G, and H). External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 1. Before external letters of evaluation are requested, candidates must sign a department form indicating whether they waive or retain their right to

read the letters (see Appendix B).

If one or more prospective evaluators decline to evaluate the candidate's file, the committee chair will proceed down the list of potential evaluators. If the entire list is exhausted before the minimum number of evaluators (as specified in the guidelines below) has agreed to serve, the Department 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 Department RPT Advisory Committee will, in part, base its decision.

The following guidelines apply:

1. There are no external evaluators used in third-year reviews.
2. During the fifth- or sixth-year review, the list shall include names of nine individuals who are prospective evaluators.
3. During the tenure review, the list shall consist of 12 such individuals, four of whom will be asked to submit reviews.
4. For promotion to professor, the list shall include names of 15 such individuals, five of whom will be asked to review the candidate's file.

c. Teaching evaluation

The staff of the Department of Mining Engineering will provide the Department RPT Advisory Committee with a statistical summary of student evaluation data generated since the candidate's most recent previous formal review.

The Department RPT Advisory 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 RPT Advisory Committee. This information will be considered in conjunction with the candidate's entire teaching record.

d. Candidate Responsibilities

Prior to the end of spring semester, the candidate is obliged to supply the Department RPT Advisory 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 RPT Advisory 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 research, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas.

e. 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, each candidate's file must contain a personal statement prepared by the candidate, and a summary report on the candidate's research, teaching, and service prepared by the RPT Advisory Committee.

f. Department RPT Advisory Committee Report

The Department RPT Advisory Committee will make a report summarizing its findings. The report will summarize the candidate's record in the areas of research, teaching, service, and professional reputation, and will include a report of a peer classroom visit by a member of the RPT Advisory Committee. The report will be fact-finding in nature only. It should be neither advocatory nor adversarial. This report and all other data pertinent to the formal review shall be placed in the file before the review progresses to the next step (review by the department chair).

g. Joint Appointments

When a candidate is jointly appointed in another academic program, the department chair, prior to the convening of the Department RPT Advisory Committee, shall notify the chair or 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 in a timely manner." (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4)

The recommendation of the academic program, along with any candidate response, will be included in the candidate's file and considered by the Department RPT Advisory Committee.

h. Candidate's Rights to Comment on File

The candidate is entitled to see his or her review file upon request, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department. The chair of the RPT Advisory 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 or 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 Department RPT Advisory Committee chair's responsibility to consult with the candidate about the completeness of the file prior to the closure of the file.

i. 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 professor shall follow the procedures as described above.

6. Action of the Department RPT Advisory Committee

The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15 and vote to determine its decision. Each member of the committee is responsible for reviewing the file before the meeting.

Wherever possible, the Department RPT Advisory Committee chair, acting on behalf of the department chair, 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.

Individual members must state the reasons for either positive or negative votes. The votes and justifications will be recorded, with no indication of the individual voters' identities.

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 chair 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 non-voting participants may be excluded.

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 Department 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 chair, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of two to five days and after such modifications as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

The candidate is to be informed of the results by the Department 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 Chair

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

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

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 RPT Advisory Committee or the evaluation of the department chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chair'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 chair within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chair's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chair within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chair.

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

8. Actions and Appeals Procedures beyond the Department Level

There are no college-level rules for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions; criteria, standards, and evidence are those developed by the relevant department. In the College of Mines and Earth Sciences, the College Faculty Relations Committee reviews records of all candidates nominated for retention, promotion, or tenure. The College Faculty Relations Committee consists of two tenured faculty members elected by each department. Members of the College Faculty Relations Committee serve for a term of two years, and one-half of the members are elected annually. The committee meets annually, or more frequently if necessary, without the Dean present, and all members of the committee have an equal vote. Results of the deliberations for each candidate are written up, approved by the committee, and submitted to the Dean along with a record of the vote on each candidate, and the Dean will review the recommendation.

Subsequent procedures beyond the department level are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G, H, and J (action by dean and College Advisory Committee, action by cognizant vice president and University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, final action by president).

C. List of Appendices

Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate

Appendix B. Faculty Option Regarding Evaluation Letters

Appendix C. Official Announcement to all Mining Engineering Faculty Members

Appendix D. Letter to the Program

Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC

Appendix F. Request for Assistance from Outside the University of Utah

Appendix G. Letter to the Reviewer

Appendix H. University RPT Standards Committee Notice of Final Approval

Appendix A. Letter to the Candidate

Date _____

Professor _____

Department of Mining Engineering

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 _____. You should also begin assembling material for a file, as described in University Policy 6-30.

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 evaluators will be compiled. The chair of your Department 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 evaluators 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 Mining Engineering

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 _____

Date _____

Appendix C. Official Announcement to all Mining Engineering Faculty Members

Memorandum to: Mining Engineering Faculty Members

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 evaluators for Professors _____ (Fifth-year Formal Review) and _____ (Final Tenure Review). If you wish to nominate potential evaluators, please give me their names no later than _____ so that a final list of prospective evaluators can be developed according to our departmental guidelines.

University Regulations note that comments from all faculty members 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:

_____ 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 Mining Engineering

Appendix E. Letter to the Department SAC

15 September 1999

_____, President, Student Advisory Committee
Department of Mining Engineering
University of Utah
Campus

Dear _____:

This academic year marks the third year of service to the University for Professor _____. By University and department regulations this is the obligatory year to have a formal retention review of Professor _____'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 Professor _____. 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 Professor _____. This information is:

1. A summary recommendation as to whether, in the students' opinion, Professor _____ should 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 Professor _____ 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.

Sincerely,

Chair
Department of Mining Engineering

Appendix F. Request for Assistance from Outside the University of Utah

Date

Professor

Department

University

City

Dear Professor:

_____, an untenured assistant professor in our department, is currently undergoing a formal _____ review. Our review procedures involve obtaining written critiques of his or her scholarly work by authorities in his or 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 evaluators.]

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 Mining Engineering

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, the candidate has waived the right to know the evaluators' identities.

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

Our University Procedures ask that external evaluators 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.

Thank you for your assistance in this important work.

Sincerely,

Chair

Department of Mining Engineering

Appendix H. Approval of RPT Statement

Date

Professor

Department

University

City

Dear Professor:

This is to confirm that the attached version of the Department of Communication's RPT Statement, dated as approved on August 16, 2013 by the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee, has been reviewed and approved by the Committee pursuant to University Policy 6-303. The Statement may be implemented for RPT proceedings in your Department for the academic year 2013-2014 (as of July 1, 2013).

Congratulations on completing the approval process, and revising your Statement to comply with University Policies and to serve well the missions of your Department, College, and the University.

Please ensure that a copy of this approval notice is attached to all copies of the final approved version of the RPT Statement.