Department of Philosophy

Guidelines for Tenure-line (regular) Faculty Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review

Approved by Department Faculty   6/7/12
Approved by Dean   6/7/12
Approved by University RPT Standards Committee June 22, 2012, for implementation as of July 1, 2012.

Contents

A. Overview

The aims of the Department of Philosophy are to provide teaching of the highest possible quality for undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Utah; to encourage and sustain excellent research in the discipline by faculty members, graduate students, and undergraduates; and to provide appropriate professional service to the University and off-campus communities. Tenure-line (regular) faculty members are appointed after well-advertised national searches, and their work is reviewed periodically to assist them in career development and to evaluate their contributions in research, teaching and service. Appointments, promotions, awards of tenure, and post-tenure reviews are governed both by university regulations – primarily U. Policies 6-303 and 6-311 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/info/policyList.html) – and the following departmental guidelines. This document serves as the departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures required by University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-a.

Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty
The revised RPT standards, criteria, and procedures contained in this Statement will be implemented as of July 1, 2012. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under the new RPT standards and procedures. 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 timeline and requirements or the new RPT timeline and 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 2014-15 academic year. In each case, the new requirements will apply unless the candidate's choice of the old requirements is communicated to the department chairperson by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations (See Part D.4.b below).

B. Criteria – general measures of merit, for all RPT reviews

B.1 Research

Publishing original work in high quality venues is the primary measure of research excellence. Quality is more important than quantity, in all RPT reviews. The principal markers of quality in publication venues are – whether in journals, books, or other types of publications – a rigorous *peer review* process, low *acceptance rates*, and wide *recognition* within the profession. Venues widely recognized as of high quality typically use a blind review process with at least two reviewers, while enforcing very low acceptance rates.

Print journals and online journals are equally regarded, other things equal. Refereed online publications count in a similar way as their print counterparts. For example, a publication in a quality, refereed online journal has the same standing as a publication in a quality refereed print journal; and a solicited contribution to a quality online anthology or encyclopedia has the same standing as a solicited contribution to a quality print anthology or encyclopedia.

In conjunction with producing high quality publications, faculty are expected to engage in a variety of research-related activities. For example, faculty should seek to present their work to other philosophers, especially at national and international conferences and symposia; faculty also may attend conferences, participate in workshops, or other activities which promote interaction with others in one's field. And although research supported by external grants is not the norm in philosophy, successful grant and fellowship applications may also be considered as positive indications of research quality.

B.2 Teaching

The Department of Philosophy values and supports excellence in teaching, and strives to be on the leading edge of innovation in the classroom. We affirm how central this activity is to the core mission of the university and give careful consideration to it in RPT decisions, as per University Policy 6-303.

Tenure track faculty are expected to be effective and committed teachers of both undergraduate and graduate students. Their courses should demonstrate effective use of current pedagogical

techniques. Course content should be up to date in relation to the professional literature. Expectations of students should be clearly defined in syllabi which are in compliance with university syllabus guidelines (http://www.humis.utah.edu/humis/docs/organization_269_1233080547.pdf). Grading of student work should be fair and unbiased. More generally, faculty should be in compliance with the university's Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (U. Policy 6-316).

In ordinary cases, faculty should be prepared – during the probationary period – to teach a mix of undergraduate courses, including one course at the lower division, 2-4 courses at the 3000/4000 level, and periodic courses at the 5000-7000 level. Teaching assignments are determined by the department chair in consultation with the undergraduate and graduate directors, as well as the faculty in question. Faculty are also expected to share the department's extracurricular instructional load by supervising directed readings and graduate research. We encourage teaching in interdepartmental and interdisciplinary programs, and contributions in these areas are considered in the evaluation of teaching.

All formal reviews of RPT candidates include an examination of, at minimum, the following documents (as further described in Part D.2—RPT File Contents):

- Teaching statement by the candidate.
- Student course evaluations.
- Course materials, including syllabi.
- Faculty peer review report(s) of the candidate's teaching.
- Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports (see U. Policy 6-303-III-C-3).

Faculty peer review reports may involve a variety of metrics: classroom visits, inspection of course materials, consideration of pedagogical methods, inspection of sample student work, etc. At least one of the faculty peer review reports should be from a tenured member of the Department of Philosophy. Candidates may schedule peer reviews at any time during the probationary period, in consultation with the department chair.

Along with the above required documents, candidates are encouraged to gather information, from a variety of sources, that would help them document teaching accomplishments – e.g., teaching awards. And to help promote teaching excellence, candidates are encouraged to participate in ongoing departmental pedagogy sessions, along with making use of university teaching resources, including the Center for Teaching & Learning Excellence (CTLE), the Technology Assisted Curriculum Center (TACC), Instructional Media Services (IMS), the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP), and Interactive Video Conferencing (IVC), among others.

B.3 Service

The Department of Philosophy considers service to be an integral part of professional growth, and it urges members to seek and accept opportunities to serve the department, the college, the university, the community, and the profession. Although service alone is insufficient to warrant retention, promotion, or tenure, the service contributions of candidates are considered in all formal and informal reviews.

Departmental service assignments are at the discretion of the department chair, who will use consideration of rank, experience, and other service commitments to allocate responsibilities to faculty. RPT candidates should expect their service load to involve fewer assignments – as few as 1-2 assignments – where the assignments involve onerous workloads. Other cases might involve 3-5 assignments where each is non-onerous.

Beyond the department, candidates will have opportunities to serve on committees for the college and the university. Some of these assignments are made by the department chair; other service assignments may result from invitations by various university officials.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, office-holding and committee service in professional societies; editing and refereeing for journals and conference proceedings; organization of professional meetings, workshops, and conferences; and serving as the external member of the dissertation committees of students at other institutions. (This service work may also be considered in connection with the candidate's research.)

Service to the community includes, but is not limited to, work on off-campus committees; public discussions, radio and television appearances; lectures to community groups; public outreach; and participation in civic activities. Academically related service to the wider community can also be a significant part of a candidate's service profile.

C. Standards – specific measures of merit, by rank

These guidelines 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 Philosophy affirms the importance of a tripartite professional commitment to research, 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, the department anticipates that each member, possessing special commitments and talents, will make unique contributions to the composite departmental profile.

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 that individual members of the department are apprised of the basic criteria by which their performance is judged.

Retention decisions made early in a candidate's career assign substantial weight to potential, while decisions on tenure and promotion to the higher ranks emphasize actual accomplishment. Candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Philosophy must meet the standards of research, teaching, and service set forth in this policy statement. And 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 U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b).

C.1 Retention

Faculty hired into tenure-line positions who have not yet completed their doctorate are initially appointed at the rank of instructor. Once the doctorate is complete they may be promoted to the rank of assistant professor, and the RPT procedures and standards described here will apply to the evaluation of their research, teaching and service in progress toward tenure. (See U. Policy 6-300-III-Sec. 2-D).

As per university policy, the performance of tenure track assistant professors is judged with regard to their potential to achieve tenure: "For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas [*i.e.,* research and teaching] must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure" and "effective service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for retention." (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i & ii).

In research, candidates should be working toward high quality publications. Additionally, candidates should be developing their broader research profile by presenting scholarly papers, especially at national and international conferences and symposia; by publishing book reviews; and when appropriate for the candidate's chosen line of research by seeking external financial support of their scholarship.

In teaching, candidates should make use of the full range of departmental and university resources (see Section B.2) to develop their teaching effectiveness – both inside and outside the classroom.

In service, candidates should be making contributions to the department and in some larger context – in the university, in the profession, or in the community.

C.2 Tenure and promotion to associate professor

a. We follow University Policy 6-303-III-a-1-c which states that: "Granting tenure is regarded as the University's most critical personnel decision." Also following University Policy, tenure is ordinarily granted in conjunction with promotion to associate professor: "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" (U. Policy 6-303-III-a-1-c).

The university characterizes its minimum standards for tenure as follows: "For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research … and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation … of departmental standards that require (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other… ." "Demonstration of effective service …is essential for tenure." (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c).

b. **Within those University parameters, the Department of Philosophy requires its candidates for tenure to demonstrate *excellence* in research, *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and *effectiveness* in service.**

c. In research, a candidate's required accomplishment of excellence is demonstrated by an established record of high-quality publications. We consider the quality and professional status

of the presses, journals, and venues in which a work is published or presented; how the work is evaluated or selected for publication or presentation, as well as its subsequent impact and how it is received. We consider also the insight, novelty, and clarity of the ideas and analysis. And we consider also the coherence and overall progress of a candidate's research program. To help measure quality and impact as accurately as possible, we seek the opinions of both external evaluators and department faculty.

No numerical statement regarding quantity can ever replace the emphasis on quality. Where a candidate's work is well-regarded by the external evaluators and the faculty, a successful case for tenure might be based on five substantial articles in high-quality refereed journals, supplemented by some less substantial work, including book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and the like; alternatively, a successful case for tenure might be based on a single-author monograph with a high-quality press, supplemented by one or two refereed articles or invited book chapters, along with some less substantial work – again, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and the like. These are merely two among the possible scenarios leading to a successful case for tenure. Each case is unique and must be judged on its own merits. In that high-quality work is always weighted more heavily, candidates should seek always to emphasize quality. And they are encouraged to consult with tenured faculty about the quality of the venues they are considering for their work.

d. In teaching, a candidate should have a demonstrated record of sustained effectiveness or excellence in the classroom. (Departmental procedures for evaluating teaching are described in Section B.2.) The candidate should be making regular contributions to graduate teaching, including mentoring graduate students whose interests overlap their own research.

e. In service, a candidate should have a record of effectiveness at the department level and have a maturing service profile in the university, the profession, and/or the community.

C.3 Promotion to full professor

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to demonstrate significant professional accomplishment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. (See Section D.5.b, below, for review schedule.)

In research, the emphasis at this level – even more than in tenure cases – must be on the quality and recognition in the field of work already published. General expectations of the department will be that the candidate will have published a monograph, or a substantial series of articles while at the rank of associate professor; that such publications will be of very high quality and represent such contributions to the field that they signify a status of leadership in the relevant area of expertise; and that such work will be visible nationally and internationally.

In teaching, candidates should have continued and built upon the strong record of teaching effectiveness we required for promotion to associate.

In service, candidates for promotion to professor should have demonstrated leadership in the department, the university, the profession, and/or the community.

C.4 Granting of tenure to associate professors or professors without tenure

The Department does not promote current tenure-line faculty to the Associate Professor or Professor rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. However, under some circumstances a candidate may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without the immediate granting of tenure, and then be reviewed for tenure in a subsequent year (see Section D.5.a below). 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 (if hired at that rank) , or that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a Professor (if hired at that rank).

D. Procedures

D.1 RPT functionaries

a. *RPT Advisory Committee*. Membership and voting for the department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by U. Policy 6-303-III-A-3. Consistent with that policy, all tenure - line faculty participate in discussion of non-confidential aspects of the candidate's RPT file. Only faculty eligible to vote on the case may be present during discussion of confidential aspects of the file (e.g., external evaluator reports), and during voting. Voting eligibility is as follows: (i) for retention votes, all tenured faculty members regardless of rank; (ii) for promotion votes, all tenure-line faculty of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate; (iii) for tenure votes, all tenured faculty, regardless of rank. (6-303-III-A-3-a). In cases involving both tenure and promotion, members vote separately as to each recommendation. The department chair shall notify absentee members of their right to submit written opinions and votes, and the votes of absentees received prior to the committee meeting will be counted the same as other votes. The department chair may attend meetings of the committee and upon invitation by majority vote of the committee may submit evidence and participate in discussion (but shall not vote). (6-303-III-E).

b. *RPT Advisory Committee secretary*. For each RPT Advisory Committee meeting, a secretary takes notes and writes a summary of the meeting. The secretary is chosen from among the vote-eligible members of the RPT Advisory Committee, by the RPT Advisory Committee chair. (See U. Policy 6-303-III-E-2,6,7)

c. *RPT Advisory Committee chair*. The chairperson is elected annually by a vote of all tenure-line faculty and is selected from the ranks of tenured faculty (see U. Policy 6-303-III-A-3-b). (Only a full professor can serve as chairperson in cases of promotion to full professor.)

d. *RPT Ad Hoc Committee and chair*. The Ad Hoc Committee consists of three tenured faculty (of vote-eligible rank for promotion cases). The RPT Advisory Committee chair functions as one of the three Ad Hoc Committee members and as the Ad Hoc Committee chair. The other two members of the Ad Hoc Committee are selected by the department chair. The Ad Hoc Committee serves roles (described below) for both RPT proceedings and tenured faculty review proceedings.

e. *Department chair*. The department chair writes independent evaluations in all RPT cases. The department chair does not serve on either the RPT Advisory Committee or the Ad Hoc Committee.

f. *Student Advisory Committee* (SAC). The undergraduate SAC consists of undergraduate philosophy majors; the graduate SAC consists of philosophy graduate students. SACs are to be given notice of the opportunity to compose reports on each candidate undergoing a formal RPT review, as specified under University Policy 6-303-III-C-3 at the direction of the department chair, with the assistance of the department's graduate and undergraduate directors. (See D.4.c, below).

g. *External Evaluators*. (See U-Policy 6-303-III-D-9) For all formal (but not informal) RPT reviews, experts from outside the department are solicited to evaluate the candidate's published research and write an opinion about its quality. Normally, 3-5 external evaluators are used for each RPT case. Evaluators should be well-established figures in the candidate's field, but not close associates (e.g., not dissertation advisors, co-authors, or the like). Evaluators are selected as follows. The Ad Hoc Committee produces a list of possible evaluators (in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee and the department chair). The candidate, too, produces a list of possible evaluators. The committee's list and the candidate's list are combined, and the candidate is given the opportunity to remove up to one fifth of the names from the combined list. The Ad Hoc Committee then decides the final list of possible evaluators – a list not revealed to the candidates, unless they've opted not to waive their right of access to external evaluator reports.

 Evaluators are sent representative samples of the candidate's research work and a copy of the departmental RPT Standards for research (from this RPT Statement), and are asked to evaluate the work primarily according to these departmental Standards, and secondarily by reference to current professional standards in the relevant subfield. They are not asked to express overall judgments of the candidate's fitness for retention, tenure, or promotion. Candidates have the option of waiving or not waiving the right to read the evaluation letters, and per Policy 6-303 must exercise that choice by signing a written waiver form which will be included in the candidate's file. (See waiver form in Appendix F.1). To facilitate forthright reviews, candidates are strongly advised to waive their right of access to reports from external evaluators, though doing so is optional. External evaluators, and all readers of the file, will be informed whether candidates have waived their access.)

D.2 RPT File Contents

a. *File contents prepared by candidates, prior to Advisory Committee meeting*

For all formal reviews, candidates are expected to provide the following to be placed in the RPT File maintained by the department:

- Current and complete curriculum vitae.
- List of potential external evaluators.
- Research-related documents:
  - Brief statement describing past, current, and projected research program.
  - Copies of all published work, to date. (Optional: unpublished manuscripts.)
- Teaching-related documents:

- o Brief statement describing teaching philosophy.
- o List of courses taught.
- o Syllabus for each course (the most recent version of the course).
- o Additional course materials that would help document teaching effectiveness – e.g., course descriptions, handouts, assignments, sample student work, etc.
- Service-related documents:
  - o List of service work for university – department committees, college committees, university committees. Include dates and an indication of any leadership roles.
  - o List of service for the profession – e.g., referee work, professional associations, etc.

In addition, candidates may opt to provide any additional materials, including the following: first, unpublished manuscripts; second, letters solicited by candidates about their research, teaching, or service. Any letters solicited by the candidate are to be non-confidential.

b. File contents added by the RPT Ad Hoc Committee chair prior to the Advisory Committee meeting

- o Peer teaching review reports from department faculty (or CTLE).
- o Course evaluations by students (collected by dept. staff)
- o SAC reports.
- o Written recommendations from any academic program the candidate is affiliated with (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4)
- o Written signed comments submitted by any department staff or faculty (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-2)
- o External evaluator letters (in a separate confidential section not accessible by candidate)
- o The summary report of the Ad Hoc Committee-- when completed.

The summary report of the Ad Hoc Committee (See D.3 below) is ordinarily the final document added to the file before the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. The committee's report is provided to the RPT Advisory Committee members and added to the RPT file and the complete contents of the file are made available to the Advisory Committee members, providing reasonable time to examine the materials before the scheduled Advisory Committee meeting. (The confidential external evaluator contents of the RPT file are made available only to vote-eligible members of the committee.) A copy of the Ad Hoc Committee's summary report is also provided to the candidate, and the candidate is entitled to review the complete contents of the RPT file (except for the confidential external evaluation letters if the candidate has waived access to those) (see U. Policy 6-303-III-D-10).

c. File contents added after the Advisory Committee meeting

- o Report of the Advisory Committee meeting (including votes)
- o Recommendation of the department chair
- o Candidate's optional response to either/both the Advisory Committee recommendation or the department chair's recommendation (See D.4.f, below).

D.3 Ad Hoc Committee duties

a. *Summary report.* The Ad Hoc Committee examines the entire contents of the RPT file, including the external evaluator letters, and writes a detailed summary report, which is placed in the RPT file, submitted to the Advisory Committee members, and provided to the candidate.

b. *Triggered reviews and extraordinary progress early reviews.* The Ad Hoc Committee may make a recommendation to the Advisory Committee and department chair that a formal review be "triggered" as a result of a candidate's unsatisfactory performance at the completion of an informal review. The Ad Hoc Committee may also make a recommendation to a candidate and the Advisory Committee that an upcoming informal review be converted to a formal review for purposes of shortening the probationary period due to a candidate's extraordinary progress. (See section D.5, below.) Such a recommendation based on extraordinary progress is normally made during the spring semester preceding the required review.

c. *Tenured faculty reviews.* The Ad Hoc Committee conducts periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members, as required by university regulations. (See Section E, below.)

D.4 Timeline for formal reviews

a. In the *spring term preceding* the year in which the candidate's review is to be conducted, the *candidate* assembles those contents of the RPT file for which they're responsible (see Section D.2) – doing so in consultation with the department chair and the Ad Hoc Committee chair. Some documents may be added later; other documents are needed sooner, e.g., publications will need to be sent to external evaluators as early as May and no later than July. Candidates should coordinate with the Ad Hoc Committee chair about the timing of when various documents are needed, along with whether to submit those documents in electronic or hardcopy form. Potential problems should be identified early, to enable resolution – e.g., a faculty peer review of teaching may need to be scheduled. Candidates intending to be considered for early review due to extraordinary progress should notify the chair of the department (see Section D.5, below).

b. In the *spring term preceding* the year in which a formal review will occur, the *department chair* (in coordination with the Ad Hoc Committee chair) initiates the process of selecting external evaluators (see Part D.1.g & U. Policy 6-303-III-D-9). The department chair also notifies administrators of non-departmental programs in which candidates are participants that written recommendations will be needed from those programs (see U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4). In May-July, the Ad Hoc Committee chair continues the process of obtaining external evaluations, by sending the candidate's publications to the external evaluators along with a copy of the department's applicable RPT Standards, and a notice as to whether the candidate has waived/not waived the right to read the external evaluation letters.

c. At the *beginning of the fall term*, the *department chair* (in consultation with the undergraduate and graduate directors) notifies the undergraduate and graduate SACs of the need for their reports, allowing at least three weeks for completion of these reports. (See D.1.f, above.) The chair's instructions to each SAC are to be in compliance with the University RPT Standards Committee's guiding principles; see U. Policy 6-303-III-C-3.) The department chair also invites all interested members of the department – faculty, staff, and students – to submit written signed comments about each candidate (see U. Policy 6-303-III-C-2); these signed comments are

included in the non-confidential section of each RPT file. The chair also requests a written recommendation from any academic program with which the candidate is affiliated (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4). And the department chair calls a meeting of the RPT Advisory Committee (see U. Policy 6-303-III-E-1).

d. In *preparation for the RPT Advisory Committee meeting*, the *Ad Hoc Committee chair* (in consultation with the candidate and the department chair) ensures that all RPT file contents are in order – including documents from the candidate, course evaluations, SAC reports, and peer teaching reviews, evaluations from non-departmental programs, reports from external evaluators, and the Ad Hoc Committee's own summary report. All file contents are made available to the members of the RPT Advisory Committee and to the candidate (barring the confidential external evaluator letters from non-voting members and the candidate), allowing reasonable time to review the files prior to the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. As per university policy, "Each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure shall be given at least 30 days advance notice of the department RPT advisory committee meeting and an opportunity to submit any information the candidate desires the committee to consider" (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-1).

e. *Following the RPT Advisory Committee meeting*, the Advisory Committee *secretary* performs three tasks: first, the secretary writes a summary of the meeting, taking care to report the specific recommendations made on each case (with the vote counts), and to summarize not only the committee's findings, but the basis of its findings (see U. Policy 6-303-III-E-6); second, the secretary forwards the summary to the committee members for final approval of its accuracy and completeness (see U. Policy 6-303-III-E-7); third, the secretary then forwards the approved summary to both the candidate and the department chair (see U. Policy 6-303-III-E-7).

f. *Following the RPT Advisory Committee meeting*, the *department chair* writes a separate report with a recommendation about the candidate. Upon forwarding this chair's report to the candidate, the chair will inform candidates of their right to add to the RPT file a written response to either/both the RPT Advisory Committee's summary report, or the chair's report; the candidate has seven business days to produce this optional written response and deliver it to the chair. The Advisory Committee report, the department chair's recommendation, and any timely optional response of the candidate are added to the RPT file. (See U. Policy 6-303-III-F)

g. Finally, the *department chair* (in coordination with the Ad Hoc Committee chair) forwards the completed file to the dean of the college, in accordance with college timelines (see U. Policy 6-303-III-F-4).

h. *Subsequent procedures* are described in U. 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).

D.5 Probationary periods and reviews schedule

a. Probationary period.

i. Normal probationary period and review schedule.
Under University Policies 6-311 and 6-303 departments have the options of setting the normal pre-tenure probationary period for candidates appointed at the rank of assistant professor as either six or seven years, and of normally having either one or two mid-probationary formal

retention reviews. In this department, the standard length of time in the rank of assistant professor **(*i.e.,* the standard probationary period) is six years, and there is one formal mid-probationary review, in the fourth year.** The following table summarizes the timing of reviews for candidates appointed at the rank of assistant professor:

Rank at appointment	Informal Reviews	Formal Reviews
Assistant Professor	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th years	4th and 6th years.

In normal cases, informal reviews occur in the first, second, third, and fifth years; the mid-probationary formal retention review occurs in the fourth year, and the final formal review for tenure occurs in the sixth year. In normal cases, tenure track assistant professors are considered for promotion to associate professor as part of the sixth year formal review for tenure.

In cases of appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without tenure, the normal probationary period is five years (Policy 6-311 Sec. 4-B), one mid-probationary formal retention review is required in the third year, and the final formal review for tenure occurs in the fifth year (Policy 6-303-III-B-2).

ii. Shortening or extending probationary period, modifying review schedule.
Within the limits set by university policy, candidates may be considered for early promotion and/or tenure whenever they request such reviews, and the RPT Advisory committee, recognizing outstanding achievement, may recommend that a candidate consider making such a request for early consideration. University policy addresses shortening of the review period as follows: *"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"* (U. Policy 6-311-Sec. 4-C-1). Such situations may occur in two cases: (a) *"Credit for prior service"*--when the candidate has demonstrated relevant accomplishments in prior employment; (b) *"Extraordinary progress toward tenure"*-- 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 *"unequivocally"* satisfy the pertinent standards (see Section C, above). *"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 U. Policy 6-311. The probationary period may also be extended in conformity with relevant university policies (See U. Policies 6-311, 6-314, 6-315, and contact the office of the Vice President for complete information).

iii. Triggered formal reviews. Renewal during the pre-tenure probationary period is not automatic. A finding of insufficient progress at the point of any informal review may trigger a formal retention review, as explained in University Policy*: "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"* (U. Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c).

b. Timing of request for promotion to professor.

Subsequent to granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor, candidates are normally considered for promotion to full professor at the time of their initial post-tenure review. (Post-tenure reviews occur every five years.) If promotion is not granted, the candidate may request a formal review for promotion in any subsequent year in consultation with the Ad Hoc Committee chair and department chair. Tenured associate professors may also be considered for promotion earlier if their progress is extraordinary. (See Section C.3, Standards)

c. *Timeline for candidates appointed prior to adoption of current RPT Guidelines.*
As further described in Section A, above, the normal RPT timeline (D5.a. above) will come into effect July 1 2012. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this timeline. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date being reviewed for promotion and tenure (assistant to associate level) will have the option of choosing the previous RPT timeline or this RPT timeline.

D.6 Informal reviews

The process for informal reviews begins at the start of the semester when these reviews are conducted, because the full set of RPT file contents used in formal reviews is not required. The work involved in informal reviews can be completed in the weeks preceding the RPT Advisory Committee's meetings. Candidates scheduled for informal reviews, and other faculty and staff of the department are notified of upcoming informal reviews during the preceding spring term. This timeline allows for a candidate to consider whether to request that a formal rather than informal review be conducted (*i.e.,* shortening the probationary period based on extraordinary progress, Part D.5.a).

Informal reviews for tenure-track faculty normally occur in the first, second, third and fifth years of the six-year probationary period (as indicated in the table above). The purpose of informal reviews is to assess whether candidates are making clearly adequate progress towards tenure consistent with the standards for retention described in Part C.1 above (and U-Policy 6-303-III-A-2-C-I, which states that *"For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas [teaching and research/other creative activity] must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure.").*

Deliberations of this kind require only updated vitas, course evaluations, and information concerning completed and in-progress scholarly work. The Ad Hoc Committee does not write reports or summaries for informal reviews but there is full discussion of the case at a meeting of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee, and the Committee votes either in favor of retention or to trigger a formal review. A report of the vote is prepared by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair, provided to the candidate, and placed in the RPT File. In cases in which the Advisory Committee and the department Chair support retention, the department Chair writes a letter to the Dean reporting the vote, recommending retention, and presenting the case for the candidate's potential to achieve tenure. If either a majority of the Advisory Committee or the department Chair decides to trigger a formal review, the triggered formal review will proceed as in Part D.5.a.iii above.

For all informal reviews, at the conclusion of the review the department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the review results and any concerns about the candidate's progress toward the next formal review.

E. Post-tenure reviews

As required by university policy, tenured faculty are reviewed every five years (U. Policy 2-005-Sec. 5-C). Faculty members under review will provide the following documents to the RPT Ad Hoc Committee chair:

- Current and complete curriculum vitae.
- Brief statement summarizing research activities over the past five years and plans for future research.
- Student course evaluations over the past five years. (Office staff will assist.)
- Faculty peer review report(s) of the candidate's teaching (no more than five years old).
- List of service work over the past five years – for the department, college, and university.

The department chair will invite other members of the department to submit written comments for each file.

The RPT Ad Hoc Committee reviews the above documents and produces a summary report on the faculty member's research, teaching, and service. The Ad Hoc Committee chair then submits the report to the department chair.

The department chair carefully reviews each report, along with any further information s/he might have. The chair meets with the faculty members under review, discussing their reports. Where appropriate, the chair discusses plans for improvement, along with further possible off-cycle reviews.

Finally, the department chair advises the College Dean of the findings of the review processes and makes the reports available to all tenure-line faculty in the department.

F. Appendices

Appendix F.1 Candidate waiver form (U-Policy 6-303-III-D-9)

Department of Philosophy, University of Utah

RPT Evaluation Waiver or Nonwaiver Form

I *waive* my right to see the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my RPT review.

_____   Date:
Signature

or

I *retain* my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my RPT review.

_____   Date:
Signature

Appendix F.2 URPTSC notice of final approval of RPT Statement

Memorandum

To: Stephen Downes, Chair, Department of Philosophy

cc: Amy Wildermuth, Associate V.P. Academic Affairs; Robert Newman, Dean of the
            College of Humanities

From: Hank Liese, College of Social Work
            Chairperson, University RPT Standards Committee 2011-2012

Subject: Approval of RPT Statement
Date: June 22, 2012

This is to confirm that the attached version of the Department of Philosophy's RPT Statement,
dated as approved on June 22, 2012, 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 2012-2013 (as of July 1, 2012).

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.