

Appendix I:
DEPARTMENT OF WRITING AND RHETORIC STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
PROCEDURES, STANDARDS, AND CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Approved by Department Tenure-line Faculty: _____

Approved by Dean: _____

Approved by University RPT Standards Committee _____ for implementation July 1, 2014

Table of Contents

1.	General Philosophy.....	
2.	Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty.....	
3.	RPT Standards.....	
	3.1 Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor.....	
	3.2 Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	
	3.3 Award of Tenure to Candidate Hired as Associate Professor or Professor.....	
	3.4 Promotion from Associate to Full Professor.....	
4.	RPT Criteria and Evaluation Guidelines.....	
5.		
6.	4.1 Research/Other Creative Activity and Publication.....	
	4.1.a Quantity of Research/Other Creative Activity.....	
	4.1.b Quality of Research/Other Creative Activity	
	4.1.c Summary Rating Scale for Research.....	
	4.2 Teaching.....	
	4.2.a Course Instruction.....	
	4.2.b Curriculum and Program Development.....	
	4.2.c Student Advising and Mentoring.....	
	4.2.d Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.....	
	4.3 Service.....	
	4.3.a Department, College and University Service.....	
	4.3.b Professional Service.....	
	4.3.c Community Service.. ..	
	4.3.d Summary Rating Scale for Service.....	
5.	RPT Procedures.....	
	5.1 Participants.....	
	5.1.a Candidate.....	
	5.1.b Department RPT Advisory Committee.....	
	5.1.c RPT Advisory Committee Chair.....	
	5.1.d Ad Hoc Committee.....	
	5.1.e Department Chair.....	

5.1.f Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee.....	
5.1.g Graduate Student Advisory committee.....	
5.1.h Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies Peer Teaching Review Committee.....	
5.1.i External Evaluators.....	
5.2 Probationary Period and Schedule of Reviews.....	
5.3 Informal Reviews.....	
5.3a Informal Reviews After the First Year.....	
5.3b First-Year Informal Review.....	
5.4 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews.....	
5.5 Formal Reviews – Steps Preceding Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting; Full File Compilation Timeline; and Candidate, Department Chair, RPT Advisory Committee Chair and Ad Hoc Committee Responsibilities.....	
5.5.1 Department Chair.....	
5.5.2 External Evaluators.....	
5.5.3 RPT Advisory Committee Chair.....	
5.5.4 Ad Hoc Committees.....	
5.5.5 Candidate.....	
5.6 RPT File Contents and File Closing Date.....	
5.6.1 Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents.....	
5.6.2 Department Responsibilities for File Contents.....	
5.6.3 File Closing Date.....	
5.7 Candidate’s Rights to Comment on File.....	
5.8. Formal Review – Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.....	
5.8.a Department RPT Advisory Committee Review.....	
5.8.b Department Chair Review.....	
5.8.c Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level.....	
6. Appendix A: Notice of URPTSC Final Approval.....	

This document constitutes the Department’s “Statement of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Standards” required by University Policy 6- 303- III - A- 2- a, in conjunction with Policy 6-311. Department criteria and procedures relating to faculty retention, promotion, and tenure are governed by applicable University Regulations, especially 6-303 (Retention, Promotion, and Tenure), and 6-311 (Faculty Retention and Tenure). Regulations are available at the University Regulations Website <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/>.

1. Introduction, Mission, and General Philosophy

The mission of the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies is to enhance the knowledge and skills related to writing and rhetoric in order to address the needs of an increasingly globalized world in which the ability to produce and comprehend texts is an essential part of everyday life.

Writing and Rhetoric Studies is dedicated to understanding the production, circulation, uses, and effects of texts, emphasizing the history of writing, the sociocultural relationship between writing and knowledge dissemination, and the impact of the written word and other forms of composition in education, the workplace, and society. Our Department draws upon the full spectrum of methodologies and perspectives. Through teaching, research and service, the Department serves the needs of its students and contributes significantly to the University's commitment to educational development through the discovery, refinement and exploration of knowledge.

Consistent with general University objectives, the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies affirms the importance of a tripartite professional commitment to excellence in research/scholarship, teaching, and service. The retention, promotion, and tenure guidelines are designed to provide standards and procedures that will be consistently applied in reviews of performance of candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure.

Each tenure-line member of the Department faculty is expected to be professionally committed to excellence in research/scholarship, teaching, and service. While each faculty member is expected to invest significant effort in each area, it is recognized that one's success in these areas varies according to one's unique abilities, commitments, and opportunities. Retention, promotion, and tenure reviews consider individualized achievements and contributions (some of which are intangible). Yet the basic criteria by which individual performance shall be judged and progress determined must be provided so that individuals know how performance will be judged and progress determined. This document provides those criteria.

In the Department's view, prolific publication and other creative activity, accompanied by inadequate teaching performance or superior teaching accompanied by inadequate publication/other creative activity, does not warrant promotion or tenure. An individual's personality or personal behavior will have no bearing upon departmental recommendations unless such factors become detrimental to effective departmental and University performance (consistent with University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b). Race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, citizenship, national origin, and political attitudes are irrelevant. However, consistent with University Policy 6-316, Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, assessments of research/other creative activity, teaching, and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty in these three areas.

In evaluating performance, we strive to employ reliable and valid indicators; however, judgments about performance are based on both qualitative and quantitative information and on professional judgments about what constitutes important research, educational, and service goals. Therefore, these sets of indicators cannot replace professional judgment from local and national/international scholars in the field. Retention and promotion decisions require judgments about the total professional performance of an individual, and we evaluate performance on a case-by-case basis.

2. 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 RPT standards.

3. RPT Standards

A faculty member under review for retention, promotion, and/or tenure is judged according to three functions (criteria): (1) research/other creative activity, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Possible ratings (standards) for each function are *excellent* (as per University Policy 6-303), *effective* (as per University Policy 6-303), and *not satisfactory*. The criteria and standards for retention at the rank of Assistant Professor; tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; tenure to candidates hired as Associate Professor or Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each level is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. Evaluation guidelines for ratings in research/other, teaching, and service are described in subsequent sections.

3.1 Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor.

“For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas [of teaching and research/other other creative activity] must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i)

3.2 Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure.

“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/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i)

“Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their public service. Demonstration of effective service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for retention, promotion, and tenure.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-ii)

In this department, normally, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are considered concomitantly. Therefore, there is a single set of standards. Tenure and promotion to this rank requires ratings of *excellent* in either research/scholarship or teaching, *sustained effectiveness* in the other, and *sustained effectiveness* in service.

Tenure: The requirements for achieving tenure are the same as those requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.3 Award of Tenure to Candidates Hired as Associate Professor or Professor.

If a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member provide 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. If 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 provide convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a Professor.

3.4 Promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

“For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas [of teaching and research/other creative activity] must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank” (U. Policy 6-303-III-a-2-c-i). In the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, promotion to the rank of Professor requires *excellence* in both research/scholarship and teaching, *sustained effectiveness* in service to the University, and *effectiveness* in some combination of service to the community. Attainment of the rank of Professor requires production of a distinctive and widely recognized contribution to scholarship relevant to one or more of the accepted areas of study in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

4. RPT Criteria and Evaluation Guidelines

Department RPT Advisory Committee members consider both how to evaluate performance in research/other creative activity, teaching, and service, and how to integrate these evaluations into an overall assessment of performance. In all cases, the significance and sustained nature of the record are considered. Below are sets of potential indicators of performance at each faculty rank in the Department. The basic departmental standard is that in each domain, a candidate shall make contributions that have impacts appropriate to his or her career stage. We expect that different candidates' records will emphasize different areas of strength based on their varied interests and responsibilities. Therefore, in providing this set of evaluation guidelines, the Department does not imply that every faculty member must perform in a uniform way in each area; instead, the applicability of these guidelines is based on the professional judgment of their peers and colleagues.

For most quantifiable indicators (whether in the research /other creative activity, teaching, or service domain), the Department RPT Advisory Committee is provided with a candidate's performance as well as the range of performance achieved in recent successful cases at the same rank as that for which the candidate is being reviewed. These numbers are provided as important comparisons and the Department is unlikely to retain or promote a candidate whose profile across these quantitative indicators is marginal in all areas (lower than the range of accomplishment of recent successful candidates). Candidates are allowed access to these comparative data at any time by requesting them from the departmental administrative officer who is responsible for keeping the information current.

4.1 Research Publication/Scholarship.

Research publication/scholarship is expected of every member of the Department. Each faculty member is expected to make a serious and sustained commitment to a planned program of scholarly research intended to result in significant publication and/or other tangible evidence of professional progress. Digitally-based and community-based research are also valued.

In the case of a candidate who joins the faculty because of specialized professional qualifications, creative activity may be accepted as comparable to research. Such activity must be public and of significant stature, subject to peer review, and under the purview of other professionals in the field.

Candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure are expected to produce scholarly publications that are publicly presented in appropriate venues. The Department's policy is to use estimable publication as evidence of research/scholarship. In general publication includes books and monographs; articles and reviews in professional journals; scholarly book chapters; essays and articles reflecting substantial research and/or creative activity which appear in other periodicals; and non-print forms of publication such as new media scholarship and convention papers. Evidence of final acceptance of a manuscript by a press or journal shall be deemed the equivalent of publication. Quality is more important than quantity at all levels. Publications or creative works must represent significant contributions to knowledge of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. In each case, a significant independent contribution is expected.

Research grants are important to scholarly activity. Where appropriate, RPT Advisory Committee members will give positive consideration to the extent to which an individual has submitted grant applications as a Principal Investigator or a Co-Investigator and has been able to obtain research grant funds and thereby increase the probability of ongoing research and future scholarly contributions. While having funded research is not a necessary component of most RPT decisions, it is viewed as important by helping to demonstrate excellence in research as well as to promote research productivity.

4.1.a Quantity of Research/Other Creative Activity.

Quantity of research/scholarship is not judged by simple publication counts. A series of publications over time that represents sustained research and scholarship in one or more areas is highly valued. The Department may take into consideration unusually long or unusually short publications in assessing quantity. In assessing sustained research, the Department may take into consideration acceptable interruptions in the research trajectory (e.g., administrative appointments, family issues).

4.1.b Quality of Research/Other Creative Activity.

Quality is best assessed by experts in the field, including peer reviewers for publications, external evaluators solicited for the RPT review, and Departmental colleagues who have read the publications. In judging the research/scholarship of a candidate for promotion or tenure, the Department will ask for opinions from knowledgeable evaluators outside the Department, consider the quality of peer-reviewed publications, and use the evaluations of internal colleagues serving on the candidate's ad hoc committee (see 5.1.d below).

Research/scholarship is evaluated with respect to three facets of quality--purpose, significance, and impact. Although these facets are not independent of one another, each defines a different aspect of quality. The three facets are applied to the variety of research areas represented by Department faculty. Successful evaluation can be achieved with a variety of products that differ with respect to these quality dimensions. However, judging the quality of contributions is an essential part of evaluating candidates in the area of research/scholarship, and these three facets define the forms of research that generally signify greater quality and importance.

4.1.b.1 Purpose of the Contribution.

Quality is in part evaluated by the degree to which the research/scholarship contributes to new knowledge or new understanding. Five categories of purpose are listed here, reflecting a general ordering from greater to lesser significance. This ordering assumes that some purposes reflect to a

higher degree the creation of new knowledge or understanding. The Department recognizes the greater contribution of these purposes.

Creation of New Knowledge. This category includes research/scholarship activity products that present new theory, methodology, empirical evidence, or interpretations relevant to the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, and also includes curation of data sets and archives.

Novel Synthesis of Existing Knowledge. This category includes research/scholarship that present a new synthesis of existing knowledge with new implications for future research/scholarship and theory. Examples include an integrative literature review or review that proposes new conceptualizations of existing evidence, or a comprehensive meta-analysis that produces a new understanding of existing empirical evidence.

New Descriptive Evidence. This category includes research/scholarship products that report new evidence, but with little or no development of new conceptual understanding. Examples include studies that describe phenomena without testing, contrasting, or proposing theoretical or novel interpretive understandings.

Summary and/or Application of Existing Knowledge. This category includes research/scholarship products that summarize existing knowledge (previously generated theory, concepts, interpretations), often with recommended applications. Examples include textbooks and written works primarily devoted to developing recommendations from existing knowledge.

Commentary on Existing Knowledge. This category includes research/scholarship products of limited scope such as a published comment, editorial, or book review. This work is limited in scope and addresses existing research, theory, or practice.

4.1.b.2 Significance of the Research/Scholarship Outlet.

The quality of contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear. Four levels of significance are listed below. The examples are meant to serve only as general guidelines for assessing the significance of outlets. In addition, some types of outlets are not listed as examples because they vary considerably in their significance. Each product is considered for its own unique merits relative to this facet of quality.

Level 1. Examples of this category include authored scholarly books by respected academic publishers, articles in widely recognized peer-reviewed journals that are general to the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, articles in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals in a specialty area, major funded research grants, and articles in highly-regarded edited books that include original scholarship.

Level 2. Examples of this category include articles in respected peer-reviewed journals, book chapters in a high-quality edited book, edited books, and externally funded research grants, and authored scholarly books by respected mainstream publishers.

Level 3. Examples of this category include articles in peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed abstracts, authored books on professional topics for the general public, textbooks, presentations at national/international professional conferences, conference proceedings, internally funded

research seed grants, major unfunded external research grants, and invited addresses to prominent national/international conferences.

Level 4. Examples of this category include articles in non-peer reviewed journals, unpublished research reports, white papers, presentations at conferences, anthologies which consist of edited collections of articles, and reprints of documents or essays.

4.1.b.3 Impact or Potential Impact of the Work.

Judgments of impact (or potential impact) range from exceptional to minimal. These judgments are based on the Departmental RPT Advisory Committee members' collective assessments of the work, conclusions from qualified external evaluators, citation rates if the publications have existed for a sufficient period of time, and in some cases other forms of recognition such as awards and honors. Both the breadth and depth of impact are considered.

Breadth of impact. This is the degree to which contributions broadly affect (or are likely to affect) different areas within the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, including one's own area(s) of specialization. Contributions that have far-reaching impact are especially valued. Breadth of impact is not meant to reflect the size of a scholar's specialty area(s) but rather the degree to which research/other creative activity products have (or are predicted to have) broad influence within and across discipline and specialty areas, and/or an impact on local, regional, and/or national communities outside the academy.

Depth of impact. This is the degree to which contributions have changed (or are likely to change) the way other scholars think about a conceptual area. Judgments about depth of impact take into account such things as the clarity with which important issues or questions are identified, the sophistication of methods or analyses used or proposed, the amount of evidence brought to bear on the issues, the depth of analysis and interpretation, the timeliness and originality of the contribution, and the degree to which conclusions and/or recommendations are likely to have an impact on the conceptual area.

4.1.c Summary Rating Scale for Research.

Ratings on the 3-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/other creative activity as described above, given the candidate's time in rank.

Excellent: The candidate has made significant contributions in one or more areas of research/scholarship. The quality and quantity of research reflect a substantial, positive impact in at least one topic area.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable contributions for time in rank. The quality and quantity of existing contributions suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

Not satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions given time in rank.

4.2. Teaching.

Teaching refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, service on graduate student committees, and advising students in general. RPT judgments in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies are

made primarily with respect to three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, and (3) student advising and mentoring. Peer Teaching Reviews (described below) and Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports provide the primary evidence used for the evaluation of teaching.

Peer Teaching Reviews should be based on information from the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy, University course evaluations, SAC reports, interviews with the faculty member, class visitation, and syllabi and other available artifacts from the course such as assignments and tests.

Peer Teaching Reviews must be conducted by the Peer Teaching Review Committee (see 5.1.h below) as a whole (not by a single individual) and should address the following: course instruction, curriculum and program development, and student advising and mentoring. The Committee's overall evaluation of a candidate's performance as an instructor gives consideration to factors that can affect student ratings and SAC evaluations.

Student Advisory Committee reports should be developed in accordance with the University's Guiding Principles for Student Advisory Committee Evaluations of Faculty Members. (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-3)

4.2.a Course Instruction.

Course instruction includes the planning and execution of classroom or online instruction for university courses. In judging the candidate's course instruction, consideration shall be given to the following: What is the quality and organization of prepared course materials? How well do instructional practices reflect the teaching philosophy? How current are the teaching materials? Do the evaluation practices match the instructional objectives stated in the course syllabi? Does the candidate meet classes as scheduled? Is the candidate regularly available for interaction with students outside of class? How do students respond to the instructor and courses in student feedback forms?

4.2.b Curriculum and Program Development.

The contributions of candidates to ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance are recognized as an important function within the evaluation of teaching. The development and teaching of courses needed to enhance the Department's curriculum are valued. Program development may include the development of new programs, as well as contributions to self-studies needed for University accreditation and Graduate Council reviews. In judging the candidate's contributions in this area, consideration shall be given to the following: How has the candidate contributed to the Department's undergraduate and graduate departmental teaching needs? How has the candidate contributed to curriculum and program development? How has the candidate contributed to the Department's teaching needs?

4.2.c Student Advising and Mentoring.

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is as important as teaching in the classroom. This includes activities such as general student advising and mentoring and the chairing and serving on graduate student committees. While there are no quantitative expectations, candidates are expected to contribute a reasonable share of the committee work relative to other faculty members at the same rank. In judging the candidate's advising and

mentoring, consideration shall be given to the following: How effectively has the candidate worked with graduate students? How effectively has the candidate worked with undergraduate students?

4.2.d Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.

Ratings on the 3-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching, relative to the candidate's time in rank.

Excellent: The candidate has made significant contributions to the department in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable contributions in the area of teaching for time in rank. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

Not satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of teaching given time in rank.

4.3 Service.

Service, no less than research/scholarship and teaching, is an essential element in a candidate's professional growth. While service alone cannot warrant retention, promotion, or tenure, it shall be regarded as an important and necessary element in the candidate's record.

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: department, college and University service; professional service; and community or public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the unique strengths and interests of faculty members. The Department recognizes extraordinary service that goes beyond normal expectations in each of the three areas. Service is evaluated based on materials provided in the candidate's file.

4.3.a Department, College and University Service.

Service on elected or appointed departmental, college and university committees or task forces is expected of every faculty member. Contributions beyond these expected committee assignments are also given consideration in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure.

4.3.b Professional Service.

As members of a professional community, candidates are expected to perform duties essential to the professional associations at regional, national, and international levels. This typically includes such activities as providing editorial services to scholarly journals or book publishers; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at meetings; serving on professional association committees or boards; and holding offices in professional organizations. Contributions to the profession beyond normal service activities are also given consideration in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure.

4.3.c Community Service.

Service in which the faculty member's professional expertise and skills are contributed to the local, state, or larger populace for little or no monetary recompense can also be a significant part of a candidate's service record. (Outside consultation that yields significant payment to the individual is specifically excluded from this definition of "service," as is volunteer activity not germane to the individual's professional interests and goals.) Noteworthy contributions to the community are considered in retention, promotion, and tenure.

4.3.d Summary Rating Scale for Service.

Ratings on the 3-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of service, relative to the candidate's time in rank.

Excellent: The candidate has made significant contributions to his/her profession, the Department, College and/or University, and/or the community

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable contributions in the area of service for time in rank. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of service given time in rank.

5. RPT Procedures

5.1 Participants.

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews conducted by the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies:

5.1.a Candidate.

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

5.1.b Department RPT Advisory Committee.

Membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy 6-303-III-A-3 (with qualification differing based on the particular decision being considered at a particular meeting for a particular candidate—retention, promotion in rank, or tenure). Only qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend and participate in its meetings.

5.1.c 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 Associate and Full Professors of the Department, with all tenure-line faculty participating in the election. (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-3-b)

5.1.d Ad Hoc Committee.

For informal reviews, a single ad hoc reviewer is appointed by the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee to prepare an ad hoc report to the Committee. The reviewer is a tenured member of the Committee. (See Part 5.3 below).

For formal reviews, a committee of three ad hoc reviewers, all of whom are eligible to vote on the candidate's formal retention, promotion and/or tenure, is appointed by the elected Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee in consultation with the candidate. One member of the ad hoc committee shall be designated as its chair by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair.

5.1.e Department Chair.

The administrative head of the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

5.1.f Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee.

A committee made up of representatives of undergraduate Writing and Rhetoric majors.

5.1.g Graduate Student Advisory Committee.

A committee made up of representatives of graduate Writing and Rhetoric students.

5.1.h Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies Peer Teaching Review Committee.

The Peer Teaching Review Committee of the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, consists of members of the faculty elected in conformity with Department procedures.

5.1.i External Evaluators.

Scholars selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, the Department Chair, and the ad hoc committee, in consultation with the candidate, to provide reviews of the candidate's scholarly work. (See Part 5.1.i, and U. Policy 6-303-III-D-9)

5.2 Probationary Period and Schedule of Reviews.

All non-tenured tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed for retention annually during their RPT probationary period, with an informal review conducted in each year that a formal review is not conducted. For a candidate initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, in the fourth year a formal retention review is mandatory, and a formal tenure and promotion review is mandatory in the seventh (final) year of the probationary period. For a candidate initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure, a formal retention review is required in the third year, and a formal tenure review is mandatory in the fifth (final) year of the probationary period. (See U. Policy 6-311.) As described below, and following University policy, the probationary period may be shortened or extended, credit may be given for prior service, and an early tenure review may be requested. In the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, a peer teaching review is mandatory in the year prior to the formal review.

Although, typically, candidates are considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously, 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.

Shortening of the probationary period. 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, 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 6-311-4-C-1) Detailed information about shortening the probationary period is contained in University Policy 6-311.

Credit for prior service. According to University policy, “*When a candidate has prior relevant experience, in most cases including both research and teaching, such experience may be credited as the equivalent of a specified number of years toward fulfillment of the probationary period. A request for credit for prior service shall be made in writing. Credit for prior service may be assessed once, either at the time of appointment or before a review for tenure commences.*” (U. Policy 6-311-4-C-1-a) Detailed information on receiving credit for prior service is contained in University Policy 6-311.

Extraordinary progress towards tenure. According to University policy, “*When a candidate believes he/she can demonstrate achievement of the tenure standards in less than the normal probationary period, that candidate may seek permission for an early tenure review. The candidate must obtain approval from the department chair and the RPT chair to be reviewed earlier than the final year of the normal probationary period.*” (U. Policy 6-311-4-C-1-b) Detailed information on extraordinary progress towards tenure is contained in University Policy 6-311.

Extension of the probationary period. The probationary period may also be lengthened in conformity with relevant University policies. Detailed information on extending the probationary period is contained in University Policy 6-311 and other pertinent policies, and readers should consult the office of the Associate Vice President for Faculty for current complete information.

Associate Professors with tenure may request promotion to the rank of Professor at any time at which they have met the Department’s requirements. The Department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor.

5.3 Informal Reviews.

Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall normally take place in the first, second, third, fifth, and sixth years of the typical seven-year probationary period (except in the case of a request for early tenure or the case of a triggered formal review – see 5.4 below).

5.3.a Informal Reviews After the First Year.

These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file for an informal review shall normally 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/scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas. The candidate may also submit relevant supplementary material if he or she so wishes. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 30.

In the case of joint appointments, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate program director or department chair in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the program director or department chair to submit a letter or a program report on the candidate’s progress

toward tenure. Program materials should also be submitted to the Department prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from the joint appointment department/program will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

Course evaluation results are added to the file by the department chair. The informal review process does not include solicitation of external evaluations, nor reports from the department Student Advisory Committees.

The RPT Advisory Committee Chair will appoint as an ad hoc reviewer one faculty member (an RPT Advisory Committee member) to review the candidate's file, meet with the candidate, and write an ad hoc informal review report that specifies progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the candidate.

The Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15 to consider informal reviews. Each member of the committee is responsible for reviewing the file, including the ad hoc informal reviewer's report, before the meeting. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention. The secretary, who is to be designated by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair, shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare minutes of the meeting reflecting the nature of the discussion.

After studying the candidate's record, the Department Chair shall prepare his/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 and the contents of the RPT Advisory Committee report and the Department Chair's letter.

The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her informal review file in response to the ad hoc reviewer's report, the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee meeting and vote, and/or the Department 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 chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.

The informal review materials shall be submitted to the dean no later than January 31. This concludes the informal review.

5.3.b First-Year Informal Review.

The first-year informal review will be conducted by the Department Chair during the Spring Semester. The Department Chair will review the candidate's scholarship, teaching evaluations, and service to ensure no serious problems have arisen. No written report is required from this review.

The Department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the review, and if problems with scholarship, teaching, or service appear, the Department Chair shall discuss those with the candidate. Pursuant to the triggered review process described below, the Department Chair in a first year review is authorized to trigger a formal review in the second year if needed.

5.4 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews.

In accordance with 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. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following academic year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.”* (U. Policy 6-303-3-B-1-c)

5.5 Formal Reviews – Steps Preceding Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting; Full File Compilation Timeline; and Candidate, Department Chair, RPT Advisory Committee Chair and Ad Hoc Committee Responsibilities.

Procedures to be followed for formal mid-probationary retention review (typically fourth-year), formal tenure, and formal promotion (both to Associate Professor and Full Professor) reviews will follow the same format.

5.5.1 Department Chair.

The Department Chair is involved with the RPT process from the point when the candidate is appointed to a tenure-line position at the University. At that point, the Chair distributes RPT guidelines to the faculty member.

By April 1, the Department Chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, by letter, faculty required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Department Chair by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Chair will also request nominations for five external evaluators from the candidate and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee (see 5.8.a below), the Department Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, “stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-2)

If a candidate holds a joint appointment in another academic unit, the Department Chair will notify the chair/director of the academic unit of the action to be considered. Academic unit faculty as defined by procedures established by that unit (and not participating in the Writing and Rhetoric Studies departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation that shall be sent to the Department Chair and added to the RPT file, along with any candidate response, prior to the closing date of the file. (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4)

The Department Chair will notify the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies Undergraduate and Graduate Student Advisory Committees of candidates undergoing formal review by February 15. In accordance with University policy, *“The SAC evaluation and report should be based on the 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-II-C-3) The SAC reports shall be due to the Department Chair no later than April 30.

5.5.2 External Evaluators.

The Department Chair, after consulting with the RPT Advisory Committee Chair and the ad hoc committee chair, and considering the list of five potential evaluators submitted by the candidate, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. The Department Chair will use a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations (see U.Policy 6-303-III-D-9). External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than August 30.

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

5.5.3 RPT Advisory Committee Chair.

By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chair will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint an ad hoc committee of three faculty members, all of which are eligible to vote on the candidate's promotion and/or tenure.

5.5.4 Ad Hoc Committees.

Research evaluation. The ad hoc committee will review the research/scholarship record based on materials in the candidate's file and external evaluations.

Teaching evaluation. The ad hoc committee will review the teaching record based on materials in the candidate's file.

Service evaluation. The ad hoc committee will evaluate service by examining information provided in the candidate's file.

5.5.5. Candidate.

Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to supply the Department Chair with a current vita, copies of publications and papers, reviews of published work, and a personal statement that specifies progress to date in research/scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these areas.

5.6. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date.

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, Writing and Rhetoric Studies candidates' files must contain a Peer Teaching Review report; a personal statement prepared by the candidate; and a summary and evaluation report on the candidate's research/scholarship, teaching, and service prepared by the ad hoc committee.

5.6.1. Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents.

As described above, prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to supply the Department Chair with a current vita, copies of publications and papers, reviews of published work, and a personal statement that specifies progress to date in research/scholarship, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these areas, all to be added to the RPT file.

5.6.2. Department Responsibilities for File Contents.

The Department Chair shall ensure that current course evaluation results, available SAC reports, any written recommendations from faculty and staff, external evaluator reports, and each of the following materials are included in the file:

“Past reviews and recommendations. The department chair shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, i.e. SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present). Teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included. The past reviews and recommendations in a file for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate's vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-D-4)

“Evidence of faculty responsibility. Letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials, arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the candidate's file.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-D-5)

“Recommendation from academic program. In the event that an academic program produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C-4, the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-D-6) This practice applies to all joint appointments whether the appointment is with an academic program or an academic department.

5.6.3. File Closing Date.

The file closes on September 30.

5.7 Candidate's Rights to Comment on File.

In accordance with University policy, *“Candidates are entitled to see their review file [including the ad hoc committee's report] upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.” (U. Policy 6-303-II-D-10)*

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

5.8.a Department RPT Advisory Committee Review.

The full Department RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15. Each committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The committee will discuss the record as it pertains to the relevant criteria. Votes will be taken by secret ballot.

Whenever possible, the RPT Advisory Committee Chair will 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. (U. Policy 6-303-III-E-4)

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

In accordance with University policy, "After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is jointly appointed with an academic program, the department advisory committee report shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program" (U. Policy 6-303-III-E-6). A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the Committee chair. The minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. In accordance with University policy, the summary report of the meeting, "signed by the secretary and approved by the committee chairperson, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting." (U. Policy 6-303-II-E-7)

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

5.8.b Department Chair Review.

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

Candidate's right to respond. "The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/ her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department RPT advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. 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 chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson. . . . The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college." (U. Policy 6-303-III-F-3 & 4)

5.8c. Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level.

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

6. Appendix A: Notice of URPTSC Final Approval.

NA