

Version 2021

Approved Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee: December 10, 2020

Approved Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs: December 16, 2020

Approved Senior Vice President for Health Sciences: February 1, 2021

University of Utah David Eccles School of Business

Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement for Tenure-line Faculty

Approved by School Tenure-line Faculty: April 3, 2023

Approved by School Dean: April 3, 2023

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee: April 21, 2023

Approved by cognizant Senior Vice President July 1, 2023, to become **effective on July 1, 2023**.

Editorial Revision 1: DEI language update approved October 2024.

Preface & Mission Statement

This document is the School's Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures, as required by University Regulations. All committees or individuals making any recommendation or decision in an RPT proceeding shall do so consistent with the governing University Regulations and the substantive criteria, standards, and evidence set forth in this Statement. The primary relevant University Regulations are Policies [6-303](#) and [6-311](#).

Mission: We build strategic leaders, embrace varied backgrounds, and apply ethical principles to create value. As a catalyst for entrepreneurial thinking and innovative solutions, we discover and apply new knowledge while enjoying the environment and people around us. Together, we make a lasting impact on our communities.

To meet these objectives, we promote thought leadership through innovative research and discovery. We will continue to solidify our researchers as thought leaders in the business education world. We will do this by increasing our research output and sharing the findings widely through academic journals and popular media.

Table of Contents

Preface & Mission Statement.....	1
1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty.....	4
2. Informal and Formal Reviews Schedule	4
2.1 Length of Probationary Period and Schedule of Reviews.....	4
a. Normal probationary period.....	4
b. Reviews schedule.....	4
Table 1: Normal Reviews Schedule.....	5
c. Shortening or extending the probationary period.....	5
2.2 Candidates Appointed at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor, without Tenure	5
2.3 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor	5
3. RPT Criteria and Standards.....	6
3.1 Summary of RPT Standards.....	6
3.2 Evaluation of Research.....	7
a. Description of research and evidence to be evaluated	7
b. Research funding.....	7
c. Summary rating scale for research.....	8
3.3 Evaluation of Teaching	8
a. Course instruction	9
b. Curriculum and program development	9
c. Student advising and mentoring.....	9
d. Summary rating scale for teaching.....	9
3.4 Evaluation of Service	10
a. Professional service.....	10
b. University service.....	10
c. Public service	11
d. Summary rating scale for service.....	11
4. RPT Procedures.....	11
4.1 Participants.....	11
a. Candidate.....	11
b. Department Chair.....	11

c.	Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT-SAC).....	11
d.	Peer Teaching Reviewers.....	11
e.	Shared-appointment unit.....	11
f.	External Evaluators.....	11
g.	Department RPT Advisory Committee.....	12
h.	Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair.....	12
i.	Secretary.....	12
j.	David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee.....	12
k.	Senior David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee.....	12
4.2	Informal Review Procedures.....	13
a.	Purpose of informal reviews.....	13
b.	First-Year informal review.....	13
c.	Informal reviews after the first year.....	13
d.	Triggering formal retention reviews.....	14
4.3	Formal Review Procedures.....	14
a.	Department Chair responsibilities.....	14
b.	Meeting and Report of Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT-SAC).....	15
c.	Assignment by Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair.....	15
d.	Peer Teaching Reviewers.....	15
e.	External Evaluators.....	15
f.	RPT file contents and file closing date.....	16
g.	Candidate's right to comment on file.....	17
h.	Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting and subsequent steps.....	17
Appendix A:	RPT File Contents.....	19
Appendix B:	Letter Templates.....	21
Letter to Request Materials from Outside Reviewer for Tenure with or without Promotion ...		21
Letter to Request Materials from Outside Reviewer for Promotion to Professor.....		23
Appendix C:	Notices of Final Approval of RPT Statement.....	25

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

These RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures are applicable as of the effective date shown on page 1. Any candidate appointed to a tenure-line faculty position on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

This document applies to all departments, schools, and divisions in the School. All references to “department” in this document apply equally to the schools and divisions.

With the exception of candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor (see below), a candidate whose appointment began prior to the effective date has the option of being reviewed under either (1) the RPT Statement in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this Statement. The Department Chair must notify the candidate that this Statement will apply automatically unless a candidate communicates a preference to be reviewed under the prior RPT Statement by signed letter submitted to their Department Chair and Dean. For a formal review during which external evaluations are solicited, the candidate must communicate their preference by signed letter prior to materials being sent to external evaluators. For all other reviews, the candidate must communicate their preference by signed letter by the deadline for the candidate to provide materials for the review.

A candidate who will be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor after the effective date of this Statement will be reviewed according to the RPT Statement in effect at the time review materials are sent to external evaluators.

2. Informal and Formal Reviews Schedule

2.1 Length of Probationary Period and Schedule of Reviews

a. Normal probationary period

The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of *Assistant Professor* is *seven* years. Per University Policy, the normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of *Associate Professor* or *Professor* is *five* years.

b. Reviews schedule

The Department shall conduct either a formal or an informal review of a candidate in each year of their probationary period (as indicated in Table 1 below). Additionally, the Department shall conduct a formal review of each candidate for tenure (and typically also for promotion) in the final year of the probationary period.

A candidate with a seven-year probationary period undergoes one formal mid-probationary retention review in the *fourth* year.

A candidate with a five-year probationary period undergoes one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the *third* year.

Table 1: Normal Reviews Schedule

Rank at Appointment	Year of Informal Review	Year of Formal Review
Assistant Professor	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 5 th , 6 th	4 th , 7 th
Associate Professor or Professor (without tenure)	1 st , 2 nd , 4 th	3 rd , 5 th

As more fully explained in 4.2.d below, if a candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress in an informal review, a formal review may be *triggered*.

c. Shortening or extending the probationary period

A candidate may request an early tenure review (i.e., *shortening* the otherwise applicable probationary period) by following the procedures provided for in University Regulations. Because early reviews require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress toward tenure, few requests are made, and few are granted. Candidates should consult with the Department Chair, Dean, and senior colleagues before requesting an early tenure review.

If the candidate has had an authorized *extension* of the probationary period, the years of the mid-probationary formal retention review and the final review for tenure shall be adjusted accordingly. Regardless of an extension of a candidate's probationary period, the Department shall conduct an informal review in any year in which a formal review is not held.

2.2 Candidates Appointed at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor, without Tenure

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

2.3 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

The School does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to the granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may request a review for promotion. Ordinarily, however, such reviews are not held before the academic year in which a candidate is scheduled for the first Tenured Faculty Review (TFR), which is five years after tenure is achieved (see [Policy 6-321](#)). In considering promotion to the rank of Professor, reviewers shall consider all of the candidate's faculty activities since the candidate was granted tenure.

3. RPT Criteria and Standards

The University and the David Eccles School of Business Departments determine a faculty member's tenure status and rank based on assessment of achievements in the three functions of tenure-line faculty members, referred to as *criteria* in University Regulations: (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service.

Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the *standards* set for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Regulations identify a three-level scale of standards for evaluating performance: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period, for tenure, and for promotion to each rank are listed below. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply for both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of a candidate's performance are based on the *evidence* provided in the RPT file, as described in subsequent sections.

Per [Policy 6-303](#), in carrying out their duties in research, teaching, and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Faculty Code ([Policy 6-316](#)). Therefore, assessments of research, teaching, and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty, based on the evidence in the file.

This School embraces the University's Foundational Pillars as articulated [here](#).

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure. Reasonable potential does not require a high probability of achieving tenure but rather a foreseeable path forward to tenure based on published research and promising work in process (e.g., working papers under review at high-quality journals, accepted at conferences, or that are highly cited¹), as well as teaching and service performance to date.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of *excellent* in research, at least *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service.

Associate Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must have developed a broad reputation for at least *sustained effectiveness* in research; demonstrated at least *sustained effectiveness* in teaching; and performed at least *effective* service in some combination of University, public, and professional settings. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.

¹ It is common in the David Eccles School of Business to share works in progress in different arenas including SSRN, conference presentations, and other sources that lead to citations prior to publication.

Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in research resulting in a national and international reputation in their field, at least *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

3.2 Evaluation of Research

Judgments about a candidate's research are based on both the quality and quantity of research and its relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive research, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research reflect professional judgments that consider the quality and quantity of contributions and the professional context of the candidate.

a. Description of research and evidence to be evaluated

High-quality research is imperative. In the long run, the quality of any research is determined by its impact on the field of study. The candidate must have a program of research in place indicative of an ongoing commitment to the discovery of knowledge and of future productivity.

Research quality and impact is assessed through direct examination of published papers. Additional evidence of research quality and impact can include, but is not limited to:

- High-quality refereed journals,
- Citation analysis,
- External reviewer assessments,
- Influence on subsequent research (that builds upon the candidate's work),
- Internal quality assessment by colleagues, and
- Research awards from recognized organizations and institutions.

Evidence of journal quality can include, but is not limited to:

- Journal citation and impact factors,
- External reviewer comments, and
- Journal rankings compiled by outside academics.

The Department and candidate should work together to present evidence regarding journal quality.

The David Eccles School of Business has a tradition of encouraging collaborative work. In some circumstances, however, questions can arise regarding the nature and extent of a candidate's contribution to jointly authored work. The candidate is encouraged to clarify in their research statement how their body of research work establishes independent contribution and impact as a scholar. Evidence of such independent contribution and impact is required for tenure.

b. Research funding

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this School and is necessary to sustain the mission of the University. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding contribute positively to a candidate's performance in research.

c. Summary rating scale for research

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research as described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research.

3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

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

Assessment of the candidate's teaching quality addresses the candidate's:

- Commitment to learning as the primary objective of the educational process;
- Ability to create a learning environment that makes state-of-the-art knowledge—which is necessary for creative, integrative thinking and problem solving in a global economy—accessible to our students and business community;
- Delivering courses at a rigorous and challenging level;
- Integration of current, cutting-edge theory and best management practices into classes;
- Ability to imbue our students with the skills and attitudes necessary for life-long learning;
- Mastery of subject matter;
- Delivery techniques;
- Performance of administrative duties associated with teaching (commitment to class schedules, preparation, accessibility to students, timely submission of grades, etc.);
- Evolutionary changes in the courses; and
- Improvements as a teacher.

The evaluation of teaching focuses primarily on for-credit courses offered through the David Eccles School of Business, but can also consider other forms of teaching, including executive education and non-credit courses. Activities such as advising undergraduate honors students, advising graduate students, and curriculum and program development are also considered.

Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's teaching shall include: (a) the candidate's description of teaching philosophy, as included in a personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; (d) information from Course Feedback Reports; and (e) Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT-SAC) report(s). The candidate may choose to submit other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE). When evaluating teaching, reviewers must consider all sources of teaching information included in the file.

Contributions in teaching are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality. In addition, the School values teaching activities that explicitly incorporate and address the University's Foundational Pillars.

a. Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics.

b. Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. Examples of these kinds of contributions include development and teaching of new courses, development of new curricula or programs for the Department, and publication of textbooks or other teaching materials. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching.

c. Student advising and mentoring

Undergraduate and graduate student advising and mentoring generally takes place outside of the classroom. Activities in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring, (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees, (3) directing undergraduate research or thesis projects, and (4) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work.

d. Summary rating scale for teaching

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.

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

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in teaching.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the strengths and interests of individual faculty members. In addition, this School values service activities that explicitly incorporate and address the University's Foundational Pillars.

The successful candidate will accept and perform service obligations necessary for the operation and performance of the Department, the David Eccles School of Business, their profession, and/or the University of Utah in a professional and competent manner. While this standard allows the candidate to decline to serve when appropriate, the candidate's share of service work must be maintained. A lighter load of internal service work may be augmented by serving the public good through professional and/or public service.

a. Professional service

Professional service primarily takes place at a national or international level. This service may be oriented toward professional organizations, and it includes such activities as holding office; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); and presenting professional workshops. Professional service contributions may also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals.

b. University service

This category includes service to the Department, School, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities at any of these levels (e.g., chairing and/or serving on standing and *ad hoc* committees, councils, and task forces or serving in administrative positions) are examples of University service contributions.

c. Public service

This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and international public settings and may take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, or consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines.

d. Summary rating scale for service

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public.

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

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service.

4. RPT Procedures

4.1 Participants

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

- a. **Candidate.** The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.
- b. **Department Chair.** The administrative head of the Department.
- c. **Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT-SAC).** A committee made up of representatives of students in the Department. It shall have three members, appointed by the Department Chair. The RPT-SAC shall elect its own Chair.
- d. **Peer Teaching Reviewers.** Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members, selected by the Department Chair, who write peer teaching review reports based on review of teaching materials and observation of teaching.
- e. **Shared-appointment unit.** This is another academic unit of the University, in which an RPT candidate under review currently has substantial responsibilities, but in which they do not hold a tenure-line position. (See University Policies [6-001](#) and [6-300](#))
- f. **External Evaluators.** These experts from outside the University of Utah evaluate the candidate's research. Each external evaluator must have a demonstrated record of

excellence in the candidate's field, and must hold the same or higher faculty rank as that for which the candidate is being considered in this review or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator. A candidate will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships and any conflicts with any other potential evaluators, all of whom shall be excluded from the list of external evaluators.

- g. Department RPT Advisory Committee.** Voting membership of the Department RPT Advisory Committee is determined by University Regulations for each specific RPT action. Per University Policy, tenured faculty members vote on a recommendation for retention or tenure, and tenure-line faculty members at the same or higher rank vote on a recommendation for promotion-in-rank. ([Policy 6-303](#) provides full details, including rules governing absentee voting). Qualified members of the Committee attend and participate in its meetings and vote on its recommendations. The Committee may agree to invite others to attend and participate in the meeting as provided by University Regulations; however, other invited participants do not vote on the Committee's RPT recommendations.
- h. Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair.** The Chair of the Department RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Department faculty at the rank of Professor, elected annually during the Spring Semester, by majority vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department.
- i. Secretary.** The Committee Chair designates a Committee member as Secretary for each candidate to prepare a report of the Committee meeting regarding the assigned candidate.
- j. David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee.** The David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee consists of the Chairs of the Department RPT Advisory Committees and one additional member of each department who is tenured and holds the rank of Associate Professor or higher. Each additional member is elected annually during the Spring Semester, by majority vote of all department tenure-line faculty. Committee members do not participate in the deliberation or vote for cases from their own unit.
- k. Senior David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee.** The Senior David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee is a subcommittee of the David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee that consists of only the Chairs of the Department RPT Advisory Committees. This Committee will elect one member to serve as Chair of both the Senior David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee and the David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee. The purpose of this subcommittee is to provide a group qualified to review promotions to Professor. Committee members do not participate in the deliberation or vote for cases from their own unit.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures

a. Purpose of informal reviews

An informal review of each tenure-track faculty member shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted.

An informal review provides a candidate with guidance and constructive feedback on their progress toward meeting RPT expectations. A primary function is to provide advice on developing the file for the formal review process, focusing particular attention on the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service.

b. First-Year informal review

The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to identify and address any problems that have arisen, and to provide mentorship to the candidate. The Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall review the candidate's research, Course Feedback Reports, and service, and shall meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall then prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. Within five (5) business days, the candidate may submit a written response to the report to the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, who shall add it to the RPT file.

c. Informal reviews after the first year

Normally by August 30, the candidate shall submit the following materials to the Department Chair, who will add them to the file: (1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae; (2) a personal statement that includes the candidate's current activities and progress and accomplishments to date, research agenda, teaching philosophy, and future plans in research, teaching, and service; and (3) copies of any new publications/creative works. The candidate may choose to submit (4) relevant supplementary material, and the Department may request additional department-specific materials, applied to all its candidates equally. The file may be updated until the *file closing date*. (See [Appendix A](#))

In the case of a candidate who has a shared appointment, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Department Chair by October 5. Any such report will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Department Chair will add to the file Course Feedback Reports from University of Utah courses and letters and reports from all levels of review from previous formal and informal reviews. If the candidate so chooses, they may provide course evaluations from other institutions, which the Department Chair will then add to the file. The Department Chair will also add to the file any appropriate materials regarding evidence of faculty responsibility. (See [Appendix A](#))

The RPT-SAC is not asked to submit a report for, and external evaluators are not involved in an informal review.

The Department RPT Advisory Committee shall meet to discuss the file, agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate, and write a summary report, which the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall place in the candidate's file. After studying the candidate's file, the Department Chair shall add a report to the file. The candidate may provide a written response to the reports within five (5) business days, which the Department Chair shall place in the file. After the informal review, the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss the reports, as well as the candidate's progress toward tenure. The informal review normally concludes at this point.

d. Triggering formal retention reviews

In the context of an informal review, if the tenure-track candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress toward tenure, under University Regulations the Department Chair or a voting majority of the Department RPT Advisory Committee members may trigger a formal retention review. The triggered formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Department RPT Advisory Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Regardless of when the review occurs, the Department Chair must provide written notice of the triggered formal review to the candidate no less than 30 calendar days prior to conducting the review. A triggered formal review shall include three external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality of research is not at issue in the triggered review.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A mid-probationary formal retention review, a triggered formal retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format, except regarding whether and how many external evaluators are included (see section 4.3.e below).

a. Department Chair responsibilities

By April 1, the Department Chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed. The Department Chair will also invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty members wishing to be formally reviewed for promotion or tenure to submit a letter requesting review to the Department Chair by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, if required, the Department Chair will request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators, and request that the candidate submit the signed waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluations.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the Department RPT Advisory Committee, and at least two weeks prior to the file closing date, the Department Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Department to submit, by the file closing date, signed written recommendations for the file of any candidate they so choose, with specific reasons for each recommendation.

In the case of a candidate who has a shared appointment, the Department Chair shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report, which shall include that unit's perspective and recommendation on the RPT action(s) under consideration. The shared-appointment unit will submit the report to the Department Chair by October 5.

The Department Chair will add the shared-appointment unit report to the RPT file and copy to the candidate. Within five (5) business days, the candidate may submit a response to the report.

At least three weeks prior to the closing of the file, the Department Chair shall notify the school's ASUU Student Senator and the Department RPT-SAC of the upcoming review, inform them that their report(s) shall be due by the file closing date, and ensure training for all RPT-SAC members. Training shall cover, but need not be limited to, the process for and importance of student input into the RPT process, teaching expectations under the departmental RPT Statement, and a fair and balanced evaluation. The Department Chair shall also provide the RPT-SAC with a copy of the University's form for RPT-SAC reports. Following training, the Department Chair shall provide the RPT-SAC members with the candidate's relevant teaching-related materials (including at least two different forms of evidence).

b. Meeting and Report of Student RPT Advisory Committee (RPT-SAC)

The RPT-SAC shall meet to discuss the candidate's teaching file. Using the University's approved RPT-SAC Report form, the RPT-SAC writes and submits a report evaluating the candidate's teaching achievements in accord with University Regulations and using the same standards for teaching as are listed above: excellent, effective, not satisfactory. The report must draw on at least two types of evidence (Course Feedback Forms alone are not sufficient) to support and illustrate the evaluation, articulating as specifically as possible the reasons for the evaluation. All Committee members who attend the meeting will sign the report.

c. Assignment by Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair

The elected Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair will assign a Secretary for each candidate.

d. Peer Teaching Reviewers

By February 1, the Department Chair shall select at least two Peer Teaching Reviewers, and then ensure that each Reviewer submits a Peer Teaching Review report to the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, who shall add the Peer Teaching Review reports to the candidate's file prior to the file closing date.

e. External Evaluators

The candidate must provide a list of six potential external evaluators (five for promotion to Professor cases) and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. Separate from potential conflicts, candidates may indicate up to two individuals to be excluded as potential external evaluators. The Department Chair, after consulting with the Department RPT Advisory

Committee Chair and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit six external evaluations (five for promotion to Professor cases). Three of the evaluators will be selected from the candidate's list (two for promotion to Professor cases), and three will be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair. At least five evaluations (four for promotion to Professor cases) must be received prior to the Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting.

The Department Chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with a copy of this approved RPT Statement. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than the file closing date. The solicitation letter templates will request that external evaluations be sent to the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty and Research. Additional communication with external reviewers about the candidate's case is not allowed.

The Department Chair may solicit additional evaluations if potential evaluators decline, with replacements drawn from the same source as the original request (i.e., from the candidate's list or a recommendation by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair).

External evaluators are not required for a mid-probationary formal retention review; however, three external evaluators are required for a triggered formal retention review unless a majority of the Department RPT Advisory Committee votes that the quality of the candidate's research is not at issue.

External evaluators may be used for more than one formal RPT review of a given candidate, provided that the number of evaluations from repeat evaluators does not exceed the number from new evaluators. Along with a list of all external evaluations included in the file, the Department shall include a list of all potential external evaluators contacted, including the reason given by each potential external evaluator who declined for why they did so. Department RPT Advisory Committee members should not infer any motivation for declining to provide an evaluation beyond the stated reason(s).

f. RPT file contents and file closing date

- (1) *File Closing*. The candidate's file will close September 15, except for materials specified as being added subsequent to the closing date.
- (2) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. By June 1, the candidate shall submit the following items for inclusion in the file: (1) a current curriculum vitae; (2) copies of publications and/or other forms of scholarly work; (3) a personal statement that includes the candidate's current activities and progress and accomplishments to date, research agenda, teaching philosophy, and future plans in research, teaching, and service; and (4) course syllabi. The candidate may choose to submit (5) other relevant materials, including Course Feedback Reports from outside the University, and updates of materials up to the file closing date. (See [Appendix A](#))

(3) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents.* Prior to the file closing date, the Department Chair shall ensure that the file includes: (1) current University of Utah Course Feedback Reports, (2) available RPT-SAC report, (3) any written recommendations from Department faculty and/or staff members or other interested individuals, (4) external evaluations (treated as confidential as appropriate), (5) peer teaching review reports, (6) the reports and recommendations from all past reviews since the last formal RPT review, as well as the candidate's CV at the time of each past review and (7) any other required materials, such as evidence of faculty responsibility. (8) Any report received from a shared-appointment unit, must be submitted and included in the file by October 5; and, any candidate response must be submitted within five (5) business days following receipt of the report. (See [Appendix A](#))

g. Candidate's right to comment on file

No later than five (5) business days after the file closing date, the candidate may submit a written response to any of the file contents to the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, who shall add the response to the file. If a shared-appointment unit submits a report, the candidate must have the opportunity to submit a response no later than five (5) business days following receipt of the report and no fewer than two (2) business days prior to the Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting.

h. Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting and subsequent steps

(1) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action.* The full Department RPT Advisory Committee will meet after the file closing date and after receiving any report from a shared-appointment unit (and any response from the candidate), but generally no later than October 15. Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Regulations, the Department Chair or others may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Each Committee member shall review the full file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research, teaching, and service). Committee members shall vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate). (See voting eligibility for each action in Section 4.1.g above).

(2) *Absent Department RPT Advisory Committee Members.* Whenever practicable, the Department Chair shall advise all Department RPT Advisory Committee members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes in advance of the meeting; proxy voting is not permitted. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded without distinction between the votes of present members and absent members.

(3) *Quorum.* Quorum of the Department RPT Advisory Committee consists of two-thirds of its members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or other unavoidable reasons (e.g., illness), and not submitting their written opinion and vote, shall not be counted in the number required for quorum.

- (4) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Report.* The report of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. It should explain both affirmative and negative votes, and should present relevant and specific evidence from the file. The report should be comprehensive enough to allow others to get a sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. Additionally, it should include consideration of the RPT-SAC report and the shared-appointment unit report (if present). The report, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the Secretary, approved by the Committee Chair, and made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two (2) business days nor more than five (5) business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Department Chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.
- (5) *Confidentiality.* The Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall inform the candidate of the Committee recommendation(s) as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Regulations and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of Committee deliberations to the candidate or others. The candidate should not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the Committee Chair has with the candidate about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.
- (6) *Department Chair Action.* After studying the entire file relating to a candidate, the Department Chair shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation as to each RPT action, including specific reasons for the recommendation with specific evidence presented, and then place a copy in the RPT file and provide a copy to the candidate. No later than seven (7) business days after receiving the evaluation and recommendation, the candidate may provide a written statement in response to the report of the Department RPT Advisory Committee and/or the evaluation and recommendation of the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall place any written response submitted by a candidate in the candidate's file, without comment.
- (7) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level.* Subsequent procedures are described in University Regulations and the relevant College Council Charter with the additional option provided to the candidate to submit a written response to the report of the David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee (if review required) prior to the Dean's review of the file. If the candidate chooses to add such a response, it must be submitted within seven (7) calendar days of the date the report is delivered to the candidate.

Promotion and tenure reviews will be evaluated by the David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee. Retention reviews do not require a David Eccles School of Business RPT Advisory Committee evaluation unless the Department RPT Advisory Committee vote and/or the Department Chair's recommendation is negative.

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

Candidate's Responsibility

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the Department Chair for inclusion in the RPT file, prior to the file closing date. The candidate should provide all teaching materials early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and RPT-SAC to use this material for their reports.

1. Curriculum Vitae. The CV should include at least the following:
 - a. All publications since the beginning of the candidate's professional career. Must list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on anonymous review or other selection method.
 - b. Conference papers presented and presentations given.
 - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
 - d. Honors received for research.
 - e. Graduate student committees served on or chaired.
 - f. Individual student research supervised.
 - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
 - h. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.

CVs should be dated. If the candidate updates their CV after it is sent to external evaluators, both versions of the CV should be included in the file and clearly identified.

2. Personal Statement. This document includes the candidate's current activities and progress and accomplishments to date, research agenda, teaching philosophy, and future plans in research, teaching, and service.
3. Copies of publications, including title page of authored or edited books.
4. Course syllabi for all courses taught in the past year for informal reviews, or since appointment or the previous formal retention review for formal retention reviews. Or, the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure and promotion review or for the past five years for promotion to professor review. The candidate may also choose to include additional materials, such as assignments, exams, and handouts.
5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters the candidate has received from faculty, staff, students, or other interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research is unclear, the candidate should include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.
6. Candidate response(s) to any file contents, if desired.

Department's Responsibility

1. Peer Teaching Review reports based on review of teaching materials and observation of teaching.
2. All Course Feedback Reports from University of Utah courses taught since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
3. Any report received from a shared-appointment unit, and any candidate's response.
4. All previous reports submitted by all voting levels from all formal and informal reviews since appointment or the last formal RPT review (whichever is more recent). Previous RPT-SAC reports need not be included; but, the CV at the time of the last formal RPT review (or appointment, if no previous formal RPT review exists) must be included.
5. Other relevant materials, such as signed recommendations from faculty, staff, or other interested individuals, consistent with University Regulations.
6. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Department Chair describing the candidate's service to the Department and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
7. External evaluator materials (when required), kept confidential if the candidate has waived the right to read
 - a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
 - b. External evaluations
 - c. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief curriculum vitae
 - d. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, Department Chair, or Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair), which evaluators declined, and why those evaluators declined.
8. Department RPT Advisory Committee report.
9. Department Chair's written evaluation and recommendation.
10. Any candidate response to the Department Chair's report and/or the Department RPT Advisory Committee report.

Appendix B: Letter Templates

Letter to Request Materials from Outside Reviewer for Tenure with or without Promotion

[DATE]

[NAME and ADDRESS]

Dear Professor XXX:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an outside review for YYY, who is being reviewed for [tenure | tenure and promotion]. YYY [has signed a letter waiving their right to see the external evaluation letters | has not waived their right to see the external evaluation letters].

This review [follows our normal process | is an early review for....]. YYY is currently an untenured [Assistant | Associate] Professor of [DEPARTMENT] at the David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah. This year marks YYY's [Nth] year at the University and according to School policy all faculty members must be formally reviewed no later than the seventh year for a tenure decision.

According to School policy, the successful candidate needs to meet the base requirements in research, teaching and service. Specifically, with regard to research:

To achieve tenure, the candidate must have made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research must reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

I have enclosed the packet of information prepared by YYY. It includes a copy of YYY's CV, their published papers, and a sample of their current working papers. It also includes an overview of their research program as well as a statement of the impact of their published work.

In your review of YYY's work, please comment on the quality and the quantity of YYY's work, the impact this research has had or is anticipated to have on the discipline of [DEPARTMENT].

We realize that you may have little knowledge of YYY's teaching or service contribution. However, if you have observed their presentations at workshops or at academic conferences or if you have any other knowledge of teaching or service activities, we would appreciate your comments.

We need your review letter by [DATE]. If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at [PHONE] or contact me by e-mail at [EMAIL]. We also request that you send a copy of your vita when you send your review. Please also include a statement describing your relationship, if any, to the candidate.

We realize that performing outside reviews is time-consuming. We very much appreciate your contribution in assisting us in this important evaluation process.

Please send your letter to:

[NAME]
Associate Dean for Faculty and Research
[EMAIL]

Sincerely,

[AAA
Enclosure
Department
Title]

Letter to Request Materials from Outside Reviewer for Promotion to Professor

[DATE]

[NAME and ADDRESS]

Dear Professor XXX:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an outside review for YYY, who is being reviewed for promotion to Professor. YYY [has signed a letter waiving their right to see the external evaluation letters | has not waived their right to see the external evaluation letters].

YYY is currently a tenured Associate Professor of [DEPARTMENT]. The timing of a request for promotion to Professor is determined by the candidate. School policy on promotion to Professor is included below for your reference.

Promotion to Professor in the David Eccles School of Business of the University of Utah is the acknowledgment of sustained and significant contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service. To be promoted to Professor, the individual must have made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research resulting in a national and international reputation in their field. The quality and quantity of the individual's research must reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area, and the individual must have a program of research in place indicative of an ongoing commitment to the discovery of knowledge and of future productivity. In addition, the individual must have made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. Finally, the individual must have made acceptable, sustained service contributions to the profession, the University, or the public, suggesting that eventual service contributions will be significant. Overall, the evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

I have enclosed the packet of information prepared by YYY. It includes a copy of YYY's CV, samples of their published papers, and a sample of their current working papers. It also includes an overview of their research program as well as a statement of the impact of their published work.

In your review of YYY's work, please comment on the quality and the quantity of YYY's work, the impact this research has had or is anticipated to have on the discipline of [DEPARTMENT].

We realize that you may have little knowledge of YYY's teaching or service contribution. However, if you have observed their presentations at workshops or at academic conferences or if you have any other knowledge of teaching or service activities, we would appreciate your comments. In addition, for promotion to Professor, we are interested in the national visibility of our faculty from research, teaching, and/or service. We ask that you also comment on YYY's national visibility if you have sufficient basis for that determination.

We need your review letter by [DATE]. If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at [PHONE] or contact me by e-mail at [EMAIL]. We also request that you send a copy of your vita when you send your review. Please also include a statement describing your relationship, if any, to the candidate.

We realize that performing outside reviews is time-consuming. We very much appreciate your contribution in assisting us in this important evaluation process.

Please send your letter to:

[NAME]
Associate Dean for Faculty and Research
[EMAIL]

Sincerely,

[AAA
Enclosure
Department
Title]

Appendix C: Notices of Final Approval of RPT Statement


Review Committee Approval:



Trina Rich, SFRSC Committee
Secretary

April 21, 2023
Date

Senior Vice President Approval:



Sarah Projansky, Designee

July 1, 2023
Date