

December 3, 2018

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

Approved by Department of Special Education Tenure-line Faculty: August 16, 2018

Approved by Dean: December 5, 2018

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on November 18, 2018 and the Senior Vice President on December 3, 2018, for implementation on December 15, 2018.

Technical edit approved by SFRSC & SVPAA designee on September 23, 2020.

Revision 1: DEI language update approved August 2024.

This document serves as the Department of Special Education's Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures required by University Policy. This statement along with relevant University Policies, Policy 6-303, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php>, and Policy 6-311, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php>, govern the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

The mission of the Department of Special Education (ratified, 9/16/2016) is to improve the quality of life of people with disabilities and their families by developing and disseminating essential skills, knowledge, and values through research, teaching, and service.

We believe:

- the primary outcome of research, teaching, and service is improving the quality of life of people with disabilities and their families.
- society is enriched by the inclusion and participation of a wide range of people, including those with disabilities, as full members of the community.
- that our primary consumers are the U of U special education students and the ultimate obligation is to people with disabilities and their families.
- school districts, the State Board of Education, early intervention agencies, Department of Health, and other community agencies are essential partners in improving the quality of life of people with disabilities.
- it is vital to model collaboration in our research, teaching, and service.
- the department has an obligation to sustain an atmosphere that supports the open communication of ideas, beliefs and opinions.
- in participatory decision making involving students, faculty, and staff members.
- that research, teaching, and service should be informed by the needs and perspectives of internal and external stakeholders.
- in the continual pursuit of excellence in research, teaching, and service.
- that progress at all levels should establish high standards and provide individualized support to each student in meeting them.

December 3, 2018

- the faculty, staff, and students have an obligation to base their research, teaching, and service on empirically validated practices, and on legal, professional, and ethical standards.

To facilitate successful achievement of the department's mission, the faculty are committed to:

- preparing competent professionals and citizen advocates to serve individuals with disabilities and their families.
- seeking new knowledge that will lead to improvements in the education and lives of individuals with disabilities.
- impacting research, policy, and practice at the university, local, state, and national level.

Table of Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty	4
2. Informal and Formal Reviews	4
2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period.....	4
2.2 Informal Reviews	5
2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews	5
2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor Rank Without Tenure	5
2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor.....	5
3. RPT Guidelines	6
3.1 Summary of RPT Standards	6
3.2 Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity	7
3.3 Evaluation of Teaching	8
3.4 Evaluation of Service	10
4. RPT Procedures	11
4.1 Participants	11
4.2 Informal Review Procedures	12
4.3 Formal Review Procedures	13
<i>Appendix A: RPT File Contents</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Appendix B: Template Letters</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Appendix C: Recommended Curriculum Vita Format</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Appendix D: Process and Guidelines for Peer Review of Classroom Instruction</i>	<i>24</i>

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of December 15, 2018. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Professor (see below), candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior RPT requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Department Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations.

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

2. Informal and Formal Reviews

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

a. Timing. To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Department of Special Education will conduct either informal or formal reviews of its tenure-track candidates in each year of their probationary period as indicated in Table 1 below.

b. Normal probationary period. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor is seven years. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is five years.

Candidates with a seven-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year (See Table 1).

Candidates with a five-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the third year (See Table 1).

Table 1: Normal Review 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 and Professor (appointed without tenure)	1 st , 2 nd , 4 th	3 rd , 5 th

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the Department RPT Advisory Committee or the Department Chair, according to University Policy.

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

If the candidate has had an authorized *extension* of the probationary period (e.g., for medical or parental leave), the years of the formal retention review and the mandatory review for tenure shall be adjusted accordingly. Extensions of the probationary period authorized by University Policies may postpone formal reviews, but informal reviews will occur in any year in which a formal review is not held.

2.2 Informal Reviews

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on RPT expectations to candidates. A primary function of the informal review is to provide advice in developing the file that will be made available for the formal review process, with due attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: research/creative activity; teaching; and service to the profession, university, and public.

2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

If in the context of an informal review in which the candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the Department Chair or a majority of the RPT Advisory Committee members may vote to conduct a formal “triggered” review. The formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate. A triggered formal review shall include external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality of research/creative activity is not at issue in the review.

2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor Rank Without Tenure

The Department of Special Education typically does not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at or promote current tenure-line faculty to the Associate Professor or Professor rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. Under appropriate exceptional circumstances, however, a new 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 immediate granting of tenure.

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when he or she has met the requirements for that rank. The Department of Special Education 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. In general, however, such requests are not made until the time of one's first tenured faculty review, which occurs five years after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah since submitting the materials for the initial granting of promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research/creative activity, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period; tenure; promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. 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 to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

University Policy allows a candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty to be taken into consideration during a review. As a result, one's failure to abide by the Faculty Code may be considered in determining whether one will be retained, promoted, or tenured.

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that he or she has *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research/creative activity or teaching, at least sustained *effectiveness* in the other, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.

Associate Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research/creative activity or teaching, at least sustained *effectiveness* in the other, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.

Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of sustained *excellence* in research/creative activity resulting in a national and international reputation

December 3, 2018

in his or her 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/Creative Activity

Judgments about a candidate's research/creative activity are based on both the quality and quantity of research/creative products and their relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive research/creative activity, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research/creative activity in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality, quantity, and impact of contributions; and the professional context of the candidate.

a. Description of research/creative activity.

We expect candidates to contribute significantly and distinctly to the development and dissemination of new knowledge through research and publication of research results. The following will be considered in evaluating a candidate's research and scholarship according to accepted publishing patterns in the candidate's own research area:

- Publication of original research papers in refereed technical journals and conference proceedings. The prestige of the journals and conferences and the quality as well as number of publications will be considered.
- Publication of research monographs, books, book chapters, and book reviews.
- Presentations at conferences, workshops, colloquia or seminars. Keynote, plenary, and invited talks will be noted.

b. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/creative activity 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 and the candidate publishes one or more national publications beyond the expectations for *Effective* (described below).

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. The following criteria represent the expectations for *Effective* that will be considered in evaluating a candidate's research/creative activity:

- A clear programmatic focus of scholarship;
- A balance between independent and collaborative scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member's ability to serve as lead or solo author on published work;

December 3, 2018

- Demonstration of the faculty member's ability to be published in nationally recognized scholarly journals;
- Assessment from a majority of external reviewers that the candidate's national publications represent high quality scholarship and that the programmatic focus is making a contribution to the subfield;
- Sustained productivity;
- The Department of Special Education's expectations for the number of publications will remain consistent with the expectations of its national peers. Currently, those standards anticipate that a candidate will have an average of 1.3 publications for each year of service in a tenure-line position, prior to tenure and promotion. The majority of the candidate's works must be published, or accepted for publication, in national refereed journals. The remaining publications can include additional publications in national refereed journals, books, book chapters, refereed and funded research or teaching and training grants, refereed and funded state personnel preparation grants, technological products disseminated by a national publisher, and invited or refereed/reviewed commentaries in national publications.
- An average of at least one refereed presentation per year at national or international conferences.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research/creative activity by not meeting the expectations for *effective* (see above).

3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

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

a. Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic 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. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her 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 student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. 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 University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses.

December 3, 2018

b. Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts are considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching.

c. Student advising and mentoring

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring; (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees; and (3) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.

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 meets the expectations for *Effective* (described below) and has contributed one or more activities in the area of curriculum and program development. Examples of curriculum and program development contributions include:

- the development of new programs,
- the development and teaching of new courses, and/or significant revisions to existing courses,
- publication of teaching materials,
- innovative use of instructional technology or pedagogy,
- collaboration with other departments in teaching and course/program development.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant. The following criteria represent the expectations for *Effective* that will be considered in evaluating a candidate's teaching activity:

- Course Instruction: The following will be considered when evaluating a candidate's course instruction:
 - Assessment from the majority of external reviewers that the candidate's syllabi are rigorous and of high quality,
 - Candidate must carry an average course load of 2 courses per semester for 2 semesters per year (adjusted according to assignments).
 - Peer review documentation of live or videotaped university classroom performance demonstrating effective teaching practices. (See Appendix B).
 - Student course evaluations that demonstrate effectiveness in teaching.

December 3, 2018

- Evidence in the candidate's personal statement that the candidate has reviewed course evaluations and made changes based on relevant student comments during course revisions or development, as appropriate.
- Student Advising and Mentoring: The following are examples that may be considered in evaluating a candidate's student advising and mentoring:
 - Advising/chairing loads commensurate with others in the department in the same program and with similar assignments.
 - Evidence in the candidate's SAC report that demonstrates effective advising and mentoring.
 - The candidate has included one or more students in research and/or coauthors in scholarly work (as noted in their personal statement and/or curriculum vitae).

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in teaching by not meeting expectations for *effective* (see above).

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. Faculty being considered for promotion from associate professor to professor must demonstrate evidence of leadership in professional service, university service and/or public service.

a. Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a national or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward national professional organizations and include such activities as 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 serving as a reviewer for professional journals.

b. University Service

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the Department, College, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces, or serving in administrative positions, at any of these levels, represent valuable 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 can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines, regional/local conference presentations.

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.

December 3, 2018

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public; and performance consistently exceeds the expectations for *Effective* (described below).

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. The following criteria represent the expectations for *Effective* that will be considered in evaluating a candidate's service activity:

- **Professional Service:** Candidates are expected to participate in a minimum of two professional service activities during the review period. Faculty who are being considered for promotion from associate professor to professor are expected to participate in a minimum of two professional service activities since the last promotion. In addition, faculty being considered for promotion from associate professor to professor are expected to (a) serve as an editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, and/or consistent guest reviewer for scholarly or professional journals, and (b) serve as an officer/member of a committee in a professional organization at the national level.
- **University Service:** Candidates are expected to participate on department committees and/or in department service activities each year, as assigned. Further, candidates are expected to serve on a minimum of one college committee and one university committee during the probationary period/since the last promotion.
- **Public Service:** Candidates are expected to conduct an average of one public service activity per year.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service by not meeting expectations for *effective* (see above).

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 RPT Advisory Committee. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.
- c. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. The Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Department of Special Education's faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.

December 3, 2018

d. Department Chairperson. The administrative head of the department.

e. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of representatives of undergraduate and graduate majors in the Department of Special Education.

f. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the candidate.

g. External Evaluators. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and Department Chairperson in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work. 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. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures

Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted.

a. Informal Reviews after the First Year. These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae and (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans, in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. 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 15.

In the case of a candidate having a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, 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 prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

Course evaluation results from the University of Utah are added to the file by the Department Chair. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the candidate.

December 3, 2018

The Student Advisory Committee is not asked to submit a report for and external evaluators are not involved in informal reviews.

The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will appoint an individual to review the candidate's file, meet with the candidate, and write an informal review report that evaluates progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the candidate and added to the RPT file. The candidate shall have the opportunity (but not an obligation) to provide a written response to the report.

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the initial report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the Department Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, the Department Chairperson and the individual assigned to review the candidate's file shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Department Chairperson or members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The Department Chairperson will review the candidate's research/creative activity, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The Department Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format.

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, 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 Department Chair will also request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators 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, the Department Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Department to submit written statements for the file of each candidate to be considered.

December 3, 2018

In the case of a “joint” appointment in another academic department or a “shared” appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, 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 with that unit’s perspective on the candidate’s progress, which should be submitted to the Department prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Department Chair will notify the Student Advisory Committee of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform that reports shall be due to the Department Chair no later than September 15. The Department Chair must provide the candidate’s relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than August 1. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, assign an individual of the RPT Advisory Committee to oversee the candidate’s file in the RPT process.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chair shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate’s file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Department Chair and the person selected to oversee the candidate’s file, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate’s list. The Department Chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate’s file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

- 1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson to place in the candidate’s file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans, for the relevant criteria (research/creative activity, teaching, and service), and (iv) course syllabi. The candidate may

similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

- 2) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents.* The Department Chairperson shall ensure that the file includes: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (ii) available SAC reports, (iii) any written recommendations from department faculty and staff, (iv) any reports from joint/shared appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) peer teaching reviews, (vii) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (viii) all other required materials.

f. Candidate's Rights to Comment on File. A candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of his or her file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.

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

- 1) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action.* The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but 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 each of the relevant criteria (research/creative activity, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Department Chair may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will 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).

Whenever possible, the Department Chair will advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes in advance of the meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

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. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then 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 Chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

The candidate is to be informed of the Committee recommendation by the Committee Chairperson as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chairperson about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

- 2) *Department Chair Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Department Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the Department Chair.
- 3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level.* Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy.

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

In order for the RPT process to operate effectively, and to ensure that all candidates receive the most accurate reviews possible, certain participants in the RPT process have responsibilities for placing certain materials in the file. All materials listed below are to be added by the file closing date, and are considered for the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. Additionally, the report of the RPT Advisory Committee meeting, recommendation of the Department Chair, and any candidate responses, are added subsequently.

Candidate's Responsibility

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the Department Chair for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:
 - a. All research publications/creative works since the candidate began his/her professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on blind review, or other selection method.
 - b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.
 - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
 - d. Honors received for research/creative work.
 - e. All 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.
2. Personal Statement detailing accomplishments as well as future plans in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy and responsiveness to relevant student comments from course evaluations
3. Copies of recent publications
4. Course syllabi for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the candidate chooses to include. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and SAC(s) to use this material for their reports.
5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions. 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 may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.
6. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

Department of Special Education's Responsibility

It is the Department Chair's responsibility to include the following documentation in the candidate's RPT file, prior to the file closing date.

December 3, 2018

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.
2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review
For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
3. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).
4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.
5. Copies of all prior years' RPT files.
6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Department Chair describing the candidate's service to the unit 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.
8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her right to read)
 - Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
 - Evaluator's curriculum vitae
 - Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, Department Chairperson, or Committee Chairperson)

Appendix B. Template Letters

Template Letter from Department Chair to External Reviewer

Date
Name
Address
Re: External Review Letter

Dear (insert external reviewer name):

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for (insert candidate name) who is being reviewed for (insert retention, promotion, promotion with tenure, etc.) as a faculty member in the Department of Special Education.

The faculty members in the Department of Special Education are asking for your assessment of Professor (insert name)'s scholarship and teaching in the following areas (representative manuscripts and course syllabi are enclosed):

1. A clear programmatic focus of scholarship;
2. The quantity, quality, and impact of the faculty member's scholarship;
3. Consistent and sustained scholarly productivity;
4. A balance between independent and collaborative scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member's ability to serve as lead or solo author on published work;
5. Demonstration of the faculty member's ability to be published in nationally recognized scholarly journals; and
6. Quality of course syllabi.

To assist you in preparing your evaluation letter, I have included a copy of the Department of Special Education's Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Statement for Tenure-line Faculty Members. I am also requesting that you do not comment on whether (insert name) would or would not be (insert retained, promoted, promoted, with tenure, etc.) at your university. Although the faculty appreciates your assessment of (insert name)'s scholarship and teaching, ultimately the decision regarding promotion and tenure must be made by the department committee using the attached guidelines.

It is also important for you to know that (insert name) has chosen (insert to, or not to) waive the right to read the letters from external reviewers. As such, (insert name) (insert will or will not) have access to your review letter.

On behalf of the faculty in the Department of Special Education, I want to

December 3, 2018

express my sincere appreciation for your willingness to assist us in this important process. We fully realize the time and energy commitment involved. In order to meet the established timelines for review of faculty members, we need to receive your letter of evaluation by (insert date). Please forward your letter and the most current copy of your *curriculum vita* to:

Department Chair
University of Utah
Department of Special Education
1721 Campus Center Drive, SAEC Room 2280
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (insert email).

Sincerely,

Department Chair

December 3, 2018

Template Memo from Candidate to Department Chair

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

TO: (Dept. Chair)
FROM: (Candidate)
SUBJECT: Suggested External Reviewers
DATE: (date submitted)

The following are recommended to serve as external reviewers for my [retention, promotion, and/or tenure] review: (insert recommended reviewer names). Also attached are copies of my curriculum vita, personal statement, recent course syllabi, and representative manuscripts/articles.

I understand that the department chair has the option of developing an independent list of external reviewers to ensure balance and that the chair and I will negotiate concerning a minimum of three and a maximum of five individuals (depending on the scope of my research interests) who agree to serve as external reviewers. If the negotiation does not result in mutual agreement on the names of all reviewers, I understand that, if there are three reviewers, at least one of the external evaluators will be from my list. I further understand that if there are more than three reviewers and the negotiation does not result in mutual agreement on the names of all reviewers, then one more shall come from my list and one more shall come from the chair's list. I understand that the external reviewers will be told of my decision to either waive or not waive my right to read the letters of evaluation obtained for this review. Finally, I understand that I am not allowed to use the same reviewers for two consecutive [retention, promotion, and/or tenure] reviews.

(Candidate will then supply the name and present position (e.g., tenure-line faculty, researcher, etc.) of each proposed reviewer; complete address, phone number; information about the professional relationship to the candidate; the reviewer's present position and title, and specific qualifications of the reviewer to evaluate the candidate's file.)

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

Signature

Date

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

Signature

Date

Appendix C. Recommended Curriculum Vita Format

NAME

TITLE

ADDRESS

EDUCATION

EMPLOYMENT

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

AWARDS OR HONORS

SCHOLARSHIP

Articles in Peer Reviewed Journals

Chapters in Books and Monographs

Books and Monographs

Published Conference Proceedings (The candidate should clarify that conference proceedings received a separate peer review if they were also listed as a presentation elsewhere on the Curriculum Vita.)

Peer Reviewed Research, Training, and Outreach Grants

Book Reviews

Nonreviewed Journal Articles

Publications of National Demonstration Projects

Commercial Curriculum and Teaching Guides

Technological Products

Peer Reviewed Presentations at International and National Conferences

Invited Presentations at International and National Conferences

December 3, 2018

UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION

Courses Taught

M.Ed., M.S., and Ph.D. Committees (Completed and In Process)

Advising

Other Instructional Activities

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

University Committee Appointments

College Committee Appointments

Department Committee Appointments

OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Service on Journal Editorial Boards, Leadership in Professional Organizations,
etc.

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

State Publications

State Contracts

Invited or Peer Reviewed Presentations at Regional and State Conferences

Unpaid Technical Assistance

Professional Development Training or Workshops

PAID CONSULTING

Appendix D. Process and Guidelines for Peer Review of Classroom Instruction

Department of Special Education
University of Utah
Peer Review of Classroom Instruction

A. Process

Department faculty members will conduct a minimum of three independent observations of the faculty member undergoing review. Peer teaching reviewers are selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member undergoing review. Prior to any observation, two weeks' notice will be provided to the faculty member under review. Each observer will meet briefly with the faculty member ahead of time to learn the scope, content, and objectives of the class session to be observed. After the observation, the observer will submit a written summary form to the Department Chair, using the following form as a guide.

B. Form to Guide Classroom Observation

Instructor:

Faculty Observer:

Course Number and Title:

Date:

Review Context _____ Live _____ Video/DVD

Brief description of the content covered in the class session observed:

The observer should complete this form and provide reasons for the answers given.

1. Does the instructor create confidence in his or her knowledge of the subject?
2. Does the instructor demonstrate effective teaching methods in presenting the material?

December 3, 2018

3. Does the instructor use examples or illustrations that help to clarify difficult material?

4. Does the instructor demonstrate enthusiasm or otherwise stimulate interest in the subject?

5. Does the instructor encourage interaction and effectively manage classroom discussions?

6. Does the instructor answer questions effectively?

7. Is the material presented well organized and consistent with course objectives?

8. Do you have other observations that would be helpful to the instructor?

Additional Comments:

December 3, 2018

Appendix E: Notice of Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Vice Presidential Final Approval.

Review Committee Approval:



Lincoln Davies, Chair

11/18/2018
Date

Senior Vice President Approval:



Harriet Hopf, Designee

12/3/2018
Date