

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

RPT WORKSHOP 2011

March 28, 2011

1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

**Intermountain Network Scientific CC
(INSCC) Building, room 110**

RPT questions should be referred to:

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Faculty Development: <http://www.admin.utah.edu/facdev/index.html>

Susan M. Olson
Associate Vice President for Faculty
120 Park Building
1-8763
susan.olson@utah.edu

Tami Garff
Office of Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs
120 Park Building
1-8763
tami.garff@utah.edu

Phyllis Vetter
Associate General Counsel
309 Park Building
5-7002
phyllis.vetter@legal.utah.edu

HEALTH SCIENCES

SOM Faculty Affairs: <http://medicine.utah.edu/facultyadmin/rpt/index.htm>

Richard J. Sperry
Associate Vice President for Health Sciences
5th Floor Moran Building
1-5619
richard.sperry@hsc.utah.edu

Jennifer Allie
Director, Faculty and Academic Affairs
Office of Sr VP Health Sciences
1C047 SOM
1-5705
jennifer.allie@hsc.utah.edu

Liz Winter
Deputy General Counsel
309 Park Building
5-7002
liz.winter@legal.utah.edu

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

RPT Workshop

March 28, 2011

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

C Roland Christensen Ctr. (CRCC) Room 110

RPT PROCEDURES

Chronological Sequence

MARCH

- ◆ Elect Department RPT Chair (Policy 6-303, A.3.b.)
- ◆ Attend RPT Review Workshop
 - Department Chair
 - RPT Chair
 - Staff Person who prepares RPT File
- ◆ Department Chair determines obligatory formal RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year. (Policy 6-303, B and D.12 (chart)) [Sample Document #1 and #2]
- ◆ Determine if SAC reviews will be done in spring or fall. If spring, send notice to SAC and Student Senator to meet regarding upcoming reviews. [Sample Document # 3 & #14]
- ◆ Chair sends memo to tenure track faculty, asking if they wish to be considered for early tenure [Sample Document #4]

March (Continued)

- ◆ **Consideration for Early Tenure (Policy 6-311, Sec 4. C. 1. a. and b.)**
[Sample Documents #5, #6, and #7]
- ◆ **a. Credit for Prior Service**
 - » 1. Candidate requests in writing a certain # of years of prior credit; encloses vita and addresses relevance of prior work to RPT guidelines.
 - » 2. The departmental RPT advisory committee convenes and votes on # of years of credit for prior service.
 - » 3. Departmental chair considers, approves # of years and sends to dean.
 - » 4. If Dean approves, signs and returns to department.
- ◆ **b. Extraordinary Progress Toward Tenure**
 - » 1. Candidate requests in writing a review for tenure on grounds of extraordinary progress and attaches vita. Include course evaluations for at least the last 2 semesters of teaching.
 - » 2. If both approve, department chair and the RPT chair write joint memo for file.
 - » 3. If review would be in fifth year or earlier for Asst Prof or third year or earlier for Assoc Prof (including prior service), memo of chair/RPT chair sent to dean and senior VP for approval.

APRIL

- ◆ Department Chair sends letter to faculty required to be reviewed, reminding them of upcoming formal review and what is required; include copy of Policy 6-303 and department RPT guidelines (Policy 6-303, A.2., B.1.-2.) [Sample Document #8]
 - » Request nominations for internal and external reviewers by specified date
 - » Request candidate to sign waiver/non-waiver form [Sample Document #9]
- ◆ Send letter to general faculty members
 - Inform them of formal review of candidate(s)
 - Request nominations for internal and external reviewers by specified date
 - Ask if they wish to request a formal review for consideration of promotion. [Sample Document #10]
- ◆ Department chair sends letter to academic program at same time faculty candidate notified, if faculty is member of Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies, Writing Program or Middle East Center (Policy 6-303, C.4) [Sample Document #11]

MAY

- ◆ Formal Review Process Begins
 - » Consult with appropriate personnel to choose internal, external reviewers
 - » Personally contact internal, external reviewers, ask willingness to serve as reviewers
 - » Send out candidate's materials and RPT standards to reviewers [Sample Document #12]
 - Chair should check materials being sent.

JUNE-JULY

- ◆ File Accumulation. (Note: The file is cumulative and is to be kept current. See Policy 6-303, D.1.)
Chart available @ Policy 6-303, D. 12
- ◆ Collect evaluations as they are sent in to department.
- ◆ Letters of Recommendation (in order of preference)
 1. Original Letterhead with signature
 2. Faxed copy with signature on Letterhead
 3. Signed PDF copy on Letterhead
 4. Electronic Letterhead
 5. Email with Full Institutional Address (.edu)

* Not Acceptable: Emails with no Institutional ID

AUGUST

- ◆ Meet with candidate, discuss file contents to be submitted by candidate and important dates. (Policy 6-303, C.1. and D.)
 - » Curriculum vitae required
 - » Evidence of research/creative activity
 - » Personal Statement (optional, but recommended)
 - » Any other material the candidate wishes to include
 - » Other material required by department or college policy
[Sample Document #13]
- ◆ If not done in spring, contact the department SAC, and Student Senator. Meet with SAC at least 3 weeks before report is needed.
[Sample Document #3 & #14]
- ◆ Post notice to department staff and faculty of right to submit written recommendations. (Policy 6-303, C.2.) [Sample Document #15]

SEPTEMBER

- ♦ Notify faculty of time of RPT Advisory Committee meeting and eligibility to participate (Policy 6-303, A. 3.)
[Note change in 2007]
- ♦ Log arrival of solicited review letters
[Sample Document #16 - note required sections]
- ♦ Reviews by programs for jointly appointed faculty
- ♦ File should be closed by September 30.
Allow time for candidate to respond before file closes.
(Policy 6-303, D.10)
- ♦ File to Department RPT Advisory Committee
(Policy 6-303, D.) [Sample Document #17]

OCTOBER

- ♦ Department Chair calls RPT meeting by October 15.
 - » Eligibility (Policy 6-303, A. 3.a.)
 - » Small department rule (Policy 6-303, A. 3.a. iv.)
- ♦ Department RPT Committee Chair:
 - » Chairs meeting
 - Committee votes re: Department Chair's participation
 - » Signs final report as approved by self and committee members
- ♦ RPT Advisory Committee meeting (Policy 6-303, E.)
 - » Read file ahead of time
 - » Quorum
 - » Absentee voting: Received before meeting
 - » Chair does not vote with department
 - » Confidentiality: votes & deliberations are personnel actions

OCTOBER (CONTINUED)

- ◆ Department RPT Advisory Committee Secretary and Report:
(Policy 6-303, E. 6 - 7)
 - Keeps/Writes Minutes
 - » Complete List of Members present at meeting
 - » Summary of meeting – How does the candidate's performance compare with department/college criteria?
 - » Exact committee vote (absentee ballots counted with other votes)
 - » Signed by RPT committee chair and secretary
 - » Report pertains to this candidate ONLY and don't mention external reviewers (otherwise violates confidentiality rules)
 - » Show consideration of program recommendation
 - Shares Meeting Minutes with Committee Participants
 - » Two to five days to respond
 - » Modifications approved by participants
 - Final report given to:
 - » Department Chair
 - » Candidate

NOVEMBER

- ◆ Department Chair (Policy 6-303, F.)
 - Writes recommendation to Dean w/ copy to program director, if joint
[Sample Document #18]
 - Provides notice to faculty member
 - » Notice of recommendation
 - » Notice of option to respond to chair's letter and RPT Advisory Committee Report
 - » Notice of 7 day time limit
[Sample Document # 19]
 - Adds candidate's response to file, if any
 - AA completes Formal RPT Summary Form [Sample Document #20]
Organizes file as per Sample Document #17
 - Forwards file to Dean's Office by November 15

Departments with joint appointments may work with their Dean's Office to adjust deadline

NOVEMBER (CONTINUED)

- ◆ Dean
- ◆ Forward files to College RPT Committee (Policy 6-303, G. 1.)
 - Criteria for forwarding
 - » All negative retention cases (negative vote at department level)
 - » All promotion and tenure cases
 - » Other retention cases deemed appropriate by dean
- ◆ College Advisory Committee (Policy 6-303, G.1.c.-d.)
 - No dean or chairs except by invitation of the committee
 - Review file; utilize review standard specified in policy
 - Forward recommendations to the dean
 - » Vote
 - » Reasons for Vote

DECEMBER

- ◆ Dean's Review (Policy 6-303, G. 2 and 3)
 - Dean writes a recommendation and rationale
 - Copy to faculty member and copy to chair/program director
 - Right to respond to dean's letter and College RPT Advisory Committee Report
 - » Time Limit - 7 days
 - [Similar to Document #19]
 - Candidate's Response (Policy 6-303, G.4.)
 - Dean forwards file to cognizant senior vice president by beginning of spring semester
 - » Academic Affairs
 - » Health Sciences

JANUARY

- ◆ Senior Vice President (Policy 6-303, H)
- ◆ Refers files to UPTAC when:
 - Differing recommendation at any level:
 - » SAC
 - » Program
 - » Department RPT Advisory Committee
 - » Department chair
 - » College RPT Advisory Committee
 - » Dean
 - If College functions as a single dept. or is organized into no more than two depts. (Policy 6-003, III. 2.C.)
 - Any time the vice president seeks the UPTAC's recommendation

UPTAC (Policy 6-304)

- ◆ Reviews file
 - Follows guidelines for review
(Policy 6-303, H. 2.)
- ◆ Writes recommendation to the cognizant senior vice president

Cognizant Senior Vice President (Policy 6-303, H. 3.-5.)

- ◆ Reviews file; may return file to department for clarification
- ◆ Writes final recommendation to President (unless positive retention, when Sr. VP decision is final)
- ◆ Provides to faculty member, dean, and department chair the following :
 - Letter (recommendation) to President
 - Notice of right to comment within 14 days
- ◆ For UPTAC cases, the RPT Advisory committee and SAC are also notified
 - Chairs of RPT Advisory committee and SAC shall notify members expeditiously of Sr. VP's recommendation
 - Notice of right to appeal to Consolidated Hearing Committee
 - Notice of need to inform cognizant vice president within 14 days of intent to appeal

- ◆ Potential appeal to Consolidated Hearing Committee by candidate, department SAC, department RPT committee, department chairperson, or dean. (Policy 6-303, I.)
- ◆ Cognizant Senior Vice President's letter sent to President in cases not appealed
- ◆ Letter from President to Candidate with President's Decision or Intent to Decide
(Policy 6-303, J.)

SAMPLE DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN HANDOUT PACKET

1. Tenure-track Probationary Period Worksheet.
2. Formal Review Schedule during Transition between Policies.
3. Letter to SAC, copied to Student Senate representative.
4. Letter from Department Chair to Tenure-track Faculty re Early Tenure.
5. Letter from Department Chair to Dean re Credit for Prior Service.
6. Memo for Tenure Review in Sixth Year.
7. Letter for Tenure Review Before the Sixth Year for Assistant Professor or Before the Fourth Year for Associate Professor (Extraordinary Progress).
8. Letter to candidate informing of obligatory review (from department chair).
9. Waiver or Nonwaiver (to be signed by candidate).
10. Memo to faculty informing of new RPT season, invitation to request formal review (from department chair).
11. Chair's letter to program informing them of upcoming review of candidate in their program (if appropriate).
12. Letter to reviewers with review instructions (from department chair or RPT committee chair).
13. Guidelines for Assessing Quality of Teaching.
14. SAC Faculty Evaluation Report (accessed on web at: <http://www.admin.utah.edu/facdev/index.html>)
15. Memo to staff and faculty informing them the right to submit comments.
16. External Reviewer Grid (Required).
17. Checklist of Essential Supporting Documents.
18. Chair's letter of recommendation to dean (checklist of required topics).
19. Chair's letter informing candidate of right to respond.
20. RPT Summary Sheet (accessed on web at: <http://www.admin.utah.edu/facdev/index.html>)
21. URPTSC Approval Process Overview.
22. Checklist & Guidelines for Review of Departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards, and Procedures

Tenure-track Probationary Period Worksheet

Name of candidate _____

Department _____

Maximum length of probationary period for this candidate (check one):

_____ 5 years (hired as Associate or full Professor)

_____ 6 years (as per approved department/college guidelines)

_____ 7 years (if hired as Asst Prof or as Instructor and years not excluded [Policy 6-300 Sec. 2.D.]

Department routinely conducts retention reviews in year _____ (and year _____)

_____ Year of candidate's initial tenure-track hire at U of U

Extensions of the probationary period: note number of years of extension for each reason and attach documentation/approval for each.

a) _____ Parental leave, as per Policy 6-315 or 8-002

b) _____ Medical leave, as per Policy 6-311, Sec. 4, C.2.a.i. or ii.

c) _____ Other leave, as per Policy 6-311, Sec. 4, C.2.a.iii or iv.

d) _____ Extraordinary circumstances, as per Policy 6-311, Sec. 4, C.2.c. (2 yrs. max.)

e) _____ Administrative Duties, as per Policy 6-311, Sec. 4, C.2.b. (3 yrs. max.)

f) _____ Years in Instructor rank, if requested as per Policy 6-300, Sec. 2.D. (3 yrs. max.)

g) _____ Years of extension subsequently rescinded

Rescission of extensions under a and b above require merely a written request from the candidate, which should be attached to this document. Rescission of extensions under c, d, e and f above require approval of chair and dean, or the faculty member must follow one or more of the criteria below for reducing the probationary period.

Reductions of the probationary period: note number of years of reduction of the probationary period for each reason and attach documentation for each.

h) _____ Credit for prior service, as per Policy 6-311, Sec. 4, C.1.a. (5 yrs. max.)

i) _____ Extraordinary progress, as per Policy 6-311, Sec. 4, C.1.b.

j) _____ Revocation of credit for prior service. Requires written request by candidate. Number in h) must equal number in j).

Adding to the "Year of candidate's initial tenure-track hire" any additions in a) through f) or in j) and subtracting any years in g), h), and/or i), the candidate's adjusted year of mandatory tenure review is _____. Adjusted year of mid-probationary retention review is _____.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT # 2

Note: This form is needed only in departments that have changed their RPT review schedule from two retention reviews before tenure to one mid-probationary retention review. If this form is used, please place in the file immediately following the Probationary Period Worksheet.

Anytime you are giving faculty a choice such as between new or old versions of department guidelines, you should get their choice in writing. Email is sufficient for this purpose.

Formal Review Schedule during Transition between Policies

Background: When the university revised Policy 6-303 in 2005, the minimum number of formal retention reviews before a 7th-year tenure decision changed from two to one. Departments or colleges must now decide whether to continue two formal retention reviews (typically in the 3rd and 5th years) or to conduct just one formal retention review in either the 3rd or 4th year of the probationary period.

In departments that have changed from two retention reviews to one, questions have arisen whether faculty members who had a third year formal review under the prior policy need to have a second formal review before tenure or not. The advice of the Office of General Counsel is that such faculty members should have the choice whether to have a second retention review, but that their choice should be documented. Please use the form below for this purpose and include it in the faculty member's file for either the second retention review or the tenure review. The choice not to have a second formal retention review does not, of course, preclude a triggered formal retention review following an unsatisfactory informal review.

.....

Given the transition in departmental RPT policies from two formal retention reviews before tenure to only one, I understand that it is my choice whether to have a second formal retention review before tenure since I have already had a formal third-year review. I understand that the department may trigger an unscheduled formal review following an unsatisfactory informal review.

_____ Yes, I choose to have a formal _____-year review.

_____ No, I choose not to have a second formal retention review.

Signature _____

Date _____

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #3

Letter from Department Chair to Department SAC for Mid-Probationary Review

September 1 [or April 1] 2011

Ms. A. Student, Student Advisory Committee
Department of Learning
The University of Utah
Campus

Dear Ms. Student:

This [or Next] academic year marks the third [or fourth] year of service to the University for Dr. K. A. Enti. By University and department regulations this is the obligatory year to have a formal retention review of Dr. Enti's accomplishments in our department. This process is described in the University Regulations 6-303. I have enclosed a copy for your information, as well as a copy of the department procedures and criteria. The department is providing the SAC the following information to review about or from Dr. Enti: _____ [list, e.g., which course evaluations, syllabi, and/or statement of teaching philosophy].

The Student Advisory Committee is asked to evaluate Dr. Enti. Enclosed is the standard form which must be filled out. Please read the detailed description of the process accompanying the form. It asks that the following information be reported, which will be included in the review file of Dr. Enti:

1. A tally of the actual vote as to whether, in the students' opinion, Dr. Enti ought to be retained as a member of the faculty: ____ For ____ Against ____ Abstaining.
2. A description of the sources and methods used to evaluate Dr. Enti.
3. A narrative evaluation of Dr. Enti's teaching performance.
4. The reasons for the specific recommendation to retain or not to retain Dr. Enti in the faculty.
5. Names and signatures of the SAC officers.

You may add additional pages to give room to describe you methods and conclusions fully. This is extremely important information that will be used at all levels of review, including that of the President. I urge you to conduct this review as expeditiously as possible. The ASUU suggests that you complete your work by April 15 [or September 15]. The report must be submitted by _____, so that Dr. Enti may see the report and, if desired, submit a written comment before the files closes on September 30.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please do not hesitate to contact me [or RPT chair or dean's designee] if you have any questions about the process. [Give contact information.]

Sincerely,

Cc: College Representative to Student Senate

Note: Separate analyses may be done by graduate and undergraduate students.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #4 (revised)

Sample memo from Department Chair to Tenure-track Faculty re Early Tenure

To: Tenure-track faculty
From: Chris Jones, Chair
Re: Requests for early consideration for tenure
Date: March 27, 2011

Faculty members who wish to be considered for tenure prior to their seventh year of service at the University of Utah (or fifth year if Associate Professor or Professor) must explicitly request early consideration. According to university policy, the probationary period may be shortened under those unusual circumstances in which the University determines that it can assess the individual's qualifications in a shorter period of time. Such a situation can occur in two ways: (1) when the candidate has demonstrated relevant accomplishments through prior service elsewhere or (2) when the candidate unequivocally demonstrates the required achievements in less time than the normal review period (i.e., extraordinary progress). In either, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the pertinent RPT criteria.
(See UPol 6-311, Sec.4, C.1.a)

Requests for credit for prior service may be made at any time, but approval of such credit must be completed before a review for tenure begins with the solicitation of external reviewers. Requests for consideration on the basis of extraordinary progress are made only in the spring before a tenure review begins, but also must be approved before external reviewers are solicited.

Either request must be made in writing to the RPT chair and be accompanied by a current vita and evidence of teaching effectiveness. A request for credit for prior service must specify the number of years of credit sought and address the relevance of the prior work to the department's tenure criteria. A request based on extraordinary progress must emphasize the work accomplished at the University of Utah. **Such requests must be received no later than _____**, to ensure time for all approvals before a tenure review could begin. Requests for consideration on the basis of extraordinary progress must be approved by the department chair and the department RPT chair. If you are now an assistant professor in your fourth year or earlier at the U or an associate professor in your second year or earlier at the U (including years of credit for prior service already approved or being requested this spring), your review must also be approved in advance by the dean and senior vice president. Credit for prior service must be approved by the department advisory committee, the department chair, and the dean. **These approvals do not guarantee a positive outcome in the review itself, but merely authorize a full tenure review to begin.**

Finally, if you have already received one or more years of credit for prior service and you wish to revoke that credit and postpone your tenure review, you must notify me in writing by the same date. You may not revoke only some of the years, but must revert to the full probationary period.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #5

Sample letter from Department Chair to Dean re Credit for Prior Service

April 15, 2011

Dear Dean Smith,

Assistant Professor Kelly Klein has petitioned the Department of Learning for ____ years of credit for prior service. Professor Klein came to the University of Utah in ____ after having taught for ____ years at the University of Central Colorado. Dr. Klein has submitted a vita and course evaluations documenting his/her work at Central Colorado.

On April 4, 2011, the department RPT advisory committee of the Department of Learning met and approved Dr. Klein's request for ____ years of credit for prior service by a vote of _____. [Attach minutes of the meeting if vote was less than unanimous or if DAC recommendation is for fewer years than requested.] I am pleased to support that recommendation and urge you to support it as well.

If you approve this amount of credit for prior service, Professor Klein's mandatory review for tenure will be scheduled for 200_. [If formal retention review (s) has(ve) not yet occurred, give year(s) in which it/they will occur.]

Yours truly,

Chris Jones
Chair

Cc: Dr. Kelly Klein
RPT Chair

Enc: Klein request and supporting documents
Department minutes [if required as noted above]

If approving request, dean notes approval and signs, sends copy to VP's office, then returns letter to department for placement in cumulative RPT file at beginning of materials for next formal review. See Policy 6-311, Section 4.C.1.a.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #6

Sample Memos for Tenure Review in Sixth Year (time at U of U plus **approved** credit for prior service)

April 15, 2011

To: Dean

From: Chair and RPT Chair [both sign]

Re: Approval of sixth-year tenure review based on extraordinary progress

Dr. Kelly Klein has requested a review for tenure in the sixth year of the probationary period. Based on our review of his/her record, Dr. Klein is likely to be able to demonstrate unequivocal achievement of the tenure standards in less than the normal length of time at the University of Utah. This is to notify you that we have approved a review for tenure in the 2011-12 year.

Cc: Dr. Kelly Klein

Copy of this memo, Dr. Klein's request and current vita are placed in RPT file at beginning of materials for tenure review.

In lieu of the memo above, where departmental policy calls for reviewing all assistant professors for tenure in the sixth year (whether "up or out" or with retention as a possibility), please include the following notice at the beginning of the materials for the tenure review:

According to the RPT guidelines of the Department of _____, all assistant professors are reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of the probationary period.

[Signed by department chair]

Reference: Policy 6-311, Sections 4B. and 4C.1.b.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #7

Sample Letter for Tenure Review Before the Sixth Year for Assistant Professor or Before the Fourth Year for Associate Professor (time at U of U plus **approved** credit for prior service)

April 1, 2011

[Note early date to allow time for approvals before soliciting external letters]

Dear Dean Smith,

Assistant/Associate Professor Pat Pringle has petitioned the Department of Learning for a tenure review next fall in her/his ____ [5th or earlier if assistant; 3rd or earlier if associate] year of the probationary period. Professor Pringle has submitted a vita and course evaluation summaries supporting his/her claim that she/he is likely to be able to demonstrate unequivocal achievement of the tenure standards in less than the normal probationary period.

Department RPT chair Marquez and I have reviewed the request and supporting materials. We endorse Dr. Pringle's request and ask that you recommend such an early tenure review to Senior Vice President Pershing/Betz as well.

Yours truly,

Chris Jones
Chair

Maria Marquez
RPT Chair

Cc: Dr. Pat Pringle
RPT Chair

Enc: Pringle request and supporting documents

If approving request, dean notes approval and signs, forwards letter and materials to senior vice president. If approving, senior vice president signs, sends copy to dean, and returns originals to department for placement in cumulative RPT file at beginning of materials for tenure review.

Sample Letter from Department Chair to Candidate for Mid-Probationary Retention Review

April 1, 2011

Dr. K.A. Enti, Assistant Professor
Department of Learning
The University of Utah
Campus

Dear K.A.:

The coming academic year will mark your third [or fourth- *depending on departmental policy*] year of service to the University. By University and Department regulations you must have a formal retention review of your accomplishments in our department. This process is described in University Policy 6-303, which is available at <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html>, and in the department's RPT guidelines, which I enclose. Please review these policies

By [date], please supply me the names and contact information for [5, 6, 7, or whatever] individuals from outside the University with national reputations in your field who you believe would be able to judge your professional accomplishments and progress. Please indicate what professional relationship, if any, you have had with them in the past (thesis advisor, co-PI on a grant; co-author, etc.). Other department members and I will also nominate individuals, and from these lists, [3, 4, or whatever] will be chosen to provide review letters, as described in our departmental procedure. Please also begin thinking about what examples of your work you would like to send these reviewers.

[Note: Departmental policy governs whether external evaluations are required for mid-probationary and/or triggered reviews. If **not** mandated, state: "Although not mandated you still have the right to request the solicitation of external letters".]

Also included is a statement which you must sign and return to me indicating whether or not you wish the review letters to be confidential. Please return this statement along with your nomination list to me by 2 weeks from today so that the process may begin in a timely manner. The file will be closed on September 30 and materials may be added after that time only at specified points. If you wish to take exception to any part of the file contents, a written statement to this effect should be added by this time.

[If department procedures provide for the candidate to select one member of a personal ad hoc- or sub-committee that prepares a preliminary report, explain and ask for the person chosen at this time.]

For the formal review, I ask that you begin assembling material to be added to your cumulative file, as described in the PPM. You are required to give us a current copy of the *curriculum vitae*. You should also furnish a personal statement of your goals and accomplishments in relation to the department criteria for retention and include evidence of your research/creative activity. [Note who is responsible for putting summarized teaching evaluations in the file.] Please be advised that you have the privilege to inspect your entire file, minus any confidential review letters, at any time during the review process. If you wish to take exception to any part of the file contents, a written statement to this effect should be added by the file closing date or at later points as notified.

[If a department has fewer than three faculty members eligible to vote on the department advisory committee, explain the process for augmenting the committee size.]

Please feel free to consult with me at any time during the review process.

Sincerely,

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #9

Waiver or Nonwaiver Form

Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the faculty member being reviewed shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

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

Date:

Signature

or

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

Date:

Signature

This form, with the candidate's signature below the statement preferred by the candidate, shall be included in the candidate's review file. When the candidate reserves the right to read the external letters of evaluation, reviewers shall be informed in writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT # 10 (revised)

Memo to faculty informing of new RPT season, invitation to request formal review

To: All Department Faculty

From: Chris Jones, Chair

Re: RPT Review process for the Coming Year

Date: April, 2011

First, any individuals who wish to be given a formal review for purposes of promotion should please contact me within the next two weeks so that the formal process may be started as soon as possible.

Second, the following individuals are scheduled for mandatory formal reviews for retention, promotion, or tenure: *list names. [Briefly describe the department's procedures and the help needed from various members of the department, such as service on subcommittees preparing preliminary reports or suggestions for external reviewers.]*

According to our departmental guidelines and UPol 6-303, Sec. A.3.a., *[describe which faculty are eligible to participate and/or vote]*. The formal RPT review meeting[s] will be held on October _____. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting. Absent members may submit a written opinion to be read at the meeting. Their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Please see me if you have any questions concerning your participation or voting status.

I remind all faculty that the Policy and Procedures Manual notes that written comments from all faculty (as well as staff) are specifically invited, whether or not you are qualified to vote. Please send them to me at your earliest convenience and not later than a month before the formal RPT review meeting. No anonymous letters may be included, and the faculty member whom the letter is about has the right to see these letters.

Thank you.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #11

Letter to Program from Chair

[To be sent at same time faculty are notified]

Dr. Program Director
Ethnic Studies
Campus

Dear Dr. Director:

Dr. K.A. Enti will be formally reviewed in the next academic year for retention in our department. According to Policy 6-303, C.,4., you have the right to review the faculty member.

Student Advisory Committees based in programs and program directors do not have an independent vote in the RPT process. If you have a SAC and wish to have its voice heard, please incorporate its views and those of the program director and the program faculty into a single report.

Unless the program provides for the candidate to make a written response to the program report, which you would send us along with the report, we must have the report at the department not later than a week before September 30 so that Dr. Enti has time to add a response, if desired, before the file will be closed and available for eligible department faculty to read in preparation for the Department RPT Advisory Committee meeting.

Thank you for your timely response to this request.

Sincerely,

[Note: It would also be appropriate for this letter to specify mutual understandings with respect to sharing information in the file and when such information will be available.]

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #12

Sample Letter to Outside Reviewers

June 1, 2011

Dr. William Review
Department of Learning
University of U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Review:

Thank you for agreeing to review the file of Dr. K.A. Enti in the Department of Learning at the University of Utah. Dr. Enti is being considered for mid-probationary retention [and/or] tenure [and/or] promotion to [rank]. *[Be very clear about the relevant actions and the time frame. If it's the "up or out" year, you may want to add "tenure in the final year of his/her probationary period." If a second retention review only, note "this is not a tenure review but the last formal review prior to the tenure review." If you are seeking assessment of his/her progress toward tenure, indicate how many more years until the mandatory review.]* ***[If applicable: Dr. Enti has received a one-year extension of the probationary period. Faculty members are not expected to maintain normal productivity during the leave associate with this extension. Please take this into consideration as you assess his/her progress.]***

Enclosed are Dr. Enti's curriculum vitae, a short description of his/her scholarship *[not required, but a good idea]*, as well as the pertinent departmental criteria *[required]*. We enclose the following examples of Dr. Enti's work: *[list]*. Please evaluate his/her work in the following areas with which you are familiar:

- 1) National recognition
- 2) Research and its quality
- 3) Clinical expertise (if applicable)
- 4) Teaching performance
- 5) Administrative work
- 6) Community activities (professional)
- 7) Progress toward meeting our standards for tenure and promotion

The University of Utah allows a candidate the option to waive or retain the right to see letters of evaluation. Dr. Enti has (or has not) waived the right to review letters pertaining to this action. *[If waived:]* Your comments may be distilled or summarized for Dr. Enti, but with no information identifying you. The University cannot guarantee confidentiality if a case goes to litigation.

Please state your relationship to the candidate and your credentials (or enclose a brief vita). Please return your letter (on institutional letterhead, if at all possible) no later than _____. Please address your response to Dr. Chris Jones, Chair of this department.

Sincerely,

[Note: Do not ask a reviewer to evaluate an area for which you have not sent adequate pertinent information. List only those areas (from 1-7 above) which you want the reviewer to evaluate.]

SAMPLE DOCUMENT # 13

Guidelines for Assessing Quality of Teaching

The University RPT Standards Committee has adopted this statement as a guide for departments in determining their criteria and indicators of good teaching for use in RPT decisions. Further information is available from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence: info@ctle.utah.edu or www.ctle.utah.edu.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should not consist solely of student evaluations, though student satisfaction with teaching methods and course administration is one component of effective teaching. Peer and expert review of teaching effectiveness is recommended, consisting of:

1. direct observation of instructor-student interaction, including classroom/laboratory/clinical and discussion sections, and office hours, etc.
2. a review of the instructor's written or orally presented teaching philosophy, if available, to determine if it is manifested in the teaching style/actions,
3. instructor, student, and teaching assistant interview to determine progress in teaching proficiency, including how the instructor has responded to student and peer feedback in the past, and the instructor's unique contribution to teaching,
4. a review of all course materials (syllabus, texts, handouts, exams, writings) to determine where the course fits in the curriculum, and how curricular threads or themes are evidenced in the course,

Particularly for those above the rank of assistant professor, a determination of the quality of leadership for teaching is recommended, through an evaluation of:

Scholarship (papers, presentations, etc.)
Committees, associations, administration, mentorship
Non-classroom teaching (dissertations, theses).

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #14

The University of Utah Student Advisory Committee Faculty Evaluation Report

THE FIRST STEP IN THIS EVALUATION SHOULD BE TO READ
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS (See Accompanying Page)

Evaluation of:

Name of Faculty Member

Present Rank

Department

College

Evaluation for (check applicable action): ☐ Retention ☐ Promotion ☐ Tenure

Completed by (check applicable action): ☐ Graduate SAC ☐ Undergrad SAC ☐ Joint Grad & Undergrad ☐ Other: _____

Recommendation (please record actual student vote in the appropriate boxes):

Retention			Promotion			Tenure		
Yes	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Abstain

PART I. Describe the sources and methods used in gathering the data upon which this evaluation is based.

Indicate the number and kinds of responses obtained from other students. (Write on separate sheet if necessary.)

PART II. Provide a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance. Give particular attention to the faculty member's knowledge of the subject and effectiveness in conveying that knowledge to students. (Write on separate sheet if necessary.)

PART III. State the reasons for the Student Advisory Committee recommendation in this case. (Write on separate sheet if necessary.)

Names & Signatures of the SAC Members:

SAC Chairperson Signature: _____ Date: _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

1. **Purpose of the retention, promotion, and tenure review process.** A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to regular faculty ranks prior to the granting of tenure. Annual reviews are scheduled during this probationary period to examine the academic competence of non-tenured individuals and to terminate those who do not meet the standards of the department and the university after their initial appointment. Promotion in rank and the granting of tenure are acknowledgments of excellent performance in teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service. Granting tenure implies a commitment by the university to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline and the university in a manner befitting an academic person.
2. **Students should understand the importance of their input in the review process.** Faculty reviews for retention, promotion and tenure are important events. They involve important individual career decisions. Student advisory committee members should keep this fact in mind. Moreover, student reviews provide important and valued information for faculty committee deliberations at all levels of review. SAC members also have the responsibility to inform other students of the importance of their participation in the review process.
3. **The review process occurs at many levels in the University, with each level having access to all information developed at lower levels.** The department review committee takes into consideration its own information but also weighs heavily information provided by the SAC. Each departmental committee makes a recommendation to the chairperson of the department, who in turn weighs all information. In departmentalized colleges, a college level committee, consisting of faculty from various departments in the college, also examines the total file, including SAC materials. This information and its recommendation are passed on to the dean of the college, who in turn makes his/her recommendation to the cognizant vice president. The cognizant vice president forwards to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (UPTAC) for its recommendation the files in which there is a differing recommendation from any of the prior review levels, or when the college functions as a single academic department. UPTAC examines the file and makes a recommendation to the cognizant vice president. The UPTAC consists of one faculty member elected from each college in the University and four student members. The final decision-maker is the president of the University. There also are procedures by which a faculty member may appeal a decision and set in motion a hearing. SAC materials are read and considered over and over again in the review process and are important.
4. **The SAC should view itself as a responsible interpreter of information concerning student opinion of an individual faculty member's teaching performance. The SAC should assess the validity and significance of the information and should present a fair and balanced synthesis of both positive and negative qualities suggested by the information.** SAC should not view itself as an advocate, but as an information-gathering and advice-giving body. A broad range of information should be sought from other students, information should be screened and weighed for its accuracy and fairness, and a SAC should make as fair and balanced a presentation as it possibly can.
5. **The SAC should endeavor to ensure the data it works with are representative of the views of the students who have had some contact with the faculty member being reviewed.** The SAC members should attempt to obtain data from as broad based a sample as possible to ensure that individual students or a small minority do not have an overly influential role in the process. As a data-gatherer, filtering and screening group, the SAC should obtain as diverse a group of opinions as possible and describe as best it can the general thrust of those views. Extreme points of view should be carefully examined in relation to the range of opinions expressed by students, and the SAC must attempt to present as representative a view of students as possible.
6. **The SAC should report the procedures used in obtaining data and should identify any limitations which might affect their reliability.** There are many ways for SAC to collect information about faculty - interviews, course evaluations, questionnaires, etc. University course evaluations are especially recommended as a data source. Evaluations from multiple courses should be used. To provide other recommending bodies with a clear picture about the underlying basis of SAC reports, the SAC should describe the data collection procedures used, the number and nature of student opinions that were obtained, and other features of the procedures. Where course evaluations are used, state from which courses in which semester the evaluations were reviewed. If a survey or questionnaire was used, attach a copy. The SAC should also describe any limitations or problems with the data so such matters can be considered by other review bodies.
7. **The SAC should describe and explain the variations of opinion among members of the SAC.** In presenting their analysis and integration, SAC members should include a balanced description and an analysis of the range of opinions of SAC members. There is no reason why a SAC should seek consensus or variations in opinion. However, it is important for the SAC to reflect the range of SAC members' opinions and recommendations. An effort should be made to analyze the change in the candidate's teaching performance over the years and to note the difference in performance in undergraduate and graduate level courses. All SAC officers should sign the report.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT # 15

Posted Memo to Staff and Faculty informing them of new RPT season; Invitation to provide written comments/recommendations

To: All Department Staff and Faculty Members

From: Chris Jones, Chair

Re: RPT Review process for the Coming Year

Date: August 28, 2011

This memorandum announces the formal review of our colleague(s):

Dr. K.A. Enti, mid-probationary retention review

Dr. S. P. White, tenure and promotion to associate professor

I remind all staff that University Policy notes that written comments/recommendations from staff relevant to these reviews are invited. Please send them to me at your earliest convenience and not later than two weeks prior to the closing date of the file on September 30. No anonymous letters will be included. The faculty member being reviewed has the right to see these letters and respond to them in writing, as they will be included in her/his cumulative file.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT # 16

EXTERNAL REVIEWER GRID

LETTER-WRITERS FOR [Faculty Name] – FALL 201_

Name & address *Required	Phone, Fax, Email address	Letter received?	Suggested by? *Required	Relationship to candidate? *Required	Used before for RPT?	Qualifications *Required	Source of qualifications data
			RPT Committee	See Letter		See Vita attached	Vita sent
			Candidate	Dissertation Chair		See Vita attached	University web site
			Dept Chair & Candidate	No direct relationship; work on similar projects		Expert in catalog research, printing	Web site of professional society
			RPT Committee	See Letter		See Vita attached	Directory of
			Dept Chair	none		See Vita attached	

Notes: _____ If a vita is sent, please put the vita behind the letter in the External Letter section of the binder.

University of Utah
Formal Retention, Promotion, Tenure Summary
Check List of Essential Supporting Documents

Start with document #1 (on top) and put these materials in a 2" D-ring locking binder to hold all of the documents for each faculty member. Please label the binder with professor's name and department. The action (RPT) can be labeled on a cover page in the binder. If a binder has been sent previously, the Dean's office will be sending forward the formal review and any informal reviews that have occurred since in a file folder, labeled and hole punched. All other materials will be returned to the dept level. Please use one divider for #5 through #12 (labeled Letters & Reports), a separate divider for: SAC Report and course evaluations, one divider each for Faculty CV, External Letters, (#18-21), Personal Statement, Dept Guidelines, and Past Reviews. Send the originals of all external letters, dean's letter, etc. The order of reviews should be the most current year on top, with past reviews in descending order. If any prior reviews can no longer be found, please insert a note saying that, e.g., the second year informal review is unavailable. Do not include publications reprints or materials sent to external reviewers that do not have to go beyond the Dean's office.

- ☐ 1. Formal Retention, Promotion, Tenure Summary worksheet
- ☐ 2. Tenure-track Probationary Period Worksheet [Sample Document #1]
- ☐ 3. Formal Review Schedule during Transition between Policies (if present) [Sample Document #2]
- ☐ 4. Authorization of changes to extend or reduce probationary period [e.g. leaves, credit for prior service or extraordinary progress] (if present)
- ☐ 5. Candidate's response to college/dean letters (if present)
- ☐ 6. Dean's letter of recommendation (showing that copies were sent to the faculty member and chair)
- ☐ 7. Report of college RPT advisory committee deliberation, signed by the committee secretary and listing names of committee members present (dean shall send a copy to the faculty member and dept. chair)
- ☐ 8. Candidate's response to department (if present)
- ☐ 9. Department chair's letter of recommendation (showing that a copy was sent to the faculty member)
- ☐ 10. Report of department faculty advisory committee deliberation, signed by the committee secretary and RPT chair and listing names of committee members, present and absent voting members (showing that a copy was sent to the faculty member)
- ☐ 11. Ad-Hoc or Subcommittee Report (if present)
- ☐ 12. Recommendation of Academic Program (if present)
- ☐ 13. Evidence of faculty responsibility (if present) / other written statements from interested individuals
- ☐ 14. Teaching report or peer review of teaching (if present) [Sample Document #13]
- ☐ 15. Student Advisory Committee Faculty Evaluation Report(s), signed by SAC officers
- ☐ 16. Course evaluation summaries -- any courses taught since last formal review (max. 5 yrs for "full Prof")
- ☐ 17. Faculty member's updated and complete curriculum vitae
- ☐ 18. Sample letter of request for external letters and /or request for internal letters (if present)
- ☐ 19. External Reviewer Grid -- Information on which reviewers were nominated by the candidate; the department chair, and the RPT advisory committee; qualifications of evaluators (or brief vita) and their relationship to the candidate.
- ☐ 20. Waiver or Nonwaiver form (signed by candidate)
- ☐ 21. Letters of evaluation from recognized experts, who are qualified to comment on faculty member's accomplishments, if vita is included, put behind the letter of external reviewer.
- ☐ 22. Personal Statement (recommended, but not required by University Policy)
- ☐ 23. Copy of departmental RPT guidelines used for review
- ☐ 24. Past reviews -- any informal reviews since last formal review (most current on top, with past reviews in descending order). For "full Prof" only CV from review for Assoc Prof plus any post-tenure review.

◆**Note:** In colleges/schools which function as single academic units (*Law, Nursing, Social Work*) the college faculty advisory committee serves in place of a department faculty advisory committee and operates according to regulations governing department faculty advisory committees. The dean's letter of recommendation replaces and substitutes for the department chair's letters of recommendation.

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #18

Chair's Letter to Dean

1. Status of Faculty Member
 - 1) Years of service
 1. Years since start of tenure-track appointment at University of Utah
 2. Reference to prior service credited or approval based on extraordinary progress
 3. Special Considerations (Leaves of Absence or administrative appointments) that extend probationary period
 - 2) Formal consideration
 1. Retention
 2. Promotion
 3. Tenure
2. Chair's Basic Decision
3. Reasons for the Decision (follow criteria)
 - 1) Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities
 - 2) Teaching
 - 3) Service (University, professional, public)
 - 4) Other Considerations (e.g., Responsible Faculty Conduct, Responses to prior reviews, etc.)

[Note: If responsible conduct or response to prior review is significant factor, refer to specific documents in file.]

SAMPLE DOCUMENT # 19

Sample Chair's Letter Informing Candidate of Right to Respond

November 7, 2011

Dr. K. A. Enti
Department of Learning
University of Utah
Campus

Dear Dr. Enti:

Enclosed is my recommendation to the dean that you [not] be retained in the rank of assistant professor [or other action].

If you choose to submit a written statement for your formal review file responding to my recommendation and/or that of the department advisory committee, that statement should be delivered to my office within seven days from the date on which you receive this letter. After this time, I will forward this letter, your statement (if offered), and your file to the dean.

[If your department uses a form for the candidate to indicate he/she is not planning to respond, enclose the form and note it in this letter.]

Sincerely,

Chris Jones, Chair
Department of Learning

University of Utah
2011-2012
Formal Retention, Promotion, Tenure Summary

College / School: _____ Department: _____

Information relating to faculty member being reviewed:

Name: _____

Highest Degree: _____ Received from: _____ Year: _____

Is this a new appointment with tenure? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, skip down to table of votes.

Hire date of current tenure track (or tenured) appointment - Month: _____ Year: _____

Is this the mandated year for tenure review - (i.e.; the "up-or-out year")? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Has this faculty member's probationary period been reduced or extended for any reason? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes--include Tenure-track Probationary Period Worksheet --worksheet included? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Rank at time of Hire: _____ Academic Year of Last Formal Review: _____

Current Rank: _____ Years in Current Rank (including present year): _____

Purpose of this review: ☐ Retention in the rank of _____
☐ Promotion to the rank of _____
☐ Tenure in the rank of _____

Record of 2011-2012 Recommendations (♦ Indicates Distribution of Votes)	Retention			Promotion			Tenure			Recommendation Date
	Yes	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Abstain	
Undergraduate SAC										
Graduate SAC (if relevant)										
#Program *(if relevant)										
#Department Advisory Committee♦										
Number of Eligible DAC Voters	Total:			Total:			Total:			
Department Chairperson										
College Advisory Committee ♦										
College Dean										
UPTAC ♦										
Cognizant Vice President										

*For faculty members involved in Ethnic Studies, Writing Program, Middle East Center or Gender Studies

Note: In colleges/schools which function as single academic units (*Law, Nursing, Social Work*) the college faculty advisory committee serves in place of a department faculty advisory committee and operates according to regulations governing department faculty advisory committees. The dean's letter of recommendation replaces and substitutes for the department chair's letters of recommendation.

#Absentee votes should be recorded with all regular votes. The total number of votes cast should match your list of present and absent voting members.

University RPT Standards Committee
URPTSC Approval Process Overview
(Rev. 2010-10-20)

Steps for review & approval of changes to a departmental RPT Statement.

I. Introduction.

A. Under U-Policies 6-303 & 6-305 the URPTSC has the final role in approval of departmental (or college-wide) RPT Statements (and a changed RPT Statement can be put into effect only after that approval).

B. Ordinarily a request for review & approval is initiated by the department, but per 6-305, a review can also be initiated by the URPTSC itself (or by vice president, dean, UPTAC, Graduate Council, individual faculty). The URPTSC is considering establishing a fixed schedule of periodic reviews, possibly linked with the existing 7-year academic unit review cycle (commonly known as grad/undergrad council reviews).

C. The URPTSC offers **two levels of review**—a *thorough* review of an entire Statement, or, (beginning in 2010) an *expedited* review of discrete changes.

1. In most instances, the URPTSC conducts a *thorough review of the entire Statement* (not limited to specific portions the department is seeking to change), involving intensive review by an assigned team of Committee members and the assistance of the office of the Associate VP as ex officio, culminating with final review and approval by the overall Committee.

2. If the department seeks to make only a small number of discrete changes clearly consistent with U-Policy an *expedited approval of the discrete changes* may be offered (see below).

D. **Contacts between URPTSC and departments---through VP's office.** The Associate V.P. for Faculty—Academic Affairs is ex officio to and provides technical assistance and other support for the URPTSC, including serving as the relay point between the URPTSC and departments (and deans) when requested by the URPTSC Chair. Currently, this role is conducted by Bob Flores, Professor of Law, as special assistant to Assoc. V.P. Susan Olson. floresr@law.utah.edu 581-5881.

II. Typical *thorough* review process.

A. **Principles of thorough review.** The URPTSC takes its role very seriously, employing a rigorous review process, ensuring that RPT Statements, by the time of final approval, provide thorough and accurate descriptions of the criteria and standards and the procedures for RPT decisions, in full accord with applicable University Regulations, and are written with adequate clarity to meet the needs both of the department's internal personnel (particularly the RPT candidates) and the various University administrators and committees involved in RPT decision-making (including any appeals). Such a rigorous review approach can be protracted---less so if the submitting department has itself thoroughly reviewed and appropriately revised its initial draft before submitting it, and then responds quickly and effectively to URPTSC feedback for subsequent drafts—and more protracted if the initial draft is of poor quality and the department moves slowly on improved drafts.

B. Steps.

1. Careful preparation of initial draft—by department. The department should begin its drafting by examining the relevant *current University Regulations* (primarily Policies 6-303 and 6-311). Many older Statements have not been kept up to date with various important changes made to those policies in recent years. The URPTSC makes available to departments its “*checklist*” that is used in the review process and can serve as guidance for drafting. *Examples of well-crafted Statements* of other departments may also be considered. With those resources for guidance, the department should carefully examine and revise the draft to be submitted. The submitted draft should document the specific changes proposed as compared to the previously approved Statement (ordinarily done using text marking—strikeout & underlining), and drafts should be submitted digitally, as MS Word files (and the Word “track changes” tool may be used for marking changes). If there are significant changes not self-explanatory, the rationale for them should be explained in an accompanying brief memo, addressed to the URPTSC. The submitted proposed draft should have been preliminarily approved by the department regular faculty and dean (per 6-303), and the dean may add additional explanation when forwarding a proposed draft on to the URPTSC.

(Resources for drafting: See IV below.)

[Use of ‘template’--- currently under consideration—check with URPTSC Chair/ Assoc. V.P. for update.]

2. Review of initial draft—by URPTSC.

The approach to reviewing the initial draft will depend on the quality of that draft. If the initial draft is well-organized, and its description of procedures is both thorough and mostly consistent with U-Policies, then it will be reviewed in a single phase, with both the Associate V.P.’s office and a team of assigned URPTSC members reviewing it simultaneously. The Associate V.P.’s office will focus primarily on document structure and the description of procedures, and the URPTSC members will focus primarily on the substantive criteria and standards. That feedback will be returned to the department (copied to the dean), and the department will prepare a second draft.

If the initial draft is either not well-organized or has a problematic description of procedures, then the review will occur in two phases.

In the *first phase*, there will be a preliminary review, to develop feedback focusing primarily on the need for document *reorganizing* and/or the need for correcting deficiencies in the description of RPT *procedures*. The URPTSC Chair and the Associate V.P.’s office will determine the assignment of a team for this first phase review (in some instances conducted by the Associate V. P.’s office).

Commentary is typically given through a combination of i) a cover memo, and ii) specific comments inserted within the draft. The feedback regarding organization & procedures will be returned to the department (cc’d to dean), and the department will prepare another draft, rectifying the serious problems of document organization and/or deficient description of procedures--- resulting in a draft that is ready to be presented to the URPTSC for a *second phase* review focusing on the core matters of substance—criteria and standards for RPT decisions.

3. Second draft submitted--by department (after dean’s approval of any significant changes). Include explanation of changes made—including explanation of responses to all major points raised in the feedback given on the initial draft.

(If this draft responds effectively to the initial feedback, the subsequent review steps may occur quickly.)

4. Second draft—assigned to review team. A team is assigned by the URPTSC Chair (typically two or three members) once the draft is submitted. Reviewers, using URPTSC Checklist, and after first examining the initial feedback materials, consider i) whether 2nd draft effectively addresses the document structure/clarity issues and RPT procedures issues raised previously, ii) whether description of substantive criteria and standards is sufficiently clear and consistent with Policy 6-303 (particularly on excellence standards for tenure), and iii) any other matters affecting the overall quality of the Statement.

5. Additional drafts---if needed.

Depending on the quality of the 2nd draft, a third draft (and sometimes more) will be needed. For each round of drafting, the commentary of the URPTSC will be relayed to the department, and the department will be asked to respond, expeditiously.

6. Final approval—formal documentation. When the assigned review team and Chair determine that a suitable draft has been submitted, it is presented to the full Committee with a recommendation of voting for approval. In order to avoid any confusion about approval status and inappropriate use of an unapproved Statement (as has occasionally happened), the final approval will be formally documented through an approval memorandum from the URPTSC Chair to the department, that memorandum will be attached to the revised Statement, and the declared date of final approval will be displayed on the Statement.

Until final approval of a proposed revised Statement is declared—the department must continue to operate under the former version (the most recent version fully approved by the URPTSC).

Statements fully approved (beginning with 2010) are then published as Supplemental Rules in conjunction with Policy 6-303 (University Regulations Library website).

7. Overall time line. The overall time for completion of review and approval is primarily dependent on i) the quality of the initial draft, ii) the time the department takes in preparing subsequent drafts, and iii) the time taken for the reviews by the URPTSC and Associate V.P. (which is affected by the time of year that drafts are submitted, and by the overall workload of the URPTSC at that time—i.e., the number of departments undergoing review). Long delays between steps in the process are undesirable, particularly bridging across academic years (committee members rotate off, memories fade, and long delays rarely improve final quality), and so departments are strongly encouraged to attend promptly to redrafting.

III. Expedited review.

Beginning in 2010, the URPTSC in appropriate cases may offer an expedited process for approval of specific discrete changes.

A. Standards. A request for expedited approval will be considered only if the changes are i) few and discrete and ii) unequivocally consistent with U-Policy, and iii) the overall Statement is otherwise of high quality and fully consistent with current U-Policy. Examples of such discrete changes include a change of the probationary period (6 vs. 7 years), or a change of the number of mid-probationary formal reviews (1 vs. 2), both of which are explicitly given as options in U-

Policy. Statements which have undergone a full review within fewer than five years are most likely to be sufficiently current and of sufficient overall quality--and older Statements are less likely to be appropriate for a limited-scope review. (This is not an avenue for avoiding a needed more comprehensive updating and thorough URPTSC review.) In appropriate cases, a determination may be made to give 'provisional' approval of such a discrete change pending anticipated completion of a more comprehensive revision and review process.

B. Steps.

1. The department (with dean's approval) submits a proposal/approval memo including i) description of the proposed discrete change, ii) description of the current practice sought to be changed, iii) proposed effective date of change and its duration, iv) policy for handling the individual cases of transitional candidates (whose probationary period began under old practice), v) date of approval vote by department regular faculty majority, vi) dated signatures of department representative (RPT Chair or Dept. Chair) & dean, and vii) signature lines for URPTSC Chair & cognizant Associate V.P. *[Sample memo is available.]*

2. The Associate V.P. and URPTSC Chair jointly (delegated the authority of the full Committee) will review the proposal and determine the appropriateness of granting the expedited approval. If approved, the full URPTSC is notified of the expedited approval, and the department implements the discrete change as of the designated date. The signed proposal/ approval memo is attached as an addendum to the departmental RPT Statement (included with all copies of the Statement, particularly those distributed to RPT candidates and department committee members, and included in candidate files).

IV. References/Resources--- pertinent U-Policies and other useful resources.

Policies 6-303, 6-305, 6-311 at the U-Regs website <http://www.regulations.utah.edu>.

The URPTSC *Checklist*, and *examples of recently approved RPT Statements*, are available at the U-Regs website, with Policy 6-303—Part IV--Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources, <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html>.

{From fall 2010 onward, newly approved Statements will be routinely added to the website, available for other departments to refer to as examples.}

SAMPLE DOCUMENT #22

Dept. Name _____ Dept. contact person _____
URPTS Committee contact person (Chair, or primary reviewer) _____
Date form completed _____

Checklist & Guidelines for Review of Departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards, and Procedures

Version 3 (April 24, 2009)

(a) Guidelines for Reviews—keyed to the summary checklist that follows

This checklist/guidelines form is used by the University RPT Standards Committee (“URPTSC”) in reviewing departmental statements of criteria, standards, and procedures used in RPT reviews which University Policy (“U-Policy”) requires be submitted for URPTSC approval. Completed form sent by URPTSC to dept. will be accompanied by memorandum explaining status of review, and describing any actions necessary to complete review process.

Departments might also study this form for guidance in preparing RPT statements.

For more information about review process, contact University Academic Senate Office— 581-5203, email= nancy.lines@utah.edu, <http://www.admin.utah.edu/asenate>, or Associate V.P. for Faculty, 581-8763, email= Susan.Olson@utah.edu, <http://www.admin.utah.edu/facdev>.

Although form describes certain requirements imposed by University Policies, users are cautioned to carefully read actual Policies, particularly on RPT criteria & procedures (Policy 6-303, formerly PPM 9-5.1), on duties of the URPTSC (Policy 6-305, formerly PPM 9-5.3), and on tenure generally (Policy 6-311, formerly PPM 8-6). For librarians, see (Policy 6-306, formerly PPM 9-5.4, and Policy 6-312, formerly PPM 8-6.1). Current policies are available at <http://www.regulations.utah.edu>.

Some parts of form refer to items that are mandatory under U-Policy. Others refer to “Best Practices,” not necessarily mandated by U-Policy, but recommended by URPTSC based on observing effective practices developed by various depts. and then sharing benefits of that experience with other depts. A finding that the dept. statement “*meets minimum requirements off/shows no apparent inconsistency with U-policy,*” with regard to a particular point can apply either when the dept. statement is silent on the point and thus implicitly applying pertinent U-Policies, or when the statement explicitly covers the point and does so in a way that is in accord with U-Policies.

Checklist Legend: URPTSC Reviewer will mark each item, indicating dept. statement is:

“S”= Satisfactory (no further work needed)

“U” = Unsatisfactory (must be revised)

“R”= Recommend further work be done (although can be approved as-is)

“?” = Reviewer has questions to discuss

“NA”= Not applicable in this case.

Any needed further explanation should be given in the accompanying memorandum.

I. CLARITY ON RELATIVE ROLES OF U-POLICY & ANY COLLEGE RULES.

A. ____ Reference to relevant **U-Policies**. (Statement adequately instructs readers to consult contents of relevant U-Policies, especially (Policy 6-311, formerly PPM 8-6) & (Policy 6-303, formerly PPM 9-5.1), and does not include any potentially misleading or confusing descriptions of U-Policies.

Although URPTSC generally recommends against repeating lengthy portions of U-Policy in dept. statement, or attempting to paraphrase contents of U-Policy, a statement containing such elements may be approved if there is no significant risk of confusing or misleading readers about meaning of U-Policies. Best practice is to provide RPT candidates with a URL link to, or accurate copy of, contents of U-Policies.)

B. ____ Reference to relevant **college rules & practices**. (Adequately informs readers of existence of any college-level rules or established practices governing RPT criteria or procedures for depts. within the college, including operations of college RPT committee. Contents of such college rules are either described accurately within dept. statement, or pertinent college documents are attached to and referenced within dept. statement.)

II. DEPT. CRITERIA & EVIDENCE DESCRIPTION.

(For each type of review, and for each of the categories of criteria mandated by U-Policy, dept. must adequately describe specific *criteria*, and the expected qualitative *standard* of performance, and as a matter of best practices should adequately describe the types of *evidence* that are expected/acceptable to prove satisfaction of the dept. requirements. The *rationale* for selecting such criteria & standards, which U-Policy also requires be included in dept. statements, is ordinarily apparent from general statements of the dept.'s mission and philosophy, but dept. may elaborate further its justification for adopting any particular requirement.

Consistent with U-Policy principle that "granting tenure is regarded as the university's most critical personnel decision," URPTSC will focus most intensely on description of criteria for the *final tenure review*, and will look for clear differentiation between the criteria & standards applicable to that review and the other types of reviews. In most depts. the granting of tenure is ordinarily linked directly with a promotion in rank, and so the description of criteria & standards applicable for what is ordinarily a combined decision—tenure and rank promotion—might be written either under the heading of requirements for tenure, or under the heading of requirements for the specific rank typically linked with tenure—most commonly Associate Prof.)

A. Teaching

1. ____ **Criteria-clarity**. (Adequately describes *criteria* and clearly articulates *standard* of quality expected regarding the fundamental aspects of teaching, including course design & preparation, delivery, providing feedback to students, supervision of student work, use of appropriate bases for grading, other-.)

2. ____ **Evidence-clarity**. (Adequately describes types of *evidence* dept. requires (or accepts) to be included in candidate file regarding teaching.)

3. ____ **Evidence-breadth**. (Teaching quality assessments are based on broad array of reliable forms of evidence that *include but are not limited to standard course evaluation rankings*.)

Best practices: The URPTSC's view is that standard course evaluations from students are useful, but taken alone do not provide enough information to assess teaching quality, and strongly recommends that depts. employ a broader array of information sources as evidence regarding teaching. Information taken into account might include: the number of courses and the number of different courses taught; curriculum development; course materials; teaching assistant supervision; student advisement activities; examples of feedback given to students; examples of student work; student accomplishments attributable to the quality of teaching—including students' awards; Student Advisory Committee reports; student exit interviews; input from alumni; teaching awards; and peer evaluations. However, caution should be taken in giving weight to informal/ anecdotal comments. SAC reports "should be based on guiding principles approved by

the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson.” (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-3). URPTSC encourages depts. to seek assistance from the University’s Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence in determining how to gather and interpret data on teaching quality. (See <http://www.ctle.utah.edu/>).

B. Research /creative activity.

1. **Criteria-clarity.** (Adequately describes *criteria* and clearly articulates *standard* of quantity & quality expected regarding those types of scholarly activity recognized in the particular discipline, e.g., publications, presentations of papers, artistic performances, grant applications, patent applications, other, and adequately explains the relative *weight* given to each particular type of activity, including e.g., differing values for various types of publications.)

2. **Evidence-clarity.** (Adequately describes types of *evidence* dept. requires/accepts to be included in candidate file.)

3. **Role of external funding-clarity.** (If applicable, describes with particularity any expectations regarding success at securing *external funding* to support research/creative activity of the candidate, or for financial support of research assistants, and the rationale for such expectations.) [New requirement of U-Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b, effective 2010.]

C. Service (university, professional, public).

1. **Criteria -clarity.** (Adequately describes *criteria* and clearly articulates *standard* of quantity & quality expected regarding those types of service valued by the dept., e.g., service in dept & college committees, University-wide committees, community organizations, governmental agencies, professional organizations, other public service.)

2. **Evidence-clarity.** (Adequately describes types of *evidence* dept. requires/accepts to be included in candidate file.)

D. Responsible conduct.

1. **Role of professional codes-clarity.** (If applicable, clearly describes expectations of candidate’s adherence to relevant *professional codes of conduct*.)

As revised in 2005, U-Policy instructs depts. to employ criteria “consistent with... professional codes if appropriate.” (Policy 6-303-III-A-2, formerly PPM 9-5.1-A-2).The URPTSC strongly encourages depts. to identify and incorporate provisions of such codes, in part because a principle encompassed in U-Policy is that faculty should serve as role models for students who will enter such professions and be governed by such codes, and in some instances the students are effectively governed by those codes during their time as students. See Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities–Student Professional and Ethical Conduct (Policy 6-400, formerly PPM 8-10)

2. **Other aspects of responsible conduct--clarity.** (If applicable, clearly describes any additional criteria dept. has adopted to further implement University’s general concern with ‘responsible’ conduct of faculty/ adherence to Faculty Code. (Policy 6-303-III-A-2 , formerly PPM 9-5.1-A-2).

III. DEPT. STANDARDS DESCRIPTION.

A. Retention-- formal pre-tenure reviews (teaching, research/creative, service)

1. **Clarity of standards** (Adequately describes *criteria*, clearly articulates *standards* of quality expected, and describes *evidence* expected to be included in file, for this level of review.) for

- (a) _____teaching, (b) _____research/creative, (c) _____service,
& (d) _____responsible conduct--if applicable.

2. _____**Comparison to final review--clarity.** (Adequately describes how the standards applicable for this type of review *compare to those for the final tenure review.*)

B. Informal pre-tenure reviews

1. **Descriptions of applicable standards**, if any, are consistent with U-Policy principle of “clearly adequate progress” toward tenure. (Depts. may, but are not required to describe in detail the criteria and standards applicable in an informal review and how they relate to those applicable for a pre-tenure formal review or the final tenure decision. A typical, and acceptable, approach is to set forth an expectation that candidates demonstrate “adequate progress toward tenure.”)

2. Best practices:

a. _____**Triggered review** option, clearly referenced. (The statement should ensure that candidates are aware of the provision of U-Policy allowing dept. to ‘trigger’ a formal review if a candidate “does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress ... in an informal review.” (Policy 6-303-III-B, formerly PPM 9-5.1-B). It should clearly describe any further rules the dept. has adopted to implement that aspect of U-Policy.)

C. Tenure reviews (This is the *most important part* of a Statement, because of the fundamental importance of tenure at the University, and will be scrutinized with great care to ensure that the applicable standards are described with sufficient clarity to inform tenure candidates, dept & college advisory committees, administrators, and University appeal/review committees.)

1. Clarity of standards for

- (a) _____teaching, (b) _____research/creative, (c) _____service,
& (d) _____responsible conduct--if applicable.

D. Promotion in rank--

1. **Clarity of standards for each step.** (Adequately describes *standards* applicable for each step of promotion, and clearly *differentiates* between those applicable for each step. Note that in certain common practices a particular step of promotion is ordinarily linked with granting tenure (e.g., tenure linked with promotion from Assistant to Associate, or tenure linked with promotion from Associate to Professor). For such practices it is acceptable to describe a single set of standards that apply to a combined review for tenure and promotion. In such instances, a sufficiently clear description of tenure standards can also suffice for the required clear description of the associated promotion standards. However, if such a joint description is used, then for any step of promotion that may occur separately from tenure in a given dept’s practices (whether routinely or infrequently, such as a promotion to full Professor years after achievement of tenure, or any promotion prior to tenure), there must be a distinguishable, clear description of the standards applied to such a standalone promotion decision. To assist URPTSC reviewers in understanding the wide variety of acceptable practices for linking or not linking tenure and steps of promotion, see the separate addendum to this checklist—“*URPTSC Review of Varying Promotion & Tenure Practices.*”

a. Assistant to **Associate Prof.**

- (i) _____Teaching, (ii) _____research/creative, (iii) _____service,

& (iv) _____ responsible conduct --if applicable.

b. Associate to **full Professor**

(i) _____ Teaching, (ii) _____ research/creative, (iii) _____ service,
& (iv) _____ responsible conduct --if applicable.

IV. Overall– Criteria & Standards

A. **General compliance** with core principles of U-Policies. (Dept. criteria & standards are not inconsistent with, and overall do serve to adequately carry out the key principles of U-Policy.)

1. **High standards.** (Candidates for retention, promotion in rank, and particularly for tenure are held to high standards consistent with the University's stated commitments to excellence. Standards should be based soundly in accepted norms of the discipline.)

a. _____ **Effectiveness, at minimum.** (*Effectiveness*, or similar standard, as defined appropriately based on the discipline, required in every category--teaching, research/creative, & service, for *tenure*, and all *promotions* in rank (level appropriate to rank), and reasonable potential shown for retention.)

b. _____ **Excellence.** (*Excellence*, or similar standard, as defined appropriately based on the discipline, required in departmentally selected combination of teaching & research/creative, for *tenure*.)

c. _____ **Responsible conduct.** (Responsible conduct expected of all faculty members at every review).

2. _____ **Overall thoroughness of criteria and standards.**

(Pertinent excerpts of U-Policies calling for high standards in RPT reviews:

-- "emphasize the university's commitment to the achievement and maintenance of *academic excellence*,"

--treat "granting tenure... as the university's most critical personnel decision," and "ensure that the most highly qualified candidates available are granted tenure,"

-- "For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department. A department may select standards higher than these minimum requirements if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement." U-Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-1. (*Note: the policy leaves it to departments to establish their own criteria for high achievement in teaching and research/creative activity. Departments may require excellence (or its equivalent) in one of these two, or they may require excellence in some combination. Departments may also set higher standards than the minimum in the policy. To avoid misunderstandings when tenure cases are reviewed by nonspecialists, as much clarity as feasible is best.*)

-- For "promotion in rank ... record for [teaching & research/creative activity] must demonstrate

continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank.” “Promotion... is.. acknowledgment ... of *continuing and increasing professional competence* and responsibility in teaching, research and creative work, and University and public service,”

-- “Demonstration of *effective* service at ... level appropriate to rank is essential for retention, promotion, and tenure. A department may select higher standards,”

--reaffirm that “faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities,”

-- ensure that RPT reviews serve to “provide constructive feedback on ...academic progress, and to terminate the appointment of those who do not meet the standards of the department and the expectations of the university after their initial appointments,”

--foster “thoroughness and fairness of procedures, & reliability of decisions” in RPT cases.

(See U-Policies 6-311-7-B-5, 6-316-4, 6-303-III-A-1&2; formerly PPM 8-6-7-B-5; 8-12.4; 9-5.1-A-1 & -2).

B. Best Practices.

1. **Dept. philosophy and mission clearly stated.** (The background rationale for RPT criteria and standards, required by U-Policy, is typically best presented in the form of a clear statement of dept mission and philosophy. In particular, helpful to have clear explanations of the value of *teaching, research/creative activity, and service* within dept’s overall mission, and explanations of how the criteria and standards are drawn from accepted norms of the discipline.)

2. **Overall clarity of criteria & standards.** (Descriptions sufficiently comprehensive and clear to give RPT candidates fair notice of standards they must meet in each category of criteria, & adequately guide decision-makers in considering candidates, including Dept. RPT Advisory Committee, Dept. chair, College RPT committee, dean, cognizant vice president, UPTAC, & CHC panel for any appeal. In particular, departmental definitions of standards of competence and excellence, or similar standards, should be clearly stated and well defined.)

3. **Reasonableness of any plan for implementing significant changes—if** applicable. (Recent changes in criteria/standards may be expected to be implemented in ways that will not unfairly disadvantage individual candidates who have justifiably relied on previous rules.

In keeping with the U-Policy concern with ‘fairness of procedures,’ when a dept. makes significant changes to its rules, the URPTSC’s view is that there should be a clear statement of the date such changes will become effective, and if the change is to occur at such a time as to substantially negatively affect any individual candidate’s progress toward tenure or promotion (e.g., more difficult criteria/standards are adopted, late in a candidate’s probationary period), there should be an explanation of how the transition from old to new will be managed to minimize harm to such candidates resulting from their reliance on previously effective rules. In the case of a very substantial change adopted late in a particular candidate’s probationary period, the dept might expressly provide such candidate with the option of being reviewed under the previously applicable rules, while other more recently arrived candidates may be held to the new more demanding rules. A dept’s approach to implementing significant changes may be described in a letter to each affected candidate.)

V. DEPT. PROCEDURES DESCRIPTION.

A. **Type and number of reviews, length of probation period.**

1. _____ **Meets minimum** requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies.
(No apparent conflict with U-Policies regarding:

- starting date* for probationary period, based on hire date June-July or July-June
 - annual* pre-tenure reviews (at least informal, beginning no later than the 2nd year),
 - at least one formal *mid-probationary* retention review (see option below),
 - a *final* formal review for tenure,
 - formal review for each *promotion* in rank (may be scheduled to coincide with, but involves criteria & standards different from a retention/ tenure review),
 - if applicable, formal review for any triggered *termination* review
- (See U-Policy 6-311 4-A, formerly PPM 8-6-4-A; Policy 6-303, formerly PPM 9-5.1).)

2. Local options. (Statement adequately describes dept. rule on matters for which U-Policy gives local options.)

a. _____ **Normal length of pre-tenure** probationary period, clearly defined.
(Implementing U-Policy that for appointments at assistant prof. rank, normal period is 7 years, but dept. has option to adopt rule of 6 years, and for appointments at associate/ or full prof. rank, period is 5 years. (Policy 6-311-3-B, formerly PPM 8-6-3-B).)

b. _____ **Number of pre-tenure formal** reviews, & _____ **year** conducted, clearly described.

(Recently revised U-Policy gives depts. option to require either one or two formal mid-probationary reviews. Statement must make clear what option dept. has adopted (which might simply be continuing past practice of requiring two). If dept. has recently changed rule, during any candidate's probationary period, statement should clearly describe plan for transition from old to new rule (typically that candidate whose probation period began under old rule has choice and must in writing, by specified deadline, make that choice to follow older or newer rule). Statement must specify the year(s) in which the formal review(s) will occur, and the one such review mandated by U-Policy must occur in either 3rd or 4th year. (Policy 6-303-III-B-2-a, formerly PPM 9-5.1-B-2-a).)

c. _____ **Extending/shortening periods, rules clearly described**—if applicable.
(If applicable, clear description of any dept. rules regarding extending or shortening of probationary period, e.g., to implement U-Policy (6-303-III-B-2, formerly PPM 9-5.1-B-2), or regarding granting tenure at time of initial appointment. Any such rules must not be inconsistent with U-Policy (Policy 6-311-4-C, formerly PPM 8-6-4-C; Policy 6-303-III-K, formerly PPM 9-5.1-K).)

d. _____ **Post-tenure promotion schedule, clearly described--if applicable.** (If applicable, clear description of any dept. rules setting a time frame for tenured faculty to be considered for promotion to full professor.)

B. Dept. RPT Advisory Committee -- membership, decision-making process.

1. _____ **Meets minimum** requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies.
(No apparent conflict with U-Policies, particularly regarding key points (see Policy 6-303-III-A-3 & E, formerly PPM 9-5.1-A-3 & E):

- selection of RPT chairperson --& states clearly if dept. limits eligibility to full profs. or allows tenured assoc.prof. to serve,
- selection of secretary
- voter eligibility for each category of decision -- Retention & Tenure = only tenured

faculty, regardless of rank. Promotion = same or higher rank, regardless of tenure -- (see Policy 6-303-III-A-3, formerly PPM 9-5.1- A-3). *Check for compliance with 2007 change in U-Policy, changing eligibility of voters on retention and tenure.*

- absentee votes are not counted separately --compliant with 2005 change in U-Policy
- single vote rule, & invited participation of administrators
- preparation & review of report of committee meeting
- other issues—explain in memo.)

2. Local Options. (Statement adequately describes dept. rule on matters for which U-Policy gives local options.)

a. _____ **Nonvoting faculty participation** in RPT committee meetings, rule clearly described.

(Recently revised U- Policy (Policy 6-303-III-A-3 & K-1, formerly 9-5.1- A-3, K-1) clarifies that depts. may opt to allow faculty who are not qualified to vote to nevertheless participate in discussions leading up to RPT committee voting. If dept. has chosen this option, dept. statement should so indicate, & clearly describe procedures for such participation, including determination of what categories of faculty may so participate, and how committee meetings will be conducted so as to allow such participation in discussions while ensuring that only qualified voters cast votes.)

b. _____ **Open or secret balloting**, rule clearly described.

(U-Policy (1-002, formerly PPM 9-1, incorporating Robert's Rules of Order), applies presumption that committee voting will be conducted through open balloting, but that secret balloting should be used if any voter so requests for a particular meeting, or if dept. has a standing rule of using secret balloting for all such meetings. If dept. has adopted such a standing rule regarding secret or open ballots, that should be clearly stated.)

c. _____ **Use of subcommittee, procedures clearly described**—if applicable.

(If applicable, adequately describes role & procedures for any subcommittee--smaller than the full membership of the dept. RPT Advisory Committee-- carrying out any RPT-related function, including

--membership & leadership of the subcommittee---eligibility for membership and for leadership, when and by whom selected;

--functions of the subcommittee--role with regard to candidate, e.g., as advocate/mentor, role in obtaining materials for candidate's file or preparing reports, role with regard to full RPT Advisory committee—e.g., making recommendations or merely presenting information to the full committee, and roles in various stages of RPT reviews;

--schedule of subcommittee's work.)

C. Procedures for *formal* reviews.

1. Notices/ opportunities to submit information.

_____ **Meets minimum** requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies regarding notification of candidate & others.

(No apparent conflict with U-Policies regarding notice of upcoming review meetings/ opportunities for input, with deadlines prior to RPT Committee meeting) given to

--candidate --30 days;

- dept. faculty --3 weeks;
- dept. staff --3 weeks-- *Check compliance with this 2005 change in U-Policy;*
- students--SAC --minimum 3 weeks to prepare report;
- any concerned academic program, if applicable.)

2. Candidate file --deadline, right of review, contents, custody.

a. Meets minimum requirements of/shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policy--- regarding

- (i) **deadline** for closing file (“before RPT committee meets”),
- (ii) **candidate’s right** to review & respond, (Candidate’s right to review the file and add to file a response about any part of file, except confidential external evaluations.)
- (iii) **contents** of file in all categories mandated by U-Policy.

(Contents mandated by U-Policy include: curriculum vitae; documentation related to criteria of teaching, research/creative, service; SAC report; past RPT reviews & recommendations (check compliance with recently added requirement that past review reports, including from informal reviews, be kept in file); other written statements from interested persons; if applicable, recommendation from concerned academic program; if applicable, evidence regarding “faculty responsibility”).

b. **Other contents adequately described.** (Contents not mandated by U-Policy but required by dept. are adequately described.)

c. **Persons responsible for file adequately described.** (Adequately identifies persons responsible for gathering materials and placing in file prior to deadline.)

d. **File custody & availability.** (Adequately describes procedures & timing for making file contents available to authorized reviewers, and protecting confidential file materials.)

3. External evaluation procedures.

a. **Adequately describes dept. rules regarding external evaluation options.**

(Clear description of dept. rules regarding these options:

- whether external evaluations are required for mid-probationary or triggered reviews -- U-Policy (6-303, formerly PPM 9-5.1) requires external evaluations for tenure or promotion reviews, and allows dept. to choose whether to use them for other formal reviews-- If dept. has adopted such rule, dept. statement should clearly describe the circumstances in which external evaluations are required;
- number of external reviewers required for each type of review --may specify exact number required, or set a range from minimum required to maximum desired;
- credentials of reviewers;
- methods for selecting external reviewers --including particularly what role the RPT candidate will play in the selection;
- allocation of responsibilities for soliciting reviewers, providing reviewable materials, and coordinating completion and filing of reviewer letters.)

b. **Evidence in lieu of external evaluations for retention, clarity of rule** -- if applicable. (If dept. chooses not to require external evaluations for the formal retention review --as U-Policy allows, (6-303-III-B-2, formerly PPM 9-5.1-B-2), statement must adequately describe what *other evidence* is expected/allowed to satisfy research/creative activity criteria.)

c. Internal evaluations, clarity of rule. (If applicable, adequately describes any dept. rules regarding use of *internal* evaluations, e.g., from faculty in the same college but not dept..)

d. Best practices:

[reserved] (As URPTSC members gain experience using the checklist, expect to add here descriptions of various best practices regarding external evaluations. E.g., rules about candidate being informed of identity of external evaluator, etc.)

4. Overall schedule clarity for formal reviews.

(Statement adequately describes *sequence & dates* for all steps dept. will follow in formal reviews. Steps described include gathering information and placing contents in candidate's file, "**closing date**" for completion of candidate's file, relevant committee meetings and voting, preparation and distribution of reports, and consultations with candidate.)

Best practices:

a. Flexibility in stating deadlines. (URPTSC recommends some *flexibility* in specifying deadlines, e.g., referring to the "third week of Month X" rather than a precise date in Month X --which in some years would fall on a non-business day.)

b. Specified reasonable period of time for committee access to file. (U-Policy states that "candidate's file shall be made available to those eligible to attend the departmental advisory committee meeting a reasonable time before the meeting, which may be specified in department policy." Best practice is to specify that time period.)

D. Procedures for *informal* reviews. (URPTSC members will note that some depts. choose to have a separate part of the statement describing these procedures, while other depts. may intertwine descriptions of the procedures for informal reviews along with those for formal reviews.)

1. Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policy regarding--

a. file contents & responsibilities (adequate description of required file contents, & who is responsible for obtaining and adding file contents),

b. minimum of one 'face to face' meeting (of candidate and dept. chair or designee--see option below, to discuss candidate's progress), &

c. written report (prepared and made available to candidate, RPT Advisory Committee, & dept. chair (Policy 6-303-III-B-1, formerly PPM 9-5.1-B-1.)

2. Local options. (Statement adequately describes dept. rule on matters for which U-Policy gives local options.)

a. Role of RPT Advisory Committee (adequate description of type of involvement of full committee in informal reviews-- can range from merely receiving the mandatory written report, to holding full meeting and voting.),

b. Role of SAC --if applicable (If dept. chooses to involve SAC in informal reviews--has adequate description of role of SAC, including any use of a SAC report.),

c. Role of Academic Program--if applicable (Adequate description of procedure for involvement of interested academic program.),

d. Role of Dept. Chair's designee --if applicable (Adequate description of

having meeting with candidate conducted by a *designee* of dept. chairperson, rather than chairperson--including procedure & criteria for appointing designee, and procedure for notifying candidate of such appointment.),

e. **Role of others meeting candidate** --if applicable (Adequate explanation regarding any other persons meeting with the candidate--either separately or as part of mandatory meeting with dept. chair/designee, e.g., any subcommittee involved in RPT activities.), &

f. **Other review procedures** --if applicable. (Adequate description of any additional review procedures adopted by dept..)

3. Best practices:

a. **Triggered review, clarity of rule** --if applicable. (Adequate description of any *procedures* dept. has adopted for converting informal review into *triggered formal review*, with possible consequence of non-retention, implementing U-Policy (6-303-III-B-1-c, formerly PPM 9-5.1- B-1-c).)

b. **Overall clarity of schedule** for *all* mandatory & optional steps in informal reviews.

E. **Overall fairness** of review procedures. (Taken as a whole, dept. procedures assure candidates of fair treatment, including adequate notice of deadlines, adequate opportunities to collect and present evidence, adequate feedback regarding progress, and adequate opportunities to respond to criticism.)

VI.. Overall-- Dept. Statement

Best Practices:

 Gender-specific language is avoided.

 Terminology used is **consistent** throughout.

VII. Other potentially relevant items--*if applicable*.

a. **Faculty with administrative responsibilities**. (If applicable, clarity of dept. description of any different criteria/ standards/ procedures employed for RPT candidates who also have significant administrative duties.)

b. **Joint appointments**. (If applicable, clarity of dept. description of any special rules applied for RPT candidates who also hold a *regular* faculty appointment in another UU department. Ordinarily not applicable for those who hold only adjunct appointments.)

c. **Single-department colleges**. (If applicable, clarity of dept. explanation of how procedures are adapted to fit a single-dept college, elaborating upon but not inconsistent with U-Policy.(6-303 Footnote 1, formerly PPM 9-5.1).)

--end--

[online at <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html> Part IV-C--Guidelines]

(a) *Summary Checklist*

I. CLARITY ON RELATIVE ROLES OF U-POLICY & ANY COLLEGE RULES.

A. Reference to relevant U-Policies.

B. Reference to relevant college rules & practices.

II. DEPT. *CRITERIA & EVIDENCE* DESCRIPTION.

A. Teaching

1. _____ Criteria-clarity.
 2. _____ Evidence-clarity.
 3. _____ Evidence-breadth.
- B. Research /creative activity.
1. _____ Criteria-clarity.
 2. _____ Evidence-clarity.
 3. _____ Role of external funding-clarity (expectations & rationale).
- C. Service (university, professional, public).
1. _____ Criteria-clarity.
 2. _____ Evidence-clarity.
- D. Responsible conduct.
1. _____ Role of professional codes-clarity.
 2. _____ Other aspects of responsible conduct--clarity.

III. DEPT. *STANDARDS* DESCRIPTION.

- A. Retention-- formal pre-tenure reviews
1. Clarity of standards for
 - (a) _____ teaching, (b) _____ research/creative, (c) _____ service,
& (d) _____ responsible conduct--if applicable.
 2. _____ Comparison to final review--clarity.
- B. Informal pre-tenure reviews
1. _____ Descriptions of applicable standards, if any, are consistent with U-Policy principle of "clearly adequate progress" toward tenure.
 2. Best practices:
 - a. _____ Triggered review option, clearly referenced.
- C. Tenure reviews *{most important !!}*
1. Clarity of standards for
 - (a) _____ teaching, (b) _____ research/creative, (c) _____ service,
& (d) _____ responsible conduct--if applicable.
- D. Promotion in rank--.
1. Clarity of standards for each step.
 - a. Assistant to *Associate Prof.*
 - (i) _____ Teaching, (ii) _____ research/creative, (iii) _____ service,
& (iv) _____ responsible conduct --if applicable.
 - b. Associate to *full Professor*
 - (i) _____ Teaching, (ii) _____ research/creative, (iii) _____ service,
& (iv) _____ responsible conduct --if applicable.

IV. Overall-- Criteria & Standards

- A. General compliance with core principles of U-Policies.
1. High standards.
 - a. _____ Effectiveness, at minimum.
 - b. _____ Excellence.
 - c. _____ Responsible conduct.
 2. _____ Overall thoroughness of criteria and standards.

B. Best Practices.

1. _____ Dept. philosophy and mission clearly stated.
2. _____ Overall clarity of *criteria & standards*.
3. _____ Reasonableness of any plan for implementing significant changes—if applicable.

V. DEPT. *PROCEDURES* DESCRIPTION.

A. Type and number of reviews, length of probation period.

1. _____ Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies.
2. Local options.
 - a. _____ Normal length of pre-tenure probationary period, clearly defined.
 - b. _____ Number of pre-tenure formal reviews, & _____ year conducted, clearly described.
 - c. _____ Extending/shortening periods, rules clearly described—if applicable.
 - d. _____ Post-tenure promotion schedule, clearly described—if applicable.

B. Dept. RPT Advisory Committee -- membership, decision-making process.

1. _____ Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies.
2. Local Options.
 - a. _____ Nonvoting faculty participation in RPT committee meetings, rule clearly described.
 - b. _____ Open or secret balloting, rule clearly described.
 - c. _____ Use of subcommittee, procedures clearly described—if applicable.

C. Procedures for *formal* reviews.

1. Notices/ opportunities to submit information.
_____ Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies regarding notification of candidate & others.
2. Candidate file --deadline, right of review, contents, custody.
 - a. Meets minimum requirements of/shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policy--- regarding
 - (i) _____ deadline for closing file,
 - (ii) _____ candidate's right to review & respond,
 - (iii) _____ contents of file in all categories mandated by U-Policy.
 - b. _____ Other contents adequately described.
 - c. _____ Persons responsible for file adequately described.
 - d. _____ File custody & availability.
3. External evaluation procedures.
 - a. _____ Adequately describes dept. rules regarding external evaluation options.
 - b. _____ Evidence in lieu of external evaluations for retention, clarity of rule --if applicable.
 - c. _____ Internal evaluations, clarity of rule.
 - d. Best practices: *[reserved]*

4. ____ Overall schedule clarity for *formal* reviews.

D. Procedures for *informal* reviews.

1. Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policy regarding:

- a. ____ file contents & responsibilities,
- b. ____ minimum of one 'face to face' meeting, &
- c. ____ written report

2. Local options:

- a. ____ Role of RPT Advisory Committee,
- b. ____ Role of SAC --if applicable,
- c. ____ Role of Academic Program--if applicable,
- d. ____ Role of Dept. Chair's designee --if applicable,
- e. ____ Role of others meeting candidate --if applicable, &
- f. ____ Other review procedures --if applicable.

3. Best practices:

- a. ____ Triggered review, clarity of rule --if applicable.
- b. ____ Overall clarity of schedule for *all* mandatory & optional steps in informal

reviews.

E. ____ Overall *fairness* of review procedures.

VI.. Overall- Dept. Statement

Best Practices:

- ____ Gender-specific language is avoided.
- ____ Terminology used is consistent throughout.

VII. Other potentially relevant items--*if applicable*.

- a. ____ Faculty with administrative responsibilities.
- b. ____ Joint appointments.
- c. ____ Single-department colleges.

The University of Utah **Current Policy and Procedures Concerning Retention, Promotion and Tenure**

University Policy 6-311: Faculty Retention and Tenure

Section 1.	Definitions and Qualifications.....	1
Section 2.	References.....	1
Section 3.	Achievement of Tenure.....	1
Section 4.	Pretenure Probationary Period.....	2
Section 5.	Advance Notice of Termination or Reduction in Status.....	4
Section 6.	Retention and Tenure Status of Faculty Members Serving as Administrators.....	4
Section 7.	University Management Policy for Tenured Positions.....	4

University Policy 6-003: College Faculties and Council

Section 1.	School and College Faculties.....	6
Section 2.	College Council.....	6

University Policy 6-303: Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

A.	Retention, promotion, and tenure reviews.....	9
B.	Informal or Formal Reviews.....	13
C.	Notice to involved individuals.....	15
D.	Candidate's File.....	16
E.	Action by department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee.....	20
F.	Action by department chairperson.....	21
G.	Action by dean and college advisory committee.....	22
H.	Action by cognizant vice president and the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.....	24
I.	Appeal of recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure.....	25
J.	Final action by president.....	26
K.	New appointment with tenure.....	27

University Policy 6-304

University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.....	32
---	----

University Policy 6-305

University RPT Standards Committee.....	34
---	----

University Policy 6-002

University RPT Standards Committee.....	36
---	----

Policy 6-311: Faculty Retention and Tenure

Section 1. Definitions and Qualifications

To hold a position with tenure means that appointment to such a position is considered permanent and is not subject to termination or substantial reduction in status without adequate cause, provided that in all cases the services of the individual continue to be needed and that funds are available to pay for them. Only the regular faculty ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are tenure ranks. Service in any regular faculty rank, including the rank of instructor, except as otherwise provided in Faculty Regulations, Section 2.D, (**Policy 6-300**), shall be counted as part of the pretenure probationary period. Tenure, or the right to achieve tenure, cannot be waived. Appointments to all auxiliary faculty positions (research, clinical, lecturer, adjunct, and visiting positions), and to all administrative positions, including the offices of vice president, dean, director, chairperson of divisions, and chairperson of department, are without significance for the holding or achieving of tenure. Tenure is established only in an academic subdivision, such as a department, a free-standing division (not within a department), a school or college. Tenure is established in a school or college only if it is not divided into departments or free-standing divisions.¹ In other university subdivisions not designated as academic departments, free-standing divisions, schools, or colleges, appointments to regular faculty ranks are not made and tenure is not granted. Individuals in administrative positions may hold a faculty position with tenure in an academic subdivision. A faculty member who transfers from one academic subdivision to another loses tenure status in the former department. The academic subdivision to which the faculty member transfers may require service for the full probationary period appropriate to the person's academic rank or may accept any or all of the years of satisfactory service completed in the former department toward tenure. An individual holding regular faculty appointments in two or more academic subdivisions must be considered separately for retention and tenure in each of them according to the criteria of each department.

Section 2. References

Policy 6-319 , Procedures for Joint Appointments to Faculty Positions

Policy 5-200, Leaves of Absence (Health-Related)

Policy 5-201, Leaves of Absence (Non Health-Related)

Policy 6-314, Leaves of Absence

Policy 6-315, Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence (all colleges except School of Medicine)

Policy 8-002, Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence (School of Medicine)

Policy 6-300, Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Policy 6-303, Retention, Promotion, Tenure

29 Code of Federal Regulations 825.100 et seq., Family and Medical Leave Act Regulations

Section 3. Achievement of Tenure

A. Effective Date

A faculty member achieves tenure upon the effective date of an award of tenure, as stated in the letter from the university president.

B. New Appointments with Tenure

Faculty whose initial appointment is at the level of associate professor or full professor may be granted tenure at the time of their appointment. Granting of such tenure must follow usual departmental and University standards and process although the timeline may be conflated. This process is governed by **Policy 6-303**, Section K and also discussed in **Policy 6-302**.

Section 4. Pretenure Probationary Period

All candidates not appointed with tenure at the University of Utah must serve a probationary period to allow for review of their qualifications. This section defines timing of that review process. The procedures are discussed in **Policy 6-303**.

A. Start of Pretenure Probationary Period.

When the effective date of a regular faculty appointment is within the period from July 1 through December 31, the academic year in which the appointment becomes effective shall be the first year of the pretenure probationary period. When the effective date of a regular faculty appointment is within the period from January 1 through June 30, the following academic year shall be the first year of the pretenure probationary period.

B. Normal Duration of Pretenure Probationary Period.

The normal pretenure probationary period shall be seven years for a person whose initial regular faculty appointment at the University of Utah is in the rank of instructor or assistant professor, except as otherwise provided in Faculty Regulations, Section 2.D **Policy 6-300**. Departments may establish six year probationary periods for assistant professors by departmental policy. The normal pretenure probationary period shall be five years for a person whose initial regular faculty appointment at the University of Utah is in the rank of associate professor or professor. For candidates with joint appointments, the pretenure probationary period shall be that of the academic subdivision with the longer period. See **Policy 6-319** for other issues.

C. Exceptions to Normal Pretenure Probationary periods.

1. Shortening of the probationary periods.

The probationary period may be shortened under those unusual circumstances in which the University determines that it can assess the individual's qualifications in a shorter period of time. Such a situation can occur in two ways: (1) when the candidate has demonstrated relevant accomplishments through prior service elsewhere or (2) when the candidate demonstrates the required achievements in less time than the normal review period. In either, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the pertinent RPT criteria. Candidates shall serve a minimum of one year before being considered for tenure unless granted tenure at the time of appointment.

- a. Credit for prior service. When a candidate has prior relevant experience, in most cases including both research and teaching, such experience may be credited as the equivalent of a specified number of years toward fulfillment of the probationary period. A request for credit for prior service shall be made in writing. Credit for prior service may be assessed once, either at the time of appointment or before a review for tenure commences. The departmental RPT committee (by majority vote), the department chair, and the dean must agree as to the number of years credited for prior service. From one to five years of prior service may be recognized. If a number of years of credit is recognized, candidates may be considered for tenure up to that number of years before the end of the normal period without the advance permission of the chair and RPT chair, as required in the paragraph below. Notwithstanding such recognition of prior service, the candidate may choose to use the normal probationary period, but only prior to the initiation of a tenure review.
- b. Extraordinary progress toward tenure. When a candidate believes he/she can demonstrate achievement of the tenure standards in less than the normal probationary period, that candidate may seek permission for an early tenure review. The candidate must obtain approval from the department chair and the RPT chair to be reviewed earlier than the final year of the normal probationary period. If the candidate has served fewer than five years if appointed initially as an

assistant professor, or fewer than three years if appointed initially as an associate professor or professor, then the candidate must obtain additional approvals from the dean and cognizant senior vice president to begin the review. To support an award of tenure prior to the final year of the probationary period, evidence in the file should demonstrate that the candidate unequivocally meets the tenure standard.

- c. Limit. If a candidate is considered for tenure prior to the final year of the probationary period and tenure is not granted, then the candidate may have only one more department vote on tenure.

2. Extension of the probationary period.

- a. Effect of leave of absence. The pretenure probationary period may be extended by one year when, in one academic year, a nontenured regular faculty member
 - i. takes a medical leave of absence for one or more terms or takes family leave (either as full or partial leave) amounting to at least half a year and elects in a written communication to the department chairperson, dean, and cognizant senior vice president before the starting date of the leave that the academic year not be counted;
 - ii. has a serious health condition as defined in **Policy 5-200 (FMLA)** that a health care provider certifies requires at least six weeks of continuous leave beginning no later than June 30 of the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled, elects in a written communication to the department chairperson, dean, and cognizant senior vice president before external reviewers are solicited or other action is taken to begin a formal review, whichever is earlier, that the academic year not be counted, and provides to the Human Resources Benefits Office documentation of the serious health condition meeting the standards described in **Policy 5-200**;
 - iii. takes family leave amounting to at least one term but less than half a year or has their productivity substantially affected by a medical or family condition for which a disability or family leave could have been taken, but was not, and successfully petitions the department chairperson and dean in a timely fashion to have the academic year in which it occurred not counted (petitions should be made at the time of leave or disability, or as soon as possible thereafter and prior to the next regularly scheduled formal review);
 - iv. takes another type of leave for one or more semesters, and the faculty member's department chairperson or college dean, before the starting date of the leave, specifies in a written communication to the faculty member and the cognizant senior vice president, that the academic year in which the leave is taken will not be counted.
- b. Effect of administrative assignments. Subject to the approval of the cognizant vice president, before a nontenured regular faculty member accepts an administrative assignment which is expected to require a significant commitment of time and effort, the faculty member's college dean, after consultation as appropriate with the faculty member, the department RTP committee, and the department chairperson, shall prepare a written memorandum specifying the basis for calculating the duration of the faculty member's pretenure probationary period. In no case may the period of pretenure service be extended for more than three years beyond the maximum period otherwise permitted by this policy, Section 3.B. Copies of this memorandum shall be given to the faculty member, to the cognizant vice president, and to committees participating in the retention/tenure review of the faculty member.
- c. Extraordinary circumstances. Extensions of maximum pretenure probationary period of one or two years may be granted when extraordinary circumstances beyond the control

of the candidate, such as natural disasters or war, have substantially impeded normal progress. The candidate must request such an extension from the department chairperson in writing. The department chairperson, the dean and the cognizant vice president must concur in granting the extension.

Section 5. Advance Notice of Termination or Reduction in Status

Any regular faculty member holding an appointment without tenure whose appointment the administration wishes not to continue or wishes to continue with substantially reduced status, shall be given advance notice in writing by the president, except as hereinafter provided. If the appointee is in the first year of service, such notice shall be given at least three months prior to the termination of the existing appointment. If the appointee is in the second or any subsequent year of service, the intended termination of employment or reduction in status shall not become effective until twelve months after the date upon which notice is served. The probationary period automatically ends on the date upon which notice of termination is served. The final twelve months of employment after such notice is served is considered a terminal appointment, not part of the probationary period. If the intended termination is reversed as a result of a successful appeal, the faculty member's appointment will be reinstated as of the first day of the terminal appointment.

Any auxiliary instructional faculty member (lecturer or clinical) who has served as a faculty member on a full-time basis continuously for three or more years shall be given at least three months notice of non-renewal of appointment unless particular contractual provisions otherwise govern. The right of advance notice shall not apply to other faculty members serving under appointments for one year or appointments stipulating that they will not be renewed, to faculty members whose appointments are to be terminated or modified for adequate cause as provided in **Policy 6-313**, or to any other individuals serving in auxiliary (research, clinical, lecturer, adjunct, and visiting), or administrative positions.

Section 6. Retention and Tenure Status for Faculty Members Serving as Administrators

If a person holding a regular faculty position is appointed to an administrative position which will require less than full-time service in an academic department, a written memorandum signed by the administrative appointing authority must accompany the formal administrative appointment recommendation and be included in the individual's personnel file. The memorandum shall indicate the nature, scope, and anticipated duration of the administrative assignment, the individual's teaching load and other departmental responsibilities, and the department's salary obligations during the period of the administrative appointment. The department shall conduct regular review of the individual as may be appropriate for purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion in the same manner and subject to the same standards as for other persons holding academic appointments in the department. While a faculty member is serving in an administrative position, the position will remain available to the department and may not be filled except on a nonpermanent basis during the period of administrative assignment.

Section 7. University Management Policy for Tenured Positions

A. Policy

In recognition of the important and mutually interdependent relationships between faculty members and the university that are associated with the status of tenure (see Sections 1 and 3 of this policy, and **Policy 6-303**), the faculty has an affirmative obligation to manage its tenured faculty positions in a manner clearly conducive to the achievement of excellence in the discharge of its academic mission. The policy of the university is to vest primary responsibility for tenure management in the university faculty and its duly constituted agencies, subject to the administrative authority of department chairpersons, deans, the vice presidents for academic affairs and health sciences, and the president. This policy statement is intended to provide guidelines to assist in the advance planning and effective exercise of that responsibility and authority.

B. Tenure Management Guidelines

University faculty members and administrative personnel exercising responsibilities that may affect faculty tenure decisions or policies are expected to be guided by the following considerations.

1. Administrative Appointments. In the selection of department chairpersons, consideration should be given to demonstrated ability of candidates to exercise effective leadership and provide sensitive direction for the optimum utilization of available faculty resources and the rigorous but fair evaluation of programs and personnel, within the framework of the university's commitment to academic freedom, tenure, and responsibility.
2. During annual budget review proceedings, cognizant committees and administrators should give specific consideration to the faculty management policies of each college and department, including (2) the relative numbers of tenured and nontenured positions in light of the academic needs of the college or department, (b) the use proposed to be made of existing or prospective vacancies in faculty positions, (c) age distribution of and anticipated turnover rate for tenured and nontenured faculty, and (d) practices relating to such matters as short-term appointments, visiting professorships, leaves of absence, retirements, and instructional use of personnel not holding regular faculty positions.
3. Department chairpersons and college deans should develop mutually acceptable plans, with both short-term (i.e., less than five years) and long-term (i.e., five or more years) components, for assuring the periodic enrichment of faculty ranks through the control and timing of new faculty appointments, the use of visiting or rotating appointments, encouragement of interdepartment transfers and joint appointments when appropriate, consideration of early retirement options if available, and other management techniques.
4. Administrative decision-making for effective management of tenure should reflect, to an appropriate degree, the extent to which the colleges or departments have adopted and are effectively carrying out programs for performance review and career development of tenured faculty members, consistent with university policies and resource allocations.
5. College and department committees exercising relevant responsibilities should periodically review existing policies and practices to assure adequacy of criteria, thoroughness and fairness of procedures, and reliability of decisions in retention, promotion, and tenure cases, in accordance with guidelines established by the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee.

Exceptions may be allowed for retention of college-level tenure for current faculty when a college without formal subdivisions reorganizes to include such subdivisions.

Approved by Academic Senate: March 5, 2007

Approved by Board of Trustees: March 12, 2007

Editorially revised: November 27, 2007

Policy 6-003: College Faculties and Council

I. Purpose and Scope

(Reserved)

II. Definitions

(Reserved)

III. Policy

SECTION 1. School and College Faculties

Each school and college faculty shall have, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and appeal to the university faculty, jurisdiction over all questions of educational policy affecting that school or college, including requirements for entrance, graduation, and major, and prescribed subjects of study.

Majors shall be authorized by the school or college faculty concerned, but the content of the major shall be determined by the department or departments in which it is given. Majors and their content shall be subject to the review of the Academic Senate in accord with **Policy 6-001, Section 4**.

A statement of the action taken upon educational policy by any school or college faculty shall be presented at the next regular meeting of the Academic Senate for consideration and action thereon.

SECTION 2. College Councils

A. Establishment and Authority of College Councils

1. Establishment. College councils are hereby established within the system of university governance.
2. Organizational Scope. A college council shall be organized and shall function within each college. Any academic unit or personnel with faculty rank not administratively situated within an existing college shall affiliate with and become a constituent part of a college council designated by the president, but only for the purpose of participating in the university governance responsibilities vested in such college council.
3. General Powers. A college council shall formulate policies and exercise primary authority to make decisions relating to college and department affairs to the extent authorized by **Faculty Regulations**. All actions taken by a college council shall be reviewable by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in accordance with criteria approved by the senate, and shall be subject to the power of the Academic Senate to establish uniform policies and take final action on all matters of university concern.

B. Areas of Responsibility of College Councils

1. Faculty Personnel Actions

Appointments, and retention, promotion and tenure. The role of college councils within the process of making appointments of faculty shall be as prescribed in **Policy 6-302**. As is more fully described in that policy, each college council may adopt college policy regarding the establishment and role of any college-level faculty appointments advisory committee, and may adopt college policy regarding the eligibility of auxiliary faculty to serve on departmental faculty appointments advisory committees.

The role of college councils with regard to decisions on retention, promotion, or tenure of faculty shall be as prescribed in **Policy 6-303**. As is more fully described

in that policy, each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee, and such committees shall make recommendations with respect to certain RPT decisions.

Colleges may choose to establish a single committee to carry out both the advisory function for appointments, and the advisory function for decisions of retention, promotion and tenure, in all cases, or to serve both functions only for cases in which it is proposed that tenure be granted at the time of initial appointment (commonly known as hiring with tenure).

2. Academic Policy Actions

College councils shall develop curriculum and related academic programs to meet the goals and purposes of the university. Any program requiring approval of the State Board of Regents including the establishment of a new department or a new degree must be submitted to the Academic Senate for approval.

3. University Curriculum Policy Review Board

The chairpersons of the various college curriculum committees will be convened as a University Curriculum Policy Review Board to review curriculum policies and procedures, coordinate curriculum planning and intercollege consultations, and promulgate modifications in guidelines for processing curricular proposals. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate Studies, or his/her designee, will chair the Review Board. The guidelines proposed by the Review Board, after approval by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, will be the operating rules for making curriculum changes during the academic year. Each college council shall develop appropriate Procedures consistent with guidelines established by the Review Board for initiating and reviewing curriculum changes and adjustments for all programs within their respective jurisdictions.

4. General Policy Recommendations

A college council may recommend to the Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee of Academic Senate, new policies or policy modifications in relationship to any aspect of the university operation.

5. Additional Duties

College councils shall perform other functions and duties assigned to them by the Academic Senate from time to time.

C. Council Structure

The organizational structure and membership of each college council shall be determined, and may be modified from time to time, by majority vote of all voting faculty members of the college involved, and may be either plenary or representative. The college councils should include student members. Where a representative structure is adopted, the representation formula should be broad, and shall be subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

Each college council shall establish appropriate committees and procedures to expedite its work, and shall provide for meaningful involvement of students in department and college deliberations and activities, including effective coordinating with departmental student advisory committees.

When dealing with faculty personnel action, a college council representing two departments or less or having a total of fewer than twenty-five faculty members in the ranks of professor, associate professor and assistant professor, shall provide for committee processing, where necessary, by referring the matter to the appropriate university-wide committee.

D. College Council Coordination With University-Wide Committees

To the extent necessary to effectuate the purposes of the college council system of governance as provided herein, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall (1) direct the transfer to the college councils of responsibility for functions delegated to them and heretofore performed by university-wide committees and (2) modify the responsibilities of university-wide committees in corresponding manner.

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources

- A. Rules
- B. Procedures
- C. Guidelines
- D. Forms
- E. Other related resource materials

V. References:

(Reserved)

VI. Contacts:

(Reserved)

VII. History:

Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 6-003 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-4, and formerly as Faculty Regulations Chapter IV.

Revision history:

1. Current version: Revision 4:

Approved by Academic Senate: 1/02/07

Approved by Board of Trustees: 1/09/07

Stated effective date of July 1, 2007.

Background information for Revision 4: **Proposal to amend Policies 6-302, 6-303, 6-003 (PPM 9-5, 9-5.1, 9-4)**

Editorially revised: 10/14/08

2. Earlier revisions:

Revision 3: effective dates November 10, 1997 to June 30, 2007

Revision 2: effective dates September 26, 1979 to November 9, 1997

Policy 6-303: Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. Revision 20 (Effective July 1, 2010).

I. Purpose and Scope.

To establish criteria, standards, and procedures for retention, promotion, and tenure of regular faculty. To establish departmental retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committees and describe their functions. To describe certain functions of the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee, the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, the Consolidated Hearing Committee, and the Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee, as related to retention, promotion, and tenure.

II. Definitions. [Reserved]

III. Policy: Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

A. Retention, promotion, and tenure reviews. [Footnote 1]

1. Purpose:

a. Retention. A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to regular faculty ranks prior to the granting of tenure. Annual reviews shall be scheduled during this probationary period to evaluate the academic performance of non-tenured individuals, to provide constructive feedback on their academic progress, and to terminate the appointment of those who do not meet the standards of the department and the expectations of the University after their initial appointments.

b. Promotion. Promotion in rank is the acknowledgment by the University of continuing and increasing professional competence and responsibility in teaching, research and creative work, and University and public service.

c. Tenure. Granting tenure implies a commitment by the University to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline, and the University in a manner befitting a responsible academic person. Granting tenure is regarded as the University's most critical personnel decision. Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be awarded to faculty

members prior to their advancement to the rank of associate professor. It is therefore imperative, before such commitments are made, that a responsible screening process be followed to ensure that the most highly qualified candidates available are granted tenure. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years as per Policy 2-005-Section 5-C.

2. Criteria, Standards and Procedures.

a. Development and approval of statements of RPT criteria, standards and procedures. Each department or college shall formulate and distribute to all regular faculty members a statement of criteria, standards, and procedures to be used in retention, promotion, and tenure ("RPT") reviews. These statements shall address the qualifications of candidates with respect to the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative activity, and (3) University, professional, and public service. These statements shall be consistent with applicable provisions of University Regulations, especially including Policies 6-303, 6-311, and 6-316 (Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), as well as professional codes if appropriate, and with the purpose of the University of Utah as stated in Chapter 1, Section 1, of the State Higher Education System Regulations. The statements shall include the rationale for the criteria and standards, and shall include a description of departmental procedures where University Regulations permit departmental variation, such as the procedures for informal reviews in part III-B-1-a. Of this Policy and any rules for allowing non-voting participants in meetings of the departmental RPT advisory committee as referred to in parts III-A-3 and III-K-1 of this Policy. Each statement must be approved by majority vote of the regular faculty of the department, the dean, and the URPT Standards Committee.

b. Criteria. Teaching, research/creative activity, and service shall be assessed for retention, promotion, and tenure in terms of both the quantity and quality of work achieved. Departmental RPT Statements shall identify means of assessing quantity and quality appropriate to the discipline or profession. Any departmental expectation of accomplishment of or potential for obtaining external funding support (and the rationale for imposing such expectation) shall be described with particularity in the departmental statement.

In carrying out their duties in teaching, research/other creative activity and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-316). Assessments of teaching, research/other creative activity and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty.

c. Standards. Insistence upon the highest attainable standards for faculty members is essential for the maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery as well as the assimilation and transmission of knowledge. Departmental RPT Statements and the decisions based upon them shall emphasize the University's commitment to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence.

i. Teaching and research/other creative activity.

For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department. A department may select standards higher than these minimum requirements if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank. Departmental RPT Statements shall clearly describe the standards applicable for each rank.

ii. University, professional, and public service. Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their public service. Demonstration of effective service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for retention, promotion, and tenure. A department may select higher standards if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

d. Prior accomplishments. Candidates in a regular faculty appointment may have accomplishments achieved prior to their probationary period at the University of Utah be considered as relevant to the demonstration of their achievement of the

RPT criteria. Prior accomplishments, such as research publications or teaching experience, shall not substitute for a continuing record of accomplishments during the probationary period at the University of Utah. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the RPT criteria. (For evaluation process, see Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-1.).

3. Department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee

a. Committee membership:

i. Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for retention if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

ii. Promotion. In each department all regular faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

iii. Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure if allowed by department rules but, may not vote.

iv. Small academic unit rule. Any department or division advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department or division chair must recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from appropriate emeritus faculty. In advance of the chair's contacting such faculty members, the chair shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.

v. Single vote rule. No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any person's case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).

b. Chairperson. The chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the department. In this election all regular faculty members of the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be entitled to vote. The department chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee.

B. Informal or Formal Reviews.

All tenure-eligible faculty members shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/other creative activity, responsibility, and service. Informal annual reviews are required in each year in which a formal review is not held. More extensive, formal reviews are required for mid-probationary retention reviews; final probationary year reviews (consideration for tenure); consideration for termination at any point in the probationary period (such as triggered reviews); and promotion decisions. (A chart of the timing and review requirements is set forth below at Policy 6-303-III-D-12.)

1. Informal reviews. Informal reviews must minimally include 1) a face to face meeting between the candidate and the department chair (or a designee, as per department rules) to discuss the candidate's progress based on the file; 2) involvement, determined by the department, from the RPT advisory committee (and academic program if relevant); and, 3) a written report to be made available to the candidate, the members of the RPT advisory committee and the department chair.

a. Procedures. The Statement of RPT criteria, standards, and procedures-adopted by the department (or college) must prescribe specific requirements for informal reviews. Minimally, it must state the required documentation and who provides it, procedures for preparing and distributing the written report, the nature of the involvement by the RPT advisory committee (and academic program if relevant), procedures and criteria for appointment of a chair's designee, if any, and the timetable for the annual reviews. Departments may elect to include in their Statements more extensive review procedures than the minimum required.

b. Actions after the report. Candidates shall have the opportunity to make a written response to the report. The report and the response, if any, are then filed in the candidate's cumulative file with a copy of each sent to the dean. The informal review concludes at this point.

c. Triggering formal retention reviews. If a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.

2. Formal reviews. Formal reviews must provide a substantive assessment of the candidate's research or other creative activity, teaching and service to date. Formal reviews require a vote of the full RPT advisory committee. External evaluations, as discussed below (Policy 6-303-III-D-9), are required for tenure and promotion reviews. Departments, through departmental RPT Statements, may also mandate external evaluations for mid-probationary and /or triggered reviews. When such external evaluations are not mandated, candidates still retain the right to have external letters solicited unless quality of research or creative activity is not an issue in the review (e.g., a triggered review focused solely on teaching) and provided that such request is made before the review commences.

a. Mid-probationary retention reviews. All tenure-eligible faculty members shall have at least one formal, mid-probationary review in their third or fourth year, as determined by departmental rule. Department RPT Statements must prescribe the number of reviews and the year(s) in which they occur.

b. "Triggered" reviews. The results of an informal review may "trigger" a formal review earlier than ordinarily prescribed by departmental rule if an informal review has demonstrated inadequate performance or progress, as described in Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c above.

c. Tenure. Tenure-eligible faculty members must be reviewed for tenure by the final year of their probationary period.

i. Deadline for tenure review. The final year is the fifth year for persons appointed at the ranks of associate professor or professor and the seventh year for those appointed at the rank of assistant professor (unless the department has established, through its RPT Statement, a six year probationary period for assistant professors). See Policy 6-311-Section 4-B.

ii. Request for earlier review. Within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement and by University Policy 6-311 Section 4-C-1, tenure-eligible faculty may request a review for tenure earlier than the year of the mandatory review.

d. Promotion.

i. Timing for tenure-eligible faculty. Tenure-eligible faculty members are usually reviewed for promotion concurrently with their tenure reviews. Under unusual circumstances, tenure-eligible faculty members may request a review for promotion earlier than the year of the mandatory tenure review.

ii. Timing for tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members may request a review for promotion within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement.

C. Notice to involved individuals.

1. Notice to candidate. Each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure shall be given at least 30 days advance notice of the department RPT advisory committee meeting and an opportunity to submit any information the candidate desires the committee to consider.

2. Notice to department faculty and staff. At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.

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

by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.

4. Notice to academic program. When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an academic program, the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.

D. Candidate's file.

Proper preparation and completeness of each candidate's file are essential for the uninterrupted progress of a RPT review through all the stages of the review process. Required components and their timing are identified in the table below in Policy 6-303 III-D-12.

1. Structure of the file. The file is envisioned as a notebook in the department office, which is growing throughout a faculty member's probationary period at the University. However, a physical notebook is not the only method allowable - for example an electronic file or other format may be used alone or as a supplement. The file shall be cumulative and kept current as described in the following sections.

2. Curriculum vitae. The candidate's file is expected to provide a current and complete curriculum vitae ("CV"), which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories related to the department's RPT criteria. The CV should be updated annually, but not during the course of a given year's review. During a review, new accomplishments may be reported and documented as a part of any of the reports or responses in the regular process.

3. Evidence of research/creative activity. The candidate is expected to provide evidence of research and other creative activity, updated annually.

4. Past reviews and recommendations. The department chair shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, i.e. SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present). Teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included.

The past reviews and recommendations in a file for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate's vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty

reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.

5. Evidence of faculty responsibility. Letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from university committees or officials, arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the candidate's file.

6. Recommendation from academic program. In the event that an academic program produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C.4, the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

7. Recommendation from the department student advisory committee. If the department SAC produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C-3, the recommendation shall be placed in the candidate's file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

8. Other written statements. Any other written statements — from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, staff, or interested individuals--which are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate, must be placed in the file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

9. External evaluations. The purpose of external evaluations is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. Along with the actual review, the external evaluator should describe his/her qualifications and relationship to the candidate. The department chairperson should make sure that any letters of evaluation from outside the department are requested early enough for the letters to arrive and be included in the candidate's file before the program and department RPT advisory committee meetings. Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the faculty member being reviewed shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

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

I retain my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/ tenure review. signature date

That form, with the candidate's signature below the statement preferred by the candidate, shall be included in the candidate's review file. When the candidate reserves the right to read the external letters of evaluation, respondents shall be informed in writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed.

10. Candidate's rights. Candidates are entitled to see their review file upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.

11. Review of file. The candidate's file shall be made available to those eligible to attend the departmental RPT advisory committee meeting a reasonable time before the meeting, which may be specified in the department RPT Statement.

12. Table of Minimum University Requirements for Reviews.

Type		Retention			Tenure	Promotion to Associate or "full" Professor
Category		Informal	Formal	Formal	Formal	Formal
When		<i>Annual</i>	<i>Triggered-b,c</i>	<i>Mid-Probationary</i>	<i>End of Probation, or see U-Policy 6-311</i>	<i>Typically end of probation or when meets department standards</i>
Involved parties:						
	External reviewers	No	As per Department rule-a	As per Department rule-a	Yes	Yes
	Academic program, if	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	appropriate					
	SAC	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Department RPT	Representa- tion-d	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Department chair-f	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	College RPT	No	As per 6- 303-III-G-1- a.	As per 6-303- III-G-1-a.	Yes	Yes
	Dean	Receives report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate includes in file: (minimum requirements)						
	Curriculum Vitae	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Includes in File: (minimum Requirements)						
	SAC report	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	External Letters (could be internal to University but external to department)	No	As per Departmental rule-a	As per Departmental rule-a	Yes	Yes
	Past Reviews and Recommendations- e	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Academic program report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Comments from others	Optional	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Student Course Evaluations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

a. Candidates retain the right to have external letters be solicited in a formal review if quality of research or creative activity is an issue in the review. See Policy 6-303-III-D-9 above.

b. This triggered review may occur in the same year as the review or in the subsequent year.

c. The required components for triggered and mid-probationary reviews may be identical or different, as determined by department rule.

d. This representation occurs through the type of involvement set forth in departmental rule. See Policy 6-303-III-B-1 above.

e. Reports from all voting levels in all RPT reviews and letters or reports from all annual reviews. See Policy 6-303-III-D-4 above.

f. A designee may be used for informal reviews in large departments' reviews as noted in Policy 6-303-III-B-1.

E. Action by the department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee.

1. Meetings. The department chairperson shall call a meeting of the departmental RPT advisory committee to conduct reviews as described in Policy 6-303-III-B.

2. Committee secretary. A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary.

3. Quorum. A quorum of a department advisory committee for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of its members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.

4. Absentee voting. Whenever practicable, the department chairperson shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting at which a vote is taken by the department advisory committee.

5. Limitations on participation and voting. Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity may attend and, upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacities shall not vote at the department level.

6. Committee report. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is jointly appointed with an academic program, the department advisory committee report shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program.

7. Approval of the committee report. This summary report of the meeting, signed by the secretary and bearing the written approval of the committee chairperson shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modification as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

8. Confidentiality. All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.

F. Action by department chairperson.

1. Recommendations. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in

the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.

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

3. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department RPT advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.

4. Forwarding files. The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.

G. Action by dean and college advisory committee.

1. Referral of cases to the college advisory committee / membership of committee.

Each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee and define its membership. The definition of membership shall specify whether there must be representation from all or fewer than all departments within the college, and whether or in what way representatives from a department are to participate or not participate in matters involving candidates from the representatives' departments, consistent with the part III-A-3-a-v of this policy (single vote rule). The definition of membership shall be included in the charter of the college council, or may be included in the college's statement of RPT criteria, standards and procedures (described in part III-A-2 of this policy).

a. Retention. The dean at his/her discretion may request the college advisory committee to review and submit recommendations on any candidate for retention. However, if termination of a candidate is recommended by the SAC, or the department advisory committee, or the department chairperson, the dean shall transmit the entire file on that candidate to the college advisory committee.

b. Promotion or tenure. The dean shall forward the entire file on all cases dealing with promotion or tenure to the college advisory committee.

c. Attendance and participation at meetings. Neither the dean nor the chairperson of the department concerned shall attend or participate in the deliberations of the college committee except by invitation of the committee.

d. Recommendations of the college advisory committee. The college advisory committee shall review the file of each case referred to it and shall determine if the department reasonably applied its written criteria, standards and procedures to each case. The college committee shall make its recommendations on an individual's retention, promotion, or tenure, based upon its assessment whether the department's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented. The college committee shall use the department's criteria and standards (or college criteria and standards if the college has college-wide instead of departmental criteria and standards) in making its assessment. If documents required by policy are missing, the college committee may return the file to the department for appropriate action. The college committee shall advise the dean in writing of its vote and recommendations.

2. Recommendations of the dean. The dean shall then review the entire file for each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure and shall make recommendations in writing, stating reasons therefore, and shall forward the file, including all the recommendations, to the cognizant senior vice president (for academic affairs or for health sciences).

3. Notice to faculty members. Prior to forwarding the file, the dean shall send an exact copy of the college advisory committee's report of its evaluation and an exact copy of the dean's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member and to the department chair.

4. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the report of the college advisory committee's evaluation and/or the dean's evaluation. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the dean's evaluation which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the dean within seven days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the dean's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the dean within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the dean.

5. Forwarding files. The dean shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the cognizant senior vice president.

H. Action by cognizant vice president, and the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.

1. Referral of cases to the university committee. The cognizant senior vice president shall forward to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee ("UPTAC") for its review and recommendation the files in all cases in which the college is organized and functions as a single academic department or there is a differing recommendation from any of the prior review levels--the student advisory committee, the academic program, the department RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson, the college RPT advisory committee, or the college dean. The cognizant senior vice president, in his/her sole discretion, may also send any other RPT case to UPTAC for its review and recommendations. UPTAC provides advice to the senior vice president.

2. Recommendations of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The committee shall review the entire file for all cases referred to it, and after due deliberation shall submit its recommendations with reasons and its vote to the cognizant senior vice president.

a. In cases reviewed only because they arise from single department colleges, UPTAC shall determine whether the college reasonably applied its written criteria, standards, and procedures to each case and whether the college's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented.

b. In cases in which there were differing recommendations from the prior reviewing entities, UPTAC shall identify the source(s) of the differences or controversy, determine how each level addressed the issues in controversy, and assess the degree to which the file is sufficiently clear to support any conclusive recommendation.

c. In cases which are reviewed at the discretionary request of the senior vice president, UPTAC shall review the file to respond to the specific issues identified by the senior vice president.

d. In making all reviews, UPTAC shall consider only the material in the file. UPTAC shall summarize its assessment of the issues identified in a, b, or c above in a written report to the senior vice president, but not report a conclusion of its own on the candidate's overall qualification for retention, promotion, or tenure.

3. Consideration by the senior vice president. The cognizant senior vice president shall review each file, including the recommendations (if any) of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. If the senior vice president determines that the file is incomplete or unclear, he/she may return the file to the department with a request to clarify specific matters, materials, and/or issues. All levels of review shall reconsider the file and their votes if appropriate, with the candidate responding in writing at the normal points in the process. (SAC need not reconsider the file unless teaching is the issue in question.)

4. Senior vice president's decision. In cases of positive retention decisions, the senior vice president's decision shall be the university's final decision. In all cases of promotion and tenure and in cases of retention when termination is recommended, the senior vice president shall prepare a final recommendation to the president with respect to the candidate's retention, promotion, and/or tenure, stating reasons therefore.

5. Notice of senior vice president's recommendation. In positive retention cases, the senior vice president shall transmit the final decision and the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) to the candidate, the department chair, and the dean. In all other cases, prior to forwarding the file to the president, the senior vice president shall send an exact copy of the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) and an exact copy of the senior vice president's recommendation with respect to that faculty member to the candidate, the dean, the department chairperson, and the chairpersons of the departmental RPT advisory committee and the Student Advisory Committee, together with a copy or summary of Policy 6-303-III-subsection I (Appeal of recommendation). The chairpersons of the departmental RPT and student advisory committees shall notify the members of their committees in an expeditious manner of the senior vice president's recommendation. The senior vice president shall not submit the final recommendation to the president until at least fourteen days have elapsed following the giving of such notice, so that parties may notify the senior vice president's office if they intend to appeal.

6. Extension of time limits. The time limits provided by this subsection H may be extended by the senior vice president in the interest of justice.

I. Appeal of recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure.

1. Appeal by faculty member. A faculty member may appeal to the Consolidated Hearing Committee (CHC) for review of an unfavorable final recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure by following the procedures provided in Policy 6-002-III-Section 10 and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. The CHC is the hearing body for an appeal brought on any grounds, including academic freedom, but if

the candidate alleges that the unfavorable recommendation violates academic freedom, then the CHC shall refer that part of the appeal to the Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee for pre-hearing consideration and report, as per Policy 6-002-III-Section 10-C-6-a-i.

2. Other appeals. Appeals of the vice president's recommendation on promotion and/or tenure may also be initiated by the department SAC, a majority of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson, or the dean, when the vice president's recommendation opposes their own recommendation. The appeal is made to the Consolidated Hearing Committee and should follow the procedures provided in Policy 6-002-III-Section 10, and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. Authorized parties initiating an appeal may have access to the entire file except that the faculty member may not see external letters which he/she waived the right to read.

J. Final action by president.

1. Action in absence of review proceedings. If no proceedings for review have been initiated under Policy 6-303-III-subsection I within the time provided therein, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure of a faculty member shall be transmitted to the president for action. After reviewing the recommendation, giving such consideration to the documents in the candidate's file as the president deems necessary under the circumstances, the president shall make a final decision granting or denying retention, or granting or denying promotion, and/or tenure, and shall advise the candidate, the cognizant vice president, the dean and the department chairperson of that decision, stating reasons therefore.

2. Action after conclusion of review proceedings. If proceedings for review have been timely initiated under subsection I of this Policy, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure shall be placed in the candidate's file but shall not be transmitted to the president for action. Except as provided in subsection J-3, below, the president shall not consider the merits of the matter and shall not take final action with respect thereto until the pending review proceedings have concluded. Upon conclusion of the review proceedings, the president shall review the file and make a final decision consistent with paragraph J-1, above.

3. Notice of termination. When review proceedings have been timely initiated under subsection I of this Policy, the president, on recommendation of the cognizant vice president, may give a candidate advance written notice of termination pursuant to [Policy 6-311-Section 4]. Such notice shall be effective as of the date it is given if a final decision to terminate the faculty member's appointment is subsequently made by the president, on or before the termination date specified in the notice, but shall have no force or effect if a

final decision is made by the president on or before that date approving retention, promotion, and/or tenure or otherwise disposing of the case in a manner that does not require termination.

K. New appointments with tenure—expedited procedures for granting tenure.

Tenure may be granted at the time of initial appointment of a faculty member (commonly known as ‘hiring with tenure’). See Policy 6-311-III-Section 3-B. When a decision regarding tenure is to be considered contemporaneously with a decision regarding initial appointment, the procedures for the appointment and initial rank decisions are governed by Policy 6-302, and the procedures for the tenure decision are as described here in this policy in Section III-K.

Section K allows the use of expedited procedures for tenure decisions arising in circumstances in which more complex and lengthy procedures are inappropriate.

1. For purposes of expedited decisions on granting of tenure at the time of initial appointment of a candidate, the voting membership of the department RPT advisory committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members of the department, regardless of rank (subject to the limitations of part III-A-3-a-v, and part III-E-5). If allowed by departmental rule described in the departmental RPT Statement, other faculty members may participate in consideration of the candidate, but shall not vote on the tenure decision.
2. The chairperson of the department shall provide interested persons with notice of scheduled meetings of the committee, and invite them to submit information for consideration by the committee. Notice may be given orally, or in writing as circumstances permit, and should be given as early as practicable under the circumstances. Notice shall be given to the candidate, the department faculty and staff, and student representatives (including any members of the student advisory committee who are available, and/or other students determined by the department chairperson to adequately represent student interests). If it is contemplated that the candidate will also be appointed to an academic program separate from the tenure-granting department, notice shall also be provided to the chair/director of that academic program, who may in turn give notice to members of that program.
3. The candidate’s file shall include information submitted by the candidate, faculty, staff, and student representatives of the department, and representatives of any related academic program, and other information determined by the department chairperson or department RPT chairperson to be relevant. It shall include a curriculum vitae, available evidence of research/creative activity, available evidence of teaching effectiveness, and a

report from student representatives, and may include available evidence regarding faculty responsibility. The file shall include letters of evaluation from at least three outside evaluators. It shall be presumed that the candidate waives any right to see such external evaluation letters, unless the candidate submits to the RPT chairperson a written request for access to any letters prior to the time the letters are submitted.

4. The actions of the department RPT committee and the department chairperson shall proceed as described in parts III-E and F of this policy, except that i) the RPT committee chairperson may set a shortened period for inspection of the report of the RPT meeting, ii) the candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation, and iii) the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation.

5. The actions of the dean and college RPT advisory committee shall proceed as described in part III-G, except that the candidate need not be provided copies of the committee's or the dean's recommendations, and the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either recommendation.

6. The actions of the vice president and UPTAC shall proceed as described in part III-H for a tenure decision, except as follows. UPTAC reviews all recommendations of tenure accompanying new appointments, regardless of college or of votes by prior levels. UPTAC may delegate its responsibilities to a subcommittee formed for purposes of such expedited proceedings, and its reports may be made in abbreviated form. The candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee's report or the vice president's recommendation. The student representatives need not be provided such copies, but when practical shall be informed of the recommendations of UPTAC and the vice president. The vice president may submit the final recommendation to the president immediately (without awaiting notice from any person of an intent to appeal).

7. In expedited proceedings neither the candidate nor any other person has a right of appeal of either a favorable or unfavorable recommendation of the vice president. The final action of the president shall be taken as provided in III-J.

[Footnote 1]

// The regulations stated here in Policy 6-303 are stated in terms appropriate for the most widely adopted form of organizational structure, in which a faculty appointment is made in a subdivision known as an "academic department," which is organized together with related subdivisions in a parent "college."

In that structure, tenure is established in an academic department. There are several variations in organizational structure relevant to appointments and tenure of faculty, as explained in Policy 2-004 (Organization of the University). See also 2-005 (Officers of the University).

These regulations in Policy 6-303 shall be interpreted for appropriate adaptation to accommodate such relevant variations in organizational structure, including the following.

Where necessary, the term "department" shall refer to an academic subdivision within a parent college, which operates as equivalent to a department but is known by another name, including any "free-standing division" or "school." See Policy 2-004.

Where necessary, the term "college" shall refer to an academic organization which operates as equivalent to a college, but is known by another name, including a "school." See Policy 2-004.

For colleges that have no formal internal academic subdivisions (known commonly as 'single-department colleges' or 'nondepartmentalized colleges'), appointments and tenure are established in the college. See Policy 2-004, and 6-311-Section 1. Accordingly, the procedures described here for development of criteria and standards, and making and reviewing of retention, promotion and tenure decisions, shall be modified appropriately, including as follows:

Formulation of criteria, standards and procedures for retention, promotion, and tenure reviews, described here in 6-303-III-A-2 and elsewhere, shall be conducted by the college.

The functions described here in 6-303-III-A and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level RPT advisory committee shall be performed by a college RPT advisory committee. The description of the membership and leadership of the committee shall be interpreted to include appropriate modifications, including that the college dean is ineligible to serve as committee chair, and that committee members shall be drawn from the ranks of the college faculty.

The functions described here in 6-303-III-B-1, and III-F and elsewhere as being performed by a department chair shall be performed by the college dean (see Policy 2-005-Section 5-F), including such activities as holding meetings with RPT candidates.

The functions described here in 6-303-III-Section C-3 and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level student advisory committee shall be performed by the college SAC.

The actions described here in 6-303-III-Section G, and elsewhere as being performed by a college dean and college-level RPT committee shall be inapplicable. Instead, RPT actions from a single-department college shall be forwarded for review at the level of the cognizant vice president and appropriate committees as provided in Section III-H and elsewhere. //

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources:

- A. Rules (Reserved)
- B. Procedures (Reserved)
- C. Guidelines

Checklist & Guideline for Department RPT Statements [link to file:
http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/Guidelines/6-303_URPT%20Checklist-form%202009-4-24.pdf]

- D. Forms (Reserved)
- E. Other related resource materials (Reserved)

V. References: (Reserved)

VI. Contacts:

Policy Officers:

Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs, 801-581-5057

Sr. Vice President for Health Science, 801-581-7480

Policy Owners:

Associate Vice President - Faculty, 801-581-8763

Associate Vice President - Health Sciences, 801-585-9602

Faculty_Policy@utah.edu

Students_policy@utah.edu

VII. History:

Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 6-303 effective September 15, 2008, formerly known as PPM 9-5.1.

A. Current version: Revision 20.

Effective date July 1, 2010.

Approved by Academic Senate March 2, 2009.

Approved by Board of Trustees March 10, 2009

Editorially revised July 30, 2009.

Background information for Revision 20:

Revision 20 Proposal [link to current location of this file:
http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-002_6-303_6-305_legislativehistory.pdf]

B. Earlier versions

Revision 19: Effective dates July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2010. [link to file of Rev 19.]

Background information for Revision 19:

Revision 19 legislative history [link to this file:

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-303.R19.app.html]

Drafting notes -- Spring 2007 Proposal [link to this file:

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-003_draft_revisions_April_2007.pdf

Revision 18: Effective dates May 16, 2005 to June 30, 2007 [link to file:

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/revisions_6/6-303.R18.pdf]

Revision 17: Effective dates March 21, 2005 to May 15, 2005 [link to file:

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/revisions_6/6-303.R17.pdf]

Revision 16: Effective dates June 9, 2003 to March 20, 2005[link to file:

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/revisions_6/6-303.R16.pdf]

Revision 15: Effective dates December 28, 1990 to June 8, 2003[link to file:

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/revisions_6/6-303.R15.pdf]

Policy 6-304: University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

1. Purpose and Scope
 1. (Reserved)
2. Definitions
 1. (Reserved)
3. Policy
 1. Membership
 1. The University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee shall consist of fifteen tenured faculty members and four fully matriculated students, including at least one graduate student, with the vice president for academic affairs or the vice president's delegate as ex officio chairperson.
 2. Election to the committee
 1. The faculty members of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee shall be elected by the regular faculty for three-year terms, with one member from each of the colleges. One-third of the faculty terms shall expire each year. The student member shall be selected for one-year terms according to Procedures established by and under the supervision of the Associated Students of the University of Utah. Committee members may be reelected and succeed themselves as representatives of their respective areas. To be elected, a candidate for this committee must receive a majority of the votes cast in his/her college. No individual who is an ex officio member of the Academic Senate shall be eligible for election to this committee.
 3. Appointment of alternates
 1. The Personnel and Elections Committee of the Academic Senate shall appoint an alternate to function in the place of any elected member of the committee who resigns or will be absent from the university for one or more semesters, or expects to be absent for such a period. If a duly elected member returns to the university, he/she shall assume the committee position and serve out the balance of the term.
 4. Disqualification
 1. No committee member shall be present during the consideration of any case from a department with which he/she is associated as a faculty member or a student major, or for any case in which he/she has been involved in the sequence of review. In addition, committee members shall decline to participate in the consideration of any case in which they have a personal bias or interest which would preclude their making a fair and objective decision.
 5. Duties
 1. Case Review. The University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee shall perform such duties as may be required under the provisions of Policy 6-303, Section F and Policy 6-003, Section 2 of Faculty Regulations.
 2. Standards. The University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee shall receive and review the annual report of the RPT Standards and Review Committee relevant to departmental standards, and, based on its experience with given departments' standards, may recommend that the committee review the standards of a department.
 6. Recommendations
 1. The recommendations of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee will be submitted to the cognizant vice president.

4. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources
 1. Rules
 2. Procedures
 3. Guidelines
 4. Forms
 5. Other related resource materials
5. References:
 1. (Reserved)
6. Contacts:
 1. Policy Officers:
 1. Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs, 801-581-5057
 2. Sr. Vice President for Health Science, 801-581-7480
 2. Policy Owners:
 1. Associate Vice President - Faculty, 801-581-8763
 2. Associate Vice President - Health Sciences, 801-585-9602
 3. Faculty_Policy@utah.edu
 4. Students_policy@utah.edu
7. History:
 1. Editorially changed 1/19/2010 - Title changed to include the word "University."
 2. Approved: Academic Senate 3/1/99
 3. Approved: Board of Trustees 9/17/99
 4. Approved: Academic Senate 5/3/99
 5. Approved: Board of Trustees 5/17/99
 6. (The Senate changes on 3/1/99 were approved on 9/17/99 by the Board of Trustees Executive Committee.)

Policy 6-305: Duties of University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee

1. Purpose and Scope
 1. To describe the duties and authority of the University Retention, Promotion, and Standards Committee,
2. Definitions
 1. (Reserved)
3. Policy
 1. Committee Membership. See Policy 6-002, Section 4-A-10. See also Policy 6-001-III Section 3
 2. Duties:
 1. The University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee shall develop and implement Procedures with which it will review and approve the statements of retention/promotion/tenure criteria, standards, and procedures applicable for the regular faculty of each department or college as required by University Policy 6-303. Such reviews should be conducted with due concern to the unique characteristics or requirements of the discipline and with the objective of improving the stature of the University by ensuring that such criteria and standards are consistent with the University's commitment to academic excellence. Such reviews will be conducted in conjunction with the faculty and administrators of the department/college being reviewed. Any department or college may be reviewed at the initiative of the committee. Requests for review may be made to the committee by the cognizant senior vice president, the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, or the Graduate Council, as well as by deans, department chairpersons, or individual regular faculty members. The committee shall use its judgment and discretion in formulating responses to such requests. The committee shall annually report on its reviews to the Academic Senate and to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.
 2. The committee is also an appropriate forum for reviewing any proposed changes to university policy with respect to retention, promotion, or tenure.
4. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources
 1. Rules
 2. Procedures
 3. Guidelines
 4. Forms
 5. Other related resource materials
5. References:
 1. (Reserved)
6. Contacts:
 1. Policy Officers:
 1. Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs, 801-581-5057
 2. Sr. Vice President for Health Science, 801-581-7480

2. Policy Owners:
 1. Associate Vice President - Faculty, 801-581-8763
 2. Associate Vice President - Health Sciences, 801-585-9602
3. Faculty_policy@utah.edu
4. Students_policy@utah.edu
7. History:
 1. Revision History:
 1. Current version: Revision 17:
 1. Approved: Academic Senate, March 2, 2009
 2. Approved: Board of Trustees, March 10, 2009
 3. Legislative History
 2. Earlier versions:
 1. Revision 16: effective February 14, 2005 to June 30, 2009

Policy 6-002: The Academic Senate-III Section 4-A-10 to clarify membership of the University RPT Standards Committee.

University RPT Standards Committee

1. Membership. The University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee voting membership shall consist of sixteen tenured faculty members, with one faculty representative from each Senate area of representation elected for three-year terms by the Academic Senate. The Associate Vice President for Faculty, or designee, shall be a non-voting ex officio member. Voting members shall be elected as follows:
 1. Nominations will be proposed in advance by the Personnel and Elections Committee, and additional nominations of eligible faculty members who have agreed to serve may be made from the floor immediately prior to the election. Voting will be by preferential ballot.
 2. Members of the University RPT Standards Committee will not be eligible for nomination for another term until an interval of one year has passed following the completion of their term on the committee.
 3. In each successive year, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall include among its nominations for the University RPT Committee two or more candidates whose tenured faculty appointments are in colleges whose current member is rotating off the committee.
2. Vacancies. If vacancies occur in the University RPT Standards Committee, they shall be filled either by the runner-up from the original elections or, if that is not possible, by special elections conducted in the Academic Senate by the Personnel and Elections Committee.
3. Duties. See University Policy 6-305 (Duties of University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee).