

SCHOOL FOR CULTURAL AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION DIVISION OF GENDER STUDIES

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

Approved by Division Tenure-line Faculty: January 16, 2019

Approved by Dean: *January 16, 2019*

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

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

Mission of Division

The University of Utah Gender Studies Division offers a space for the study of a wide range of feminist thought and practices. The curriculum offers theory and practice (community-engaged learning); activism and professional development; lively debate and professional skill building. The Division fosters intellectual rigor and practical application for students as they pursue their passions.

The mission of the Division of Gender Studies is to provide a quality graduate and undergraduate education in gender scholarship, to promote an integration of this scholarship and research into the university curriculum, to encourage new pedagogies, and to foster the growth of an interdisciplinary community of scholars who are interested in gender as a category of analysis. The Division provides students with the tools of academic analysis so that they may explore the significance of gender and sexuality as crucial components in the organization of personal lives and social institutions. To this end, the courses offered by Gender Studies re-evaluate the assumptions at work in traditional disciplines as they study individuals, cultures, social institutions, policy and other areas of scholarly inquiry. In these ways, the Division prepares students for graduate work and professional studies (e.g. Law or Medical School) and for employment in professional and community organizations.

DRAFT

Table of Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty
 2. Single-appointment, Joint-appointment, and Shared-appointment Faculty
 3. Informal and Formal Reviews
 - 3.1. Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period
 - 3.2. Informal Reviews
 - 3.3. Triggering Formal Retention Reviews
 - 3.4. Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure
 - 3.5. Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor
 4. RPT Guidelines
 - 4.1. Summary of RPT Standards
 - 4.2. Evaluation of Research/creative activity
 - 4.3. Evaluation of Teaching
 - 4.4. Evaluation of Service
 5. RPT Procedures
 - 5.1. Participants
 - 5.2. Information Review Procedures
 - 5.3. Formal Review Procedures
- Appendix A. RPT File Contents
- Appendix B. Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

As of the effective date of this document, all existing faculty members hold shared-appointments with 100% of their tenure-line held by another academic unit.

The RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of [date]. Existing tenured shared-appointment faculty may choose, between [effective date] and December 31, 2017, to hold tenure in the Gender Studies Division. Faculty will continue to hold tenure in their home department and thus will be joint appointments. Existing shared appointment faculty are not permitted to move to hold tenure only in Gender Studies. To request to hold tenure in Gender Studies, the faculty member shall request the Gender Studies Chair submit a request to the Senior Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After December 31, 2017 any tenured shared-appointment faculty who wish to hold in Gender Studies may request to do so, but will be required to follow the full process of review within Gender Studies and according to RPT guidelines as outlined below for single-appointment faculty.

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Professor (see below), shared-appointment candidates whose tenure is held by another academic unit and whose appointments began prior to this date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure by their tenure-holding unit will have the option of choosing to have their research, teaching, and service evaluated for the purposes of the Gender Studies letter to be included in their file under either (1) the prior Gender Studies Program RPT General Policy Statement that was in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Division Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations. Upon a positive decision, their tenure and rank, if they choose and in accordance with the previous provision for currently tenured shared-appointment faculty, will become effective in both the home department and the Gender Studies Division.

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

2. Single-appointment, Joint-appointment, and Shared-appointment Faculty

Single-appointment faculty members are those whose tenure is held entirely by the Division of Gender Studies.

Per Policy 6-319 (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-319.php>), *joint-appointment* faculty members are reviewed and subsequently hold tenure in both the Division of Gender Studies and another academic unit. Both informal and formal reviews take place separately and in parallel unless a memorandum of understanding lays out a process for collaboration between the two academic units during RPT reviews. When timeline or process conflict between the two appointing units, a memorandum of understanding regarding how to handle that conflict must be developed and included with the offer letter.

Per Policy 6-001 (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-001.php>), *shared-appointment* faculty members are reviewed for and subsequently hold tenure entirely in one academic unit (either the Division of Gender Studies or another academic unit), but a Shared-Appointment Agreement states the percentage of the faculty member's work that is shared with the other academic unit. The process for the shared-appointment unit's participation in the review process is described in 6-001 and 6-303 (<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php>) and in the RPT Statement of the academic unit in which the faculty member's tenure line resides.

The Division of Gender Studies faculty may be made up of any or all of these types of candidates.

This Statement applies to all candidates for whom a portion of their tenure-line is held by the Division of Gender Studies. For shared-appointment faculty members whose tenure is held by another academic unit, the Division of Gender Studies follows the *procedures* as described in the tenure-line holding unit's RPT Statement and in Policies 6-001 and 6-303; and, during that process, the Division of Gender Studies *evaluates* the candidate's research, teaching, and service based on the criteria and standards described in Section 4 of this Statement, below.

3. Informal and Formal Reviews

3.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

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

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

Candidates with a seven-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year. Candidates with a five-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the third year.

Table 1: Normal Review Schedule

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

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

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

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

3.2 Informal Reviews

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

3.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

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

3.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure

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

3.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when she or he has met the requirements for that rank. The Division does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. In general, however, such requests are not made until the time of one's first tenured faculty review, which occurs five years after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of the rank of Associate Professor and tenure shall count towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

4. RPT Guidelines

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

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period, tenure, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

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

4.1 Summary of RPT Standards

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

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

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

Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in research/creative activity resulting in a national and international reputation in his or her field, at least *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and at least *sustained*

effectiveness in service. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

4.2 Evaluation of Research/creative activity

Judgments about a candidate's research are based on the quantity and quality of research, and on its relevance to the academic community. The Division values co-authored research, but also recognizes the more substantial contribution when the candidate has primary or equal responsibility for the research as opposed to when she or he plays a secondary or tertiary role. The characteristics of productive research/creative activity differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research/creative activity in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality and quantity of contributions, and the professional context of the candidate. This statement intends to define research flexibly enough to reflect the wide variety of research activities typically conducted by Gender Studies faculty. This Division values all three types of research described below; candidates may participate in only one type of research, or in any combination of these types of research.

a. Description of research/creative activity.

1) *Assessment Factors.*

- a. *Quantity.* The Division values a series of research outcomes over time that represents research in one or more topic areas as part of a coherent research program. While a specific number of research activities and outcomes is not mandated, the Division recognizes that a record of active and ongoing production and dissemination of research is one measure of accomplishment and is an important sign of substantive exploration and ongoing engagement with the field.
- b. *Quality.* High quality research contributes to *the creation of new knowledge*; has a significant *impact*, particularly at the national and/or international level; and appears in *top-ranked peer-reviewed venues*. Distinction in research does not require that a candidate's research always represent the highest levels within all of these aspects of quality. Rather, overall excellence may be achieved through a variety of examples of disseminated research that may differ with respect to these dimensions of quality. Quality is more important than quantity at all levels.

2) *Types of Research.*

- a. *Scholarly research* includes published work in any of the established disciplinary areas (i.e., arts, humanities, social sciences, sciences, health sciences), as well as interdisciplinary and innovative work within or across these areas. It is disseminated through peer-reviewed print or electronic publications (books, journal articles, book chapters, and/or equivalent contexts). Evidence of final acceptance of a manuscript by a press or journal shall be deemed the equivalent of publication.
- b. *Creative research* includes, but is not limited to, artistic works (e.g., painting, sculpture, ceramics, printmaking); performance; participation in the production

process of a performance (e.g., director, dramaturg, conductor); performance, production, or publication of original works (e.g., music compositions, choreography, screenplays, fiction, creative writing, poetry); film, media, or other technology works; and other generative or interpretive work. It must be public and of significant stature, subject to peer review, and under the purview of other professionals in the relevant field. In addition, creative research must be disseminated through production or presentation of the work in a credible venue that is appropriate to its genre, or through equivalent contexts. Creative research made in collaboration with other artists and scholars to support a singular work of art, particularly where each participant plays a unique and significant role in the research process, is viewed as equal to work made solely by one individual. Collaboration as a means to expand artistic vision and research possibilities is both valued and supported.

- c. *Community-based research* (CBR) takes place in community settings and involves community members in the design and implementation of research projects. Such activities should demonstrate respect for the contributions made by community partners, respect for the principle of "do no harm," and engagement with relevant literature(s). CBR research must be disseminated publically and have an impact beyond those who participated in the research. Evidence may include, but is not limited to: (i) publication of peer-reviewed print or electronic books, journal articles, book chapters, or other equivalent publications, (ii) creative research disseminated in a credible venue that is appropriate to its genre, or through equivalent contexts. In addition, the following forms of dissemination may serve as the centerpiece of CBR research when produced in some combination with items (i) and/or (ii) above: (iii) development of new reports for or policies in community-based organizations, social service agencies, governmental programs, or other relevant organizational entities, (iv) improved quality of life in the community, and/or (v) transference of knowledge in the researcher's field to the community(s) served and vice versa.

b. Research funding.

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this Division and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the University. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding will be considered as contributing positively toward one's research.

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

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate's research has originality, depth, and/or impact.

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

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

4.3 Evaluation of Teaching

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, counseling and advising of students in general, and other pedagogical activities. There are therefore four components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, (3) student advising and mentoring, and (4) additional activities.

DRAFT

a. Description of teaching.

- 1) *Course instruction.* Course instruction encompasses (a) classroom instruction, (b) online and distance education teaching, (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs, (d) studio teaching, (e) private instruction, (f) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics, and (g) practicum instruction, professional supervision, and management of internship or field practicum placements. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in her or his personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and/or other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; information from student course evaluations; (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, observation of the candidate's teaching, or evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses.
- 2) *Curriculum and program development.* Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new courses or other teaching materials, as well as work on or with the Division or School curriculum committees.
- 3) *Student advising and mentoring.* Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (a) general student advising and mentoring; (b) chairing and serving on undergraduate or graduate student committees; and (c) including students in research, as co-authors in scholarly work and/or as collaborators in creative work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.
- 4) *Additional activities.* Teaching may also include (a) invited teaching inside or outside the University, (b) teaching in the context of the performance process, such as directing students in rehearsals or performances, (c) teaching grants, (d) teaching awards, and (e) other relevant activities.

b. Summary rating scale for teaching. Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the four components of teaching described above.

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

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development,

and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

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

4.4 Evaluation of Service

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the strengths and interests of individual faculty members.

a. Description of service.

- 1) Professional service. This refers primarily to professional participation at a national and/or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences, competitions, or festivals; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); presenting professional workshops, and serving as an artist or consultant (as appropriate within University guidelines) for other colleges, universities, or professional organizations. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals; as well as adjudicating for professional organizations and competitions.
- 2) University service. This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the Division, School, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces; serving in administrative positions; or serving as a participant in official events at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.
- 3) Public service. This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and/or international public settings and can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, and/or consulting with or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines.

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

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

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

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

5. RPT Procedures

5.1 Participants

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

- a. Candidate. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.
- b. Division RPT Advisory Committee. Membership in and voting on the Division RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. All tenured faculty members are members of the Division RPT Advisory Committee. These qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The Committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy, including all tenure-line (non-tenured) and career-line faculty members. These other participants may participate in the discussion but may not vote on recommendations.
- c. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Division faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty members eligible to participate in the election.
- d. Ad Hoc Subcommittee. A committee of three members, all of whom are eligible to vote on the candidate's retention, tenure, and/or promotion, appointed by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair in consultation with the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall designate one member of the Committee as its chair, and that person shall serve as Secretary for the purposes of producing the full RPT Advisory Committee's report.
- e. Division Chair. The administrative head of the Division.
- f. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of students in the Division.
- g. External Evaluators. These are scholars or creative artists, as appropriate for each candidate, from outside the University of Utah selected by the Division Chair in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and the candidate to evaluate the candidate's research. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

5.2 Informal Review Procedures

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

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

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae; (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of research, teaching, and service; a description of the research agenda; a description of teaching philosophy; and a description of current activities and future plans in research, teaching, and service; and (iii) evidence of research. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Division Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of the file on September 15.

In the case of a candidate whose tenure-line is held in Gender Studies but also has a shared appointment in another academic unit, the Division Chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Division by October 5. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

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

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, the Division Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Division to submit written statements for the file of each candidate to be considered.

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

The RPT Advisory Committee Chair will appoint the members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to review the candidate's file and to write an initial draft of a report that evaluates progress toward tenure.

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the initial draft report and the file, and the RPT Advisory Committee Secretary for each candidate shall draw on the initial Ad Hoc Subcommittee's draft report to prepare the summary report of the meeting. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary and Committee Chair shall sign the report, and then the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Division Chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting. After reviewing the file and the RPT Advisory Committee's summary report, the Division Chair shall prepare her or his written recommendation to be included in the file. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee and/or the recommendation of the Division Chair. After all informal reviews, the Division Chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and her or his progress, and the

Division Chair shall forward the file to the Dean. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Division Chair or a majority of members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen and to mentor the candidate regarding the RPT process. The Division Chair will review the candidate's CV, research, teaching (including course evaluations), and service; she or he will then meet with the candidate to discuss the review, acknowledge achievements, and address any problems with research, teaching, or service. The candidate may request that a tenured faculty mentor also attend the meeting. The Division Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

5.3 Formal Review Procedures

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

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

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, the Division Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Division to submit written statements for the file of each candidate to be considered.

In the case of a candidate whose tenure-line is held in Gender Studies but also has a shared appointment in another academic unit, the Division Chair shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the question of retention, promotion, tenure, or promotion and tenure, which should be submitted to the Division by October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

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

SAC report must be written, and the rationale for the distribution of votes should be noted in the report.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. By September 15, the RPT Advisory Committee Chair will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint three members and select a chair for the Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

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

d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five (5) potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Division Chair, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three (3) external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. At least one (1) external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The Division Chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this Statement. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

d. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for any report from a shared unit [due October 5] and materials specified as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

- 1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the Division Chair to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and/or other forms of research, (iii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of research, teaching, and service; a description of the research agenda; a description of teaching philosophy; and a description of current activities and future plans in research, teaching, and service, and (iv) course syllabi. The candidate may choose to submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.
- 2) *Division Responsibilities for File Contents*. The Division Chair shall ensure that the file includes: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (ii) available SAC reports, (iii) any written recommendations from division faculty and staff, (iv) any reports from shared-appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) peer teaching reviews; (vii) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (viii) all other required materials.

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

f. Division RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.

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

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

The Committee's report should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the report others should be able to get a sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. . The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary and Committee Chair shall sign the report, and then the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Division Chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

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

- 2) *Division Chair Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Division Chair shall prepare her or his written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written

statement in response to the report of the Committee and/or the recommendation of the Division Chair.

- 3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Division Level*. Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy.

DRAFT

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

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

Candidate's Responsibility

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

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:
 - a. All research publications, creative works, and/or community-based participatory research since the candidate began her or his professional career. Please state if acceptance was based on peer review or another selection method. For publications, please list inclusive page numbers.
 - b. All conference papers presented and presentations given. Please state if the presentation was selected by peer review or was a result of an invitation.
 - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
 - d. Honors received for research.
 - e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.
 - f. Individual student research supervised.
 - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
 - h. All courses taught.
 - i. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.
2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in research, teaching, and service, and include a description of the research agenda and teaching philosophy.
3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.
4. Documentation of creative works, such as still images, video, and/or sound files.
5. Course syllabi for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the candidate chooses to include. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and SAC to use for

their reports. In addition, the candidate may choose to include additional assignments, exams, and handouts. Candidates should provide this information for the file early enough for the SAC to use this material for their reports.

6. Other relevant materials may be included, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, peer teaching reviews, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research is unclear, the candidate may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.
7. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

Division's Responsibility

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

1. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
2. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).
3. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a shared appointment.
4. All previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal and informal reviews, *i.e.* SAC, Division RPT Advisory Committee, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC.
5. For promotion to Professor, the candidate's vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor).
6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Division Chair describing the candidate's service to the Division and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived her or his right to read)
 - a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
 - b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae

- c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate or Division Chair)

**Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and
Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval**

DRAFT