

**COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE**

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

Approved by Department Tenure-line Faculty: May 17, 2017

Approved by Dean: June 13, 2017

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on April 26, 2018, and the Senior Vice President on December 3, 2018, for implementation on July 1, 2018.

This document serves as the Department’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.

**DEPARTMENT VISION**

The Department of Theatre seeks to be a place where students and faculty learn, grow, explore, discover, and innovate. It is a community of artists and scholars committed to transformative education and academic and creative endeavor.

**DEPARTMENT MISSION**

The Department of Theatre’s faculty of artists and scholars provides academic training, engaged learning, and creative exploration for prepared students who wish to pursue careers in theatre and related fields or advanced graduate education. The Department is committed to the highest standards of excellence, embraces equity and diversity, and promotes personal wellness and responsibility. It supports the kinds of teaching, creative work, scholarship, and service that seek to make a positive difference.

## Table of Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty .....	3
2. Informal and Formal Reviews .....	3
2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period .....	3
Table 1: Normal Review Schedule .....	3
2.2 Informal Reviews .....	4
2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews .....	4
2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Either Associate Professor or Professor, without Tenure .....	4
2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor .....	4
3. RPT Guidelines .....	5
3.1 Summary of RPT Standards .....	5
3.2 Evaluation of Research .....	6
3.3 Evaluation of Teaching .....	7
3.4 Evaluation of Service .....	9
4. RPT Procedures .....	10
4.1 Participants .....	10
4.2 Informal Review Procedures .....	11
4.3 Formal Review Procedures .....	12
Appendix A: RPT File Contents .....	15
Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval .....	17

## **1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty**

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of July 1, 2018. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be evaluated according to this Statement.

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

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

## **2. Informal and Formal Reviews**

### **2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period**

#### a. Timing

To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and to make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Department 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**

<b>Rank at Appointment</b>	<b>Years of Informal Review</b>	<b>Years of Formal Review</b>
Assistant Professor	1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> , 6 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup>
Associate Professor, Professor (without tenure)	1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup>

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the

Department RPT Advisory Committee or the Department Chair, according to University Policy.

c. Shortening or Extending the Probationary Period

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

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

## **2.2 Informal Reviews**

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

## **2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews**

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

## **2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Either Associate Professor or Professor, without Tenure**

The Department typically does not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at 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 without the immediate granting of tenure.

## **2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor**

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when he or she has met the requirements for that rank. The Department 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 promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

### **3. RPT Guidelines**

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research, (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, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

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

#### **3.1 Summary of RPT Standards**

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that he or she has reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. In addition, retention at the rank of assistant professor requires ratings of at least *effective* in teaching, research, and service.

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

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 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.

### 3.2 Evaluation of Research

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

#### a. Description of Research

Research may vary depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Research may consist of a wide range of work, including but not limited to: scholarly books, chapters, and articles; theatre criticism; dramaturgical work; creation of new plays; professional theatre production work—acting, directing, coaching, design (e.g., of sets, costumes, properties, lighting, sound, projections, or multi-media), technical direction, stage management; or community-engaged research.

A work's quality includes such elements as its objectives and significance (particularly as described by the candidate), its scope, and its relevance to the academic community or professional community.

Research funding may also play an important role in one's research. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to secure research funding will be considered as contributing positively toward a candidate's record of research.

*Quantity:* Faculty members are expected to demonstrate an extended record of activity commensurate with their rank. While a specific number of activities is not mandated, quantity is one measure of accomplishment, a sign of ongoing engagement and substantive exploration within the field.

*Quality:* Quality will be evaluated on the basis of the following:

- 1) *Scope.* A work may be evaluated according to its national or international, regional, or local distribution. A work may be evaluated according to its breadth or depth of impact. Research may, for example, create new knowledge, synthesize existing knowledge in a new way, present new descriptive evidence, summarize or otherwise apply existing knowledge, or comment upon or critique existing knowledge.
- 2) *Relevance to the academic community or professional community.* A work's relevance may be evaluated by assessing its clarity, sophistication, persuasiveness, creativity, or potential or proven influence.

#### b. 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 quantity and quality of research reflect a coherent and substantial agenda in at least one topic area. The candidate has established an outstanding and extended record of research recognized at the national or international level.

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time. The candidate has established a respectable record of research at least at the local or regional level.

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

### **3.3 Evaluation of Teaching**

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. There are therefore three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, and (3) student advising and mentoring. Given this Department's mission, additional teaching activities are recognized in a fourth category.

#### **a. Description of Teaching**

##### *Course Instruction*

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; (d) studio teaching, (e) private instruction, and (f) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards or other college, university, state, regional, or national recognitions for teaching, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses.

##### *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 and novel courses and the publication of textbooks or other teaching materials. It also may include participating at the Department, College, and University levels in activities that enhance teaching effectiveness (e.g., attending

lectures and seminars; completing university and other courses that enrich knowledge or skills; participating in interdisciplinary courses; engaging in guest teaching; or co-teaching across disciplines and departments).

#### *Student Advising and Mentoring*

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

#### *Additional Activities*

Teaching may also include (a) participating in co-curricular Department productions (*e.g.*, Babcock and Studio 115 productions, or environmental productions), as a coach, director, designer, performer, dramaturg, playwright, or mentor; (b) presenting master classes or workshops on or off-campus; or (c) developing exhibitions of students' creative or scholarly work.

#### b. Summary Rating Scale for Teaching

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

*Excellent:* The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. The candidate stands out as a highly motivated and dedicated teacher with outstanding knowledge of subject matter, superior classroom performance, and a strong commitment to continued pedagogical development. The candidate also demonstrates the following: (1) teaching that is conscientious and knowledgeable, (2) skillful delivery of subject matter, (3) thoughtful, innovative course design, and (4) commitment to keeping abreast of current developments in the field and, as appropriate, incorporating them into classroom teaching.

*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. The candidate is a diligent and reliable teacher with solid knowledge of subject matter, good communication in the classroom, and a strong commitment to continued pedagogical development. The candidate also demonstrates the following: (1) teaching that is conscientious and knowledgeable, (2) skillful delivery of subject matter, (3) thoughtful, innovative course design, and (4) commitment to keeping abreast of current developments in the field and, as appropriate, incorporating them into classroom teaching.

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



### 3.4 Evaluation of Service

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

a. Description of Service

*Professional Service*

This refers primarily to professional participation at a national 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; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); 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 serving as an adjudicator for professional organizations or competitions.

*University Service*

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the Department, College, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing committees, ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces, or serving in administrative positions, at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.

*Public Service*

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

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. Specifically, the candidate has established an outstanding and comprehensive record of service in University assignments; national or international organizations, boards, projects, or events in the theatre or allied field; or community outreach in the theatre or allied field. Special attention shall be paid to the candidate's record of leadership.

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant. Specifically, the candidate has established a highly respectable record of service, *e.g.*, in University assignments; in regional or local professional organizations, boards, projects, or events in the theatre or an allied field; or in regional, local, or community outreach in the theatre or an allied field. Special attention shall be paid to the candidate's record of participation.

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

## **4. RPT Procedures**

### **4.1 Participants**

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

- a. Candidate. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.
- b. Department RPT Advisory Committee. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.
- c. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Department faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.
- d. RPT Advisory Committee Secretary. The RPT Advisory Committee Chair, in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee, will appoint for each candidate under review a Secretary, who will prepare a summary report of the Committee's meeting, evaluation, and recommendations for that candidate.
- e. Department Chair. The administrative head of the Department.
- f. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of students in the Department.
- g. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the RPT Committee Chair. One Peer Teaching Reviewer may be a representative of the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE).
- h. External Evaluators. These are creative artists or scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair—in consultation with the Department Chair, the RPT Advisory Committee, and the candidate—to evaluate the candidate's research. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of excellence in the candidate's field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review, or shall have commensurate professional experience equivalent to the rank for which the candidate is being considered. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or

mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with the candidate. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

#### **4.2 Informal Review Procedures**

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

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

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (a) an up-to-date curriculum vitae; (b) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans in research, teaching, and service; (c) copies of publications or other forms of creative and/or scholarly work; and (d) course syllabi. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 15.

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track appointment in another academic department or interdisciplinary academic program, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Department prior to 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 Department Chair. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the candidate.

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

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

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the initial report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the [head of unit] shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, the head of the unit OR the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and the individual assigned to review the candidate's file shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the unit head or members of the RPT Advisory

Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

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

#### **4.3 Formal Review Procedures**

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format, except that a different number of external evaluators are required for the mid-probationary retention review.

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

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

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track appointment in another academic department or interdisciplinary academic program, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress, which should be submitted to the Department prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Department Chair will notify the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform them that reports shall be due to the Department Chair no later than September 15. The Department Chair must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than August 1. The SAC will participate in the RPT process in accordance with University Policy.

- b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee, appoint a Secretary for each candidate.

- c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chair shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.
- d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of four to six potential external evaluators from outside the University and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Department Chair and the RPT Advisory Committee, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations from outside the University for each formal mid-probationary retention review, and at least four external evaluations from outside the University for formal tenure review and formal promotion review (either to Associate Professor or to Professor). At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The Department Chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations and appropriate supporting materials, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.
- e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).
  - 1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson to place in the candidate's file: (a) a current vita, (b) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (c) a personal statement that includes a teaching statement, and specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans for the relevant criteria (research, teaching, and service), and (d) course syllabi. The candidate may submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.
  - 2) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents*. The Department Chairperson shall ensure that the file includes: (a) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (b) available SAC reports, (c) any written recommendations from department faculty and staff, (d) any reports from joint/shared appointment units, (e) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (f) peer teaching reviews, (g) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (h) all other required materials.
- f. Candidate's Rights to Comment on File. A candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of his or her file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.
- g. Formal Review—Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.
  - 1) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action*. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from any pertinent interdisciplinary program but no later than October 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an

executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Department Chair may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate).

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

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

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

## **Appendix A: RPT File Contents**

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

### **Candidate's Responsibility**

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

1. Curriculum Vitae, including at least the following:
  - a. All research publications/creative works since the candidate began their professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on anonymous/peer review, or other selection method. For publications, please list inclusive page numbers.
  - b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.
  - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
  - d. Honors received for creative and/or scholarly work.
  - e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.
  - f. All courses taught.
  - g. Individual student research supervised.
  - h. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
  - 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 teaching philosophy.
3. Copies of recent research, including title page of authored or edited books and documentation of creative works, such as reviews, still images, video, or sound files.
4. Course syllabi for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the candidate chooses to include. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and the SAC to use this material for their reports.
5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, 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.

6. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

### **Department's Responsibility**

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

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.
2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
3. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).
4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.
5. Copies of all prior years' RPT reports submitted by all voting levels in formal and informal reviews—i.e., SAC, shared-appointment unit (if applicable), Department and College RPT Advisory Committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president, and recommendation from UPTAC (if applicable).
6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Department Chair describing the candidate's service to the Department and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her 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, Department Chair, or RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson)



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

*Review Committee Approval:*



\_\_\_\_\_  
Lincoln L. Davies, Chair

12/3/2018

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

*Senior Vice President Approval:*



\_\_\_\_\_  
Harriet W. Hopf, Designee

12/3/2018

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date