COLLEGE OF HEALTH

Departments of:

**COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS
HEALTH, KINESIOLOGY, AND RECREATION
NUTRITION AND INTEGRATIVE PHYSIOLOGY
OCCUPATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL THERAPIES
PHYSICAL THERAPY AND ATHLETIC TRAINING**

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

Approved by College of Health Tenure-Line Faculty: March 18, 2016

Approved by Dean: March 18, 2016

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on March 25, 2016 and the Senior Vice President on April 22, 2016 for implementation on April 22, 2016.

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

The Mission of the College of Health is to promote health and enhance quality of life through the discovery, application, and dissemination of information on health promotion, risk reduction, disease prevention, fitness, nutrition, recreation, and rehabilitation processes for a changing society.

This document should be used as a guide for evaluating faculty in a manner that appreciates the diversity of disciplines and roles represented within the College of Health. Therefore, the review process should be sensitive to the nature of individual faculty members' areas of inquiry and distribution of effort for teaching, research and service.

Table of Contents   Page

1. <u>Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty</u>

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of April 22, 2016. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Professor (see below), candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior RPT requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Department Chairperson 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. <u>Informal and Formal Reviews</u>

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

a. <u>Timing.</u> To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Departments and/or College 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. <u>Normal probationary period</u>. 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 (Select Option B in Table 1 below).

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	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th	4th, 7th
Associate Professor and Professor (appointed without tenure)	1st, 2nd, 4th	3rd, 5th

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 College RPT Advisory Committee or the Department Chairperson according to University Policy.

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

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

2.2 Informal Reviews

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

2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

If in the context of an informal review in which the candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the Department Chairperson 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 of research/creative activity is not at issue in the review.

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

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

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when they have met the requirements for that rank. The College 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. <u>RPT Guidelines</u>

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

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

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

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that they have *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure. The Department RPT Committee and Department Chairperson are responsible for providing ongoing feedback regarding discipline-specific expectations required to achieve tenure.

Tenure:

A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of either (a) *excellent* in research/creative activity, at least *very good* in teaching, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service, or (b) *very good* in research/creative activity, *excellent* in teaching, 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 *very good* evaluation of 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 either research/creative activity or teaching, *sustained very good* evaluation in the other, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service.

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

3.2 Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

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

a. Description of research/creative activity.

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

• Publication of original research papers in refereed journals and conference proceedings. The discipline-specific quality of the research is an important consideration. Number of publications will be considered in balance with the quality of research publications.

• Funding obtained through internal and external mechanisms to support scholarly activity. Examples include research grants, contracts, training grants and donations to support research. Within this context, emphasis is placed on extramural funding appropriate for the discipline. Unfunded proposals will also be considered.

• Publication of original research monographs, book chapters, and text books.

• Presentations at conferences, workshops, colloquia or seminars. Keynote, plenary, and invited talks will be noted.

• Patents issued and software licensed or otherwise distributed.

b. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/creative activity as described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial and 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. Substantial contributions include recognized leadership and impact in the discipline.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant 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. Significant contributions include being recognized as an emerging authority in his/her discipline

Effective: The candidate has made 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 not made sufficient contributions in research/creative activity.

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 developments, and (3) student advising and mentoring.

a.   Course instruction

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

shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review and/or review from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) 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; (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports, and (f) teaching awards. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, or any other evaluation of the candidate's teaching may also be included if the candidate so chooses.

b. Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, 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 or other teaching materials.

c. Student advising and mentoring

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

d. Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.

Ratings on the four-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. Substantial contributions include expertise in course instruction, leadership in curriculum/program development, and exceptional mentorship.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. Significant contributions include high quality course instruction, and active involvement in curriculum/program development and mentorship.

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 not made sufficient 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.   Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a national or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward national professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); and presenting professional workshops. Significant professional service contributions can also include consulting, serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals.

b.   University Service

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

c.   Public Service

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

d.   Summary Rating Scale for Service. Ratings on the four-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. Substantial contributions include leadership in one's profession, for the University and/or for the public.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. Significant contributions include active involvement in one's profession, for the University and/or for the public.

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

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has not made sufficient contributions in service.

4. RPT Procedures

4.1 Participants
The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

a. <u>Candidate</u>. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.

b. <u>Department RPT Advisory Committee</u>. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy (see Regulations Library 6-303 – III – e). 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. <u>RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson</u>. The Chairperson 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. <u>Ad Hoc Subcommittee</u>. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee prepares a report about an RPT candidate for consideration by the RPT Advisory Committee. Two members are appointed as a subcommittee for a candidate's informal review, and three for a formal review. The members of the subcommittee are tenured and are qualified by rank to vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the candidate. They are selected in consultation with the candidate by the Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee, who also designates a chairperson for the subcommittee.

e. <u>Department Chairperson</u>. The administrative head of the department.

f. <u>Dean</u>. The administrative head of the College.

g. <u>Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee (USAC)</u>. A committee made up of representatives of undergraduate majors.

h. <u>Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC)</u>. A committee made up of representatives of graduate students.

i. <u>Peer Teaching Reviewers</u>. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the Department Chairperson and/or the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. The College of Health also approves the teaching reviewers provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence.

j. <u>External Evaluators</u>. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work. All external

evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member or the advisor or mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

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

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

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae and (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans, in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chairperson by the last Friday of the first week of classes in Fall semester and may be updated until the close of files on the 3rd Friday of September.

In the case of a candidate having a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Department Chairperson shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 1 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 the last Friday of the first week of classes in Fall semester. 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 Chairperson. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the candidate.

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

The Department of Health, Kinesiology, and Recreation will utilize an *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee.

The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson for the Department of Health, Kinesiology, and Recreation will appoint the members of the *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee to review the candidate's file, meet with the candidate, and write an ad hoc 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 Subcommittee 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 *ad hoc* subcommittee's report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the Department Chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, the Department Chairperson and a member of the *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Department Chairperson or members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

The Departments of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Nutrition and Integrative Physiology, Occupational and Recreational Therapies, and Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, will follow review procedures without an *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee.

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

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

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The Department Chairperson will review the candidate's research/creative activity, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service.

The Department Chairperson will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

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

a. <u>Department Chairperson Responsibilities</u>. By April 1, the Department Chairperson 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 Chairperson by April 1. For each candidate being reviewed, the Department Chairperson 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 Chairperson 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 "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Department Chairperson shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 1 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 the date to file close (the 3rd Friday of September). Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Department Chairperson will notify the Student Advisory Committee(s) of candidates undergoing formal review by Friday of the first week of classes, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform that reports shall be due to the Department Chairperson no later than the date to file close (the 3rd Friday of September). The Department Chairperson must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than the date to file close (the 3rd Friday of September). The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. <u>RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson</u>. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint members to and select a chairperson for the *ad hoc* subcommittee (Department of Health, Kinesiology and Recreation) OR assign an individual of the RPT Advisory Committee to oversee the candidate's file in the RPT process (all other Departments in the College).

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chairperson shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct reviews according to the College of Health Teaching Quality Policy (approved March 3, 2014) 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 to seven potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by the 4th Friday of April. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Department Chairperson and the *ad hoc* subcommittee chairperson OR person selected to oversee the candidate's file, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The Department Chairperson and/or the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than August 31.

e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will open no later than the first day of classes in Fall semester and close no later than the 3rd Friday of September (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the RPT Advisory Committee meeting).

1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to May 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson/the Department Chairperson or his/her designee to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans, for the relevant criteria (research/ creative activity, teaching, and service). The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University. The CV may be updated until the last Friday of the first week of class.

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

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

g. <u>Formal Review—Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps</u>.

1) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action*. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but no later than the last Friday of September. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research/ creative activity, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Department Chairperson 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 Chairperson will advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes in advance of the meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

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

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

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

statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the Department Chairperson.

3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the College 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 Chairperson 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 Chairperson for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. *The most recent version, as indicated by date, of the Curriculum Vitae*. This should include at least the following:

   a. All research publications/creative works since the candidate began his/her professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on blind review, or other selection method.

   b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.

   c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.

   d. Honors received for research/creative work.

   e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.

   f. Individual student research supervised.

   g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.

   h. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.

2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy.

3. Copies of three representative publications, including title page of authored or edited books.

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. This information should be added to the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers, reviews from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, SAC(s), and for faculty in the Department of Health, Kinesiology, and Recreation, the RPT *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee, to use this material for their reports.

5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, other teaching materials, course

evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. 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 Chairperson'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 files.

6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.

7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Department Chairperson describing the candidate's service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.

8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her right to read)
   a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read with signature of witness
   b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief *Curriculum Vitae*
   c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, Department Chairperson or Committee Chairperson).

9. Report of RPT *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee (Department of Health, Kinesiology, and Recreation).

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

Approved: _[signature]_ 4/22/16

Vivian S. Lee, M.D., Ph.D., M.B.A.
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University Health Care