

Policy 2-03

Template Version 1.4
January 12, 2018
August 2021 Revisions

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE + PLANNING

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

Approved by College of Architecture + Planning Tenure-line Faculty: August 20, 2021

Approved by Dean: August 20, 2021

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on September 14, 2021 and the Senior Vice President on September 22, 2021 for implementation on July 1, 2021.

This document serves as the Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures for the School of Architecture, the Department of City & Metropolitan Planning, and the Division of Multi-Disciplinary Design of the College of Architecture + Planning, as required by University Policy. For ease of reference, all three units are referred to as “departments” in this document. Similarly, references to “chair” also include director, as may be appropriate. 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.

College of Architecture + Planning Vision

“Designing to make a difference”

We believe that the global dynamics of population growth and aging, environmental degradation and resource inequality challenge 21st-century architects, designers and planners to think, work and make in new ways.

We also believe that the particularity of this place – ecologically and culturally—provides both meaningful challenges and lessons to catalyze such innovation.

We thereby challenge ourselves (students, faculty, alumni, clients) to seize upon these intrinsic resources to inform the creation of purposeful, aesthetically elegant interventions that foster ecological, social and economic resilience, and further health and well-being for all, especially those for whom design makes the greatest difference.

We do so guided by four commitments in our teaching, scholarship, creative work and service:

Responsibility: A responsibility to past, present and future generations for the sustainability of our creative expressions that reallocate natural resources

Resilience: A systemic understanding that polycultures and diversity nurture greater ecological and community resilience

Respect: A respect for the health and culture of all places

Response: The demand to respond to the grand challenges of our time through innovative and collaborative modes of practice that demonstrate our commitment to excellence and quality

We thereby challenge the CA+P family to be proactive stewards of the built environment and take leadership in promoting the resilience of all segments of our communities and the environments in which they reside.

We believe that innovative processes predicated on human-centered, evidence-inspired, integrated, collaborative inquiry and harnessing emergent technologies to enhance these processes are essential to preparing the design mind of the future. These processes must be tested in real-world applications—such as problem-based community engaged learning, applied research and reflective practice—so as both to respond to the needs of our local, regional and global communities and to provide immersive educational experiences that create a strong foundation for life-long learning.

In so doing, we will be the spark for transforming our designed world to promote the health and well-being of our society and environment through collaborative innovation. We understand that our students will create tomorrow; and through all we do, we seek to nurture the agile, inventive minds necessary to address challenges that are yet unknown.

We will become a nationally recognized incubator of innovative processes of discovery, engagement, teaching and application in the fields of architecture, design and planning, rooted in our four commitments which will become known as the “Utah School”: An approach to design and planning rooted in an ethic of care, community and commitment.

Table of Contents

College of Architecture + Planning Vision.....	1
1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty	5
2. Informal and Formal Reviews	5
2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period	5
a. Timing.....	5
b. Normal probationary period.....	5
Table 1: Normal Review Schedule.....	5
c. Shortening or extending the probationary period.....	6
2.2 Informal Reviews	6
2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews	6
2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor Rank without Tenure ...	6
2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor	7
3. RPT Guidelines.....	7
3.1 Summary of RPT Standards.....	7
3.2 Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity.....	8
a. Description of research/creative activity.....	8
b. Summary rating scale for research/creative activity.....	9
3.3 Evaluation of Teaching	10
a. Course instruction.....	10
b. Curriculum and program development	10
c. Student advising and mentoring.....	11
d. Summary rating scale for teaching.....	11
3.4 Evaluation of Service	11
a. Professional service.....	11
b. University service.....	12
c. Public Service.....	12
d. Summary rating scale for service.....	12
4. RPT Procedures	12
4.1 Participants	12

a. Candidate.....	12
b. Department RPT Advisory Committee	13
c. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson.	13
d. Department Chairperson.	13
e. Dean	13
f. Student Advisory Committee (SAC).....	13
g. Peer Teaching Reviewers	13
h. External Evaluators.	13
i. College RPT Advisory Committee.	13
4.2 Informal Review Procedures	13
a. Informal Reviews after the First Year.....	13
b. First-Year Informal Review.	14
4.3 Formal Review Procedures	15
a. Department Chairperson Responsibilities.....	15
b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson.	15
c. Peer Teaching Reviews	16
d. External Evaluators	16
e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date	16
f. Candidate’s Rights to Comment on File.	16
g. Formal Review—Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.....	16
Appendix A: RPT File Contents	19
Candidate’s Responsibility.....	19
1. Curriculum Vitae.....	19
2. Personal Statement.	19
3. Copies of recent research works and documentation of creative works.	19
4. Course syllabi.....	19
Department’s Responsibility	20
Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval	22

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, 2021. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

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

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

2. Informal and Formal Reviews

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

- a. **Timing.** To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the department 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 Department RPT Advisory Committee or the Department Chair, according to University Policy.

- c. Shortening or extending the probationary period. Candidates may request early tenure reviews (i.e., *shortening* the otherwise applicable probationary period) on the grounds described in and by following the procedures provided for in University Policy. Because early review cases require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress, few requests are made and few are granted. Candidates are therefore encouraged to consult with their Department Chair, 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 Regulations 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 the candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the Department Chair or a majority of the RPT Advisory Committee members may vote to conduct a formal “triggered” review. The formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate. A triggered formal review shall include external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality of research/creative activity is not at issue in the review.

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

The departments typically do 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 departments do 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/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 departments 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* in University Policy.

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

A candidate's activities in the areas of research/creative activity, teaching, and service will be considered in terms of their significance and constancy. The data gathered on a candidate at the time of review for retention, promotion, or tenure are considered to be predictive of future activity. Emphasis is placed on a record of continuous productivity.

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that they have *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research/creative activity or teaching, at least *very good* in the other, and at least *very good* 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/creative activity resulting in a national and international reputation in their field, *sustained excellence* in teaching, and at least *very good* 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, and the professional context of the candidate.

The departments value the extent to which a candidate can integrate their research/creative activity, teaching, and service, as well as the degree to which those activities are informed by and relevant to the communities in which they are embedded. In addition, the departments value collaborative research and creative activities and acknowledges that publications resulting from such endeavors often involve multiple authors. The departments also values publications that are co-authored with students.

a. Description of research/creative activity.

1) Types of Research/Creative Activity

The mission of the University of Utah, in part, is to create new knowledge. Consistent with this mission, the department evaluates the quality of candidates' research/creative activities by the degree to which they contribute to new understanding. The four categories listed below are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather as illustrations of the types of research and creative activities that we foster in our college. These categories are not intended to be mutually exclusive as a candidate's research/creative activities may fall into more than one category.

Discovery: the pursuit of scholarly inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge or creative innovation or to support the teaching and learning enterprise;

Integration: making connections across disciplines and advancing knowledge through synthesis;

Application: how knowledge and creative innovation is applied (1) in practice or (2) in service to address a pressing social or environmental problem or meet a community need;

Engagement: scholarship or creative work that seeks to understand or address pressing social, civic, and ethical problems with a value of reciprocity with community partners.

2) Works of Research/Creative Activity Considered for Formal Reviews

To be considered as part of a formal review for retention, promotion, or tenure, works should be:

- a. creative, intellectual, and demonstrating expertise that adds to relevant bodies of knowledge;
- b. peer-reviewed or assessed for quality by peers outside the university (or in the process of being reviewed); and
- c. broadly disseminated to audiences in high-quality venues outside the university.

3) Evaluation Criteria

The external evaluators, the Department RPT Advisory Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean will assess the body of works meeting the criteria in paragraph (2) for their overall innovation and impact (or potential for impact).

a. Innovation

Innovation refers to the degree to which the candidate's work presents new theories, methodologies, or empirical evidence, or a new understanding of how theories, methods, or evidence are integrated, applied, taught, or used through engagement or practice.

b. Impact

Impact is defined as the demonstrable beneficial contributions or advances that the candidate's work brings to either the academic enterprise or society (e.g., environment, economy, professional practice, culture, public policy). Important factors may include the potential for future impacts and the quantity and consistency of the work and its significance.

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. In interpreting the rating categories, the department relies on the Oxford English Dictionary for the definitions of *substantial*, *significant*, *acceptable*, and *sustained* (<https://www.oed.com/>).

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.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, 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.

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.

3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

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

a. Course instruction.

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in the personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses. For those candidates engaged in collaborative forms of teaching, the assessment will take into account the added demands and enhanced pedagogical benefits of such forms. The assessment will also take note of evidence of achievement of student learning outcomes.

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 and the publication of textbooks 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. In interpreting the rating categories, the department relies on the Oxford English Dictionary for the definitions of *substantial*, *significant*, *acceptable*, and *sustained* (<https://www.oed.com/>).

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

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.

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.

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 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 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. In interpreting the rating categories, the department relies on the Oxford English Dictionary for the definitions of *significant*, *substantial*, *acceptable*, and *sustained* (<https://www.oed.com/>).

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

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or 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 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 Chairperson. 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. Department Chairperson. The administrative head of the department.
- e. Dean. The administrative head of the college.
- 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 Department Chairperson.
- h. External Evaluators. 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, the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluators are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators. Candidates may also indicate a potential external evaluator that the candidate would prefer not to be solicited.
- i. College RPT Advisory Committee. The purpose of the College RPT Advisory Committee is to review all promotion and tenure reviews, as well as retention reviews if termination is recommended by the Department RPT Advisory Committee and/or the Department Chair. The procedures of the committee are governed by College Policy 1-05: College Committees.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures

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

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

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae and (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans, in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chairperson 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 a shared-appointment with another academic unit, the Department Chairperson shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Department prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

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

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

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

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the initial report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the Department Chairperson shall prepare a 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 the candidate's 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/creative work, 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. Department Chairperson Responsibilities. 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 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Department Chairperson will also request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that the candidate sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters. The Department Chairperson will also solicit the department faculty for suggestions on possible external evaluators.

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 candidate who has a shared-appointment with another academic unit, the Department Chairperson shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress, which should be submitted to the Department prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

At least three weeks prior to the closing of the file, the Department Chair shall notify the college's ASUU Student Senator and the Department RPT-SAC(s) of the upcoming review, inform them that their report(s) shall be due no later than the file closing date, and ensure training for all RPT-SAC members. Training shall cover, but need not be limited to, the process for and importance of student input into the RPT process, teaching expectations under the departmental RPT Statement, and recognition of unconscious bias. The Department Chair shall also provide the RPT-SAC(s) with a copy of the University's form for RPT-SAC reports. Following training, the Department Chair shall provide the RPT-SAC members with the candidate's relevant teaching-related materials (including at least two different forms of evidence).

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

- c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chairperson shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.
- d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Department Chairperson and the person selected to oversee the candidate's file, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit and secure 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 will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, an abbreviated dossier of research/creative works selected by the candidate, notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and a copy of this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluation letters no later than September 15.
- e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).
 - 1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans for research/creative activity, teaching, and service. The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University. The candidate should designate which of the research products/creative works the candidate wishes to be included in the abbreviated dossier that will be sent to external evaluators.
 - 2) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents*. The Department Chairperson shall ensure that the file includes: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (ii) available SAC reports, (iii) any written recommendations from department faculty and staff, (iv) any reports from joint/shared appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) peer teaching reviews, (vii) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (viii) all other required materials.
- f. Candidate's Rights to Comment on File. A candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of the file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.
- g. Formal Review—Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.
 - 1) *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action*. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but no later than

October 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research/creative activity, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Department 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 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 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 a 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. The candidate may waive this response period by providing to the Department Chairperson a written statement indicating their intent to waive. After the

conclusion of the response period (or the candidate's waiver of that period), the Department Chairperson will forward to the chairperson of the College RPT Advisory Committee the candidate's complete file, including the Department Chairperson's recommendation.

- 3) *College RPT Advisory Committee Action.* Consistent with standards and procedures stated in the College Policy 1-05: College Committees, Charter of the College of Architecture + Planning, the College RPT Advisory Committee shall review each formal review for retention, promotion, or tenure, and retention reviews if termination is recommended, after action by the department chairperson. In each case, the committee shall determine whether the department reasonably applied its written criteria, standards, and procedures to each case and whether the department's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented. The College RPT Advisory Committee shall provide a copy of its written report and recommendations to the candidate and forward the candidate's complete file, including the Committee's report and recommendations, to the Dean.
- 4) *Dean Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Dean shall prepare a 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 College RPT Advisory Committee's and the Dean's recommendations. The candidate may waive this response period by providing to the Dean a written statement indicating their intent to waive.
- 5) *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, recommendations of the Department Chairperson and Dean, 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. Candidates should indicate which research/creative work materials they wish to be included in the abbreviated dossier that will be sent to external evaluators for their review.

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include 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 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 recent research works and documentation of creative works. For each co-authored work, the candidate should provide a statement explaining their contribution to the work.
4. Course syllabi for all courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and

handouts the candidate chooses to include. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and SAC 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 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 the 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 Chairperson, or Committee Chairperson)

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

Review Committee Approval:

 _____	<u>09/14/2021</u> _____
Trina Rich, SFRSC Committee Secretary	Date

Senior Vice President Approval:

 _____	<u>09/22/2021</u> _____
Sarah Projansky, Designee	Date