

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

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

Version 3 (April 24, 2009)

(a) *Summary Checklist*

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

- A. ____ Reference to relevant U-Policies.
- B. ____ Reference to relevant college rules & practices.

II. DEPT. *CRITERIA & EVIDENCE* DESCRIPTION.

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

III. DEPT. *STANDARDS* DESCRIPTION.

- A. Retention-- formal pre-tenure reviews
 - 1. Clarity of standards for
 - (a) ____ teaching, (b) ____ research/creative, (c) ____ service,
& (d) ____ responsible conduct--if applicable.
 - 2. ____ Comparison to final review--clarity.
- B. Informal pre-tenure reviews
 - 1. ____ Descriptions of applicable standards, if any, are consistent with U-Policy principle of "clearly adequate progress" toward tenure.
 - 2. Best practices:
 - a. ____ Triggered review option, clearly referenced.
- C. Tenure reviews {*most important !!*)
 - 1. Clarity of standards for
 - (a) ____ teaching, (b) ____ research/creative, (c) ____ service,
& (d) ____ responsible conduct--if applicable.

D. Promotion in rank--.

1. Clarity of standards for each step.

a. Assistant to *Associate* Prof.

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

b. Associate to *full Professor*

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

IV. Overall– Criteria & Standards

A. General compliance with core principles of U-Policies.

1. High standards.

a. _____ Effectiveness, at minimum.

b. _____ Excellence.

c. _____ Responsible conduct.

2. _____ Overall thoroughness of criteria and standards.

B. Best Practices.

1. _____ Dept. philosophy and mission clearly stated.

2. _____ Overall clarity of *criteria & standards*.

3. _____ Reasonableness of any plan for implementing significant changes—if applicable.

V. DEPT. PROCEDURES DESCRIPTION.

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

1. _____ Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies.

2. Local options.

a. _____ Normal length of pre-tenure probationary period, clearly defined.

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

c. _____ Extending/shortening periods, rules clearly described—if applicable.

d. _____ Post-tenure promotion schedule, clearly described--if applicable.

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

1. _____ Meets minimum requirements of/ shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policies.

2. Local Options.

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

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

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

C. Procedures for *formal* reviews.

1. Notices/ opportunities to submit information.

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

2. Candidate file --deadline, right of review, contents, custody.
 - a. Meets minimum requirements of/shows no apparent inconsistency with U-Policy--- regarding

- (i) ___ deadline for closing file,
- (ii) ___ candidate's right to review & respond,
- (iii) ___ contents of file in all categories mandated by U-Policy.

- b. ___ Other contents adequately described.
- c. ___ Persons responsible for file adequately described.
- d. ___ File custody & availability.

3. External evaluation procedures.

- a. ___ Adequately describes dept. rules regarding external evaluation options.
- b. ___ Evidence in lieu of external evaluations for retention, clarity of rule --if applicable.

- c. ___ Internal evaluations, clarity of rule.
- d. Best practices: *[reserved]*

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

D. Procedures for *informal* reviews.

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

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

2. Local options:

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

3. Best practices:

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

reviews.

- E. ___ Overall *fairness* of review procedures.

VI.. Overall- Dept. Statement

Best Practices:

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

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

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

(b) Guidelines for Reviews—keyed to the summary checklist

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“S”= Satisfactory (no further work needed)

“U” = Unsatisfactory (must be revised)

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

“?” = Reviewer has questions to discuss

“NA”= Not applicable in this case.

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

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

A. ___Reference to relevant **U-Policies**. (Statement adequately instructs readers to consult contents of relevant U-Policies, especially (Policy 6-311, formerly PPM 8-6) & (Policy 6-303, formerly PPM 9-5.1), and does not include any potentially misleading or confusing descriptions of U-Policies. Although URPTSC generally recommends against repeating lengthy portions of U-Policy in dept. statement, or attempting to paraphrase contents of U-Policy, a statement containing such elements may be approved if there is no significant risk of confusing or misleading readers about meaning of U-Policies. Best practice is to provide RPT candidates with a URL link to, or accurate copy of, contents of U-Policies.)

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

II. DEPT. CRITERIA & EVIDENCE DESCRIPTION.

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

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

A. Teaching

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

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

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

Best practices: The URPTSC's view is that standard course evaluations from students are useful, but taken alone do not provide enough information to assess teaching quality, and strongly recommends that depts. employ a broader array of information sources as evidence regarding teaching. Information taken into account might include: the number of courses and the number of different courses taught; curriculum development; course materials; teaching assistant supervision; student advisement activities; examples of feedback given to students; examples of student work; student accomplishments attributable to the quality of teaching--including students' awards; Student Advisory Committee reports; student exit interviews; input from alumni; teaching awards; and peer evaluations. However, caution should be taken in giving weight to informal/ anecdotal comments. SAC reports “should be based on guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson.” (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-3). URPTSC encourages depts. to seek assistance from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence in determining how to gather and interpret data on teaching quality. (See <http://www.ctle.utah.edu/>).

B. Research /creative activity.

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

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

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

C. Service (university, professional, public).

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

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

D. Responsible conduct.

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

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

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

III. DEPT. STANDARDS DESCRIPTION.

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

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

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

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

B. Informal pre-tenure reviews

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

2. Best practices:

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

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

1. Clarity of standards for

(a) _____ teaching, (b) _____ research/creative, (c) _____ service,
& (d) _____ responsible conduct--if applicable.

D. Promotion in rank--

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

a. Assistant to **Associate Prof.**

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

b. Associate to *full Professor*

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

IV. **Overall**– Criteria & Standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

-- “emphasize the university’s commitment to the achievement and maintenance of *academic excellence*,”

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

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

-- For “promotion in rank ... record for [teaching & research/creative activity] must demonstrate *continuing professional growth* at a level appropriate to the particular rank.” “Promotion... is..

acknowledgment ... of *continuing and increasing professional competence* and responsibility in teaching, research and creative work, and University and public service,”

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

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

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

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

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

B. Best Practices.

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

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

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

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

V. DEPT. PROCEDURES DESCRIPTION.

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

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

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

(See U-Policy 6-311 4-A, formerly PPM 8-6-4-A; Policy 6-303, formerly PPM 9-5.1).)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- selection of RPT chairperson --& states clearly if dept. limits eligibility to full profs. or allows tenured assoc.prof. to serve,

--selection of secretary
-- voter eligibility for each category of decision -- Retention & Tenure = only tenured faculty, regardless of rank. Promotion = same or higher rank, regardless of tenure -- (see Policy 6-303-III-A-3, formerly PPM 9-5.1- A-3). *Check for compliance with 2007 change in U-Policy, changing eligibility of voters on retention and tenure.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

–schedule of subcommittee’s work.)

C. Procedures for *formal reviews*.

1. **Notices/ opportunities to submit** information.

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

(No apparent conflict with U-Policies regarding notice of upcoming review meetings/

- opportunities for input, with deadlines prior to RPT Committee meeting) given to
- candidate --30 days;
 - dept. faculty --3 weeks;
 - dept. staff --3 weeks-- *Check compliance with this 2005 change in U-Policy;*
 - students--SAC --minimum 3 weeks to prepare report;
 - any concerned academic program, if applicable.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. External evaluation procedures.

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

(Clear description of dept. rules regarding these options:

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

b. _____ **Evidence in lieu of external evaluations for retention, clarity of rule** --if

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

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

d. Best practices:

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

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

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

Best practices:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. ____ **Role of SAC** --if applicable (If dept. chooses to involve SAC in informal

reviews—has adequate description of role of SAC, including any use of a SAC report.),

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

d. _____ Role of Dept. Chair's designee --if applicable (Adequate description of having meeting with candidate conducted by a *designee* of dept. chairperson, rather than chairperson--including procedure & criteria for appointing designee, and procedure for notifying candidate of such appointment.),

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

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

3. Best practices:

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

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

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

VI. Overall– Dept. Statement

Best Practices:

_____ **Gender-specific** language is avoided.

_____ **Terminology** used is **consistent** throughout.

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

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

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

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

--end--