COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

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

Approved by Department of Anthropology's Tenure-line Faculty: April 30, 2019

Approved by Dean: April 25, 2019

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on December 16, 2019 and the Senior Vice President on February 6, 2020, for implementation on July 1, 2020

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

Mission Statement
Anthropology is the comparative, evolutionary and historical study of humankind. Our internationally respected faculty takes a theoretically driven, empirically informed approach to research on humans and other primates. Our core mission is to discover and communicate new knowledge through basic and strategic research, the foundation from which we educate and train scientifically literate and intellectually engaged citizens and equip them with relevant skills for living in the globally connected world.

Table of Contents

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 July 1, 2020. 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. <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 Department of Anthropology 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.

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, 4rth	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 Chair, according to University Policy.

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

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

2.2 Informal Reviews

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on RPT expectations to candidates. A primary function of the informal review is to provide advice in developing the file that will be made available for the formal review process, with due attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: research/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 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 without Tenure

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

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research/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. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: excellent, effective, and not satisfactory.

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

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

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

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

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of excellent in research/creative activity, at least sustained *effectiveness* in teaching, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service.

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

Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in research/creative activity resulting in a national and international reputation in his or her field, at least *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

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.

a. Description of research/creative activity.

The candidate's research should be of high quality, showing originality, depth, and impact. In order to evaluate research quality, the RPT Advisory Committee will consider the following:

- external evaluation letters from experts in the field outside the department (for formal reviews)

- number of citations per year in citation indices such as Scopus and Google Scholar. Candidates whose areas of research are not well represented in Scopus may suggest other indices, as appropriate. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to be visible in citation indices, and their work should show evidence of continued impact.

- published reviews (if any) of the candidate's work

- quality and number of the candidate's publications, including the publication of original research papers in refereed journals

- title, source, and amount of all research grants

- Presentations at conferences, workshops, colloquia or seminars. Keynote, plenary, and invited talks

- additional relevant information from the candidate's CV, such as (a) appointments to editorial boards and grant review panels and (b) awards and honors received

b. Research Funding

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and the Department of Anthropology and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the university. A candidate must therefore demonstrate that he or she has either acquired funding that will help sustain his or her research program or that he or she has made significant efforts to obtain such funding and will continue to do so.

c. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/creative activity as described above.
Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

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. <u>Course instruction</u>

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 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.

b. <u>Curriculum and program development</u>

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. <u>Student advising and mentoring</u>

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.

<u>Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.</u> Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching described above.

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

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 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 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, and consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines.

d. Summary Rating Scale for Service. Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above.

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

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, 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 Chair. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Department of Anthropology faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.

d. Secretary. The Secretary prepares a report about an RPT candidate for consideration by the RPT Advisory Committee. A Secretary is appointed for a candidate's informal and formal reviews. The Secretary is tenured and qualified by rank to vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the candidate. They are selected in consultation with the candidate by the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee.

e. Department Chair. The administrative head of the department.

f. Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee (USAC). A committee made up of representatives of undergraduate majors.

g. Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC). A committee made up of representatives of graduate students.

h. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair.

i. External Evaluators. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair and Chair of the Department in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work. (Please see 4.3.d for more details.) 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, advisor, mentor, or close collaborator of the candidate. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures

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

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

    The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (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 Chair of the Department by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 15.

In the case of a candidate having a "shared" appointment with another unit, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Department prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

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

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

The RPT Advisory Committee Chair will appoint the Secretary to review the candidate's file, meet with the candidate, and write an ad hoc informal review report that summarizes the candidate's progress. 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 Secretary's report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the Secretary'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 Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, the Department Chair and the Secretary shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Department Chair 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. <u>First-Year Informal Review.</u> The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The Department Chair 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 Chair will then 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.

1. <u>Chair of the Department Responsibilities.</u> By April 1, the Department Chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Department Chair by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Department Chair will also request

nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

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

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

The Department Chair will notify both the Graduate and Undergraduate Student Advisory Committees of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are each informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluations, and inform them that their reports shall be due to the Department Chair no later than September 15. The Department Chair must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SACs no later than August 1. The SACs are 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.

2. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chair will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint a Secretary to oversee the candidate's file in the RPT process.

3. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Chair of the Department 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.

4. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five to seven potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee Chair, after consulting with the Department Chair and the Secretary, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than five 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 two external evaluators will be from the candidate's list. The Department Chair will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

5. 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).

   a. *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents.* Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chair 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.

b. *Department Responsibilities for File Contents.* The Department Chair 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 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.

6. <u>Candidate's Rights to Comment on File.</u> 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, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

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

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

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

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

2)   *Department Chair Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Department Chair shall prepare 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 Chair, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

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

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

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

Candidate's Responsibility

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

1. Curriculum Vitae. 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 anonymous 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 and a summary of citations.

3. Hard copies or digital files of recent 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. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers, the Graduate and Undergraduate SACs, and the RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee to use this material for their reports.

5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the

Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research is unclear, the candidate may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.

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

Department's Responsibility

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

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.

2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.

3. Graduate and Undergraduate 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 shared appointment.

5. Copies of all prior years' RPT reports.

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

7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Department Chair describing the candidate's service to the 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
   b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae
   c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, Department Chair, or Committee Chair)

9. Report of RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

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

Review Committee Approval:

_____   12.19.2019_____
Trina Rich, SFRSC Committee   Date
Secretary

Senior Vice President Approval:

_____   2.6.2020_____
Sarah Projansky, Designee   Date