

## **COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS DEPARTMENT OF FILM & MEDIA ARTS**

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

#### **Revision 1: Minor edits in 2025**

Approved by Department Tenure-line Faculty: March 7, 2025

Approved by Dean John Scheib: March 21, 2025

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on April 22, 2025 and the Senior Vice President on May 9, 2025, for implementation on July 1, 2025.

#### **Revision 0: 2017 Submission**

Approved by Department Tenure-line Faculty: December 11, 2015

Approved by Dean: January 22, 2016

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on September 16, 2016 and the Senior Vice President on July 1, 2017, for implementation on July 1, 2017.

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

### **DEPARTMENT MISSION**

The Department of Film & Media Arts is committed to the creative, scholarly, and professional development of our students and faculty; and the interdisciplinary nature of the artistic enterprise. Building on our strengths, we seek to create an environment that welcomes inquiry, provokes change, and inspires innovation. We are dedicated to service to the greater University community and to making a difference in the global neighborhood we all share.

We believe our students deserve a holistic understanding of the cinematic and media arts to prepare them to fulfill their aspirations as artists, academics, and citizens. Our curriculum combines strong grounding in history and criticism with a solid base in film production, animation, and new media arts.

Thus each faculty member should: (1) uphold departmental policies which have been accepted by a majority of the faculty, (2) exhibit respect for opinions differing from their own position, (3) work to develop and revise mutually acceptable goals for the Department, (4) support the work of colleagues, (5) have a knowledge of the University milieu and an understanding of the role of the Department of Film & Media Arts in an institution of higher learning, and (6) understand the demands and opportunities of the discipline, including national trends. Finally, because the philosophy of the Department of Film & Media Arts places equal value on the artistic and scholarly aspects of the discipline, faculty of the Department should exhibit support for both of these strands of the curriculum.

## Table of Contents

1.	Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty.....	3
2.	Informal and Formal Reviews .....	3
2.1	Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period.....	3
	Table 1: Normal Review Schedule.....	3
2.2	Informal Reviews .....	4
2.3	Triggering Formal Retention Reviews .....	4
2.4	Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor Rank without Tenure .....	4
2.5	Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor.....	4
3.	RPT Guidelines.....	5
3.1	Summary of RPT Standards .....	5
3.2	Evaluation of Creative and/or Scholarly Research.....	5
3.3	Evaluation of Teaching.....	8
3.4	Evaluation of Service .....	9
4.	RPT Procedures.....	11
4.1	Participants .....	11
4.2	Informal Review Procedures .....	12
4.3	Formal Review Procedures.....	13
	Appendix A: RPT File Contents.....	17
	Candidate's Responsibility.....	17
	Department's Responsibility .....	18
	Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval.....	20

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

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of the date on page 1. 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 this date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior RPT requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Department Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to external evaluators.

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

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

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

a. Timing. To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and to make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Department will conduct either informal or formal reviews of its tenure-track candidates in each year of their probationary period as indicated in Table 1 below.

b. Normal probationary period. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor is seven years. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is five years.

Candidates with a seven-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year.

Candidates with a five-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the third year.

**Table 1: Normal Review Schedule**

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

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be "triggered" by the Department RPT Advisory Committee, the Department Chair, or the Dean, 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, 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: creative and/or scholarly research; teaching; and service to the profession, university, and public.

## **2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews**

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

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

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

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

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when they have met the requirements for that rank. The

Department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of the rank of Associate Professor and tenure shall be considered 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) creative and/or scholarly research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

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

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

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

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

Tenure and Associate Professor: A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research or teaching, at least *an extended record of effectiveness* in the other, and at least *an extended record of effectiveness* in service.

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

#### **3.2 Evaluation of Creative and/or Scholarly Research**

Judgments about a candidate's creative and/or scholarly research are based on both the quality and quantity of research and their relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive creative and/or scholarly research, however, may differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of creative and/or scholarly

research 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 creative and/or scholarly research.

Faculty members in the Department are expected to establish and develop a professional and/or scholarly identity through dissemination of their work in regional, national and/or international venues. Faculty members may focus on either creative work or scholarly work, or a combination of the two. They are encouraged to engage in a range of activities in support of the dissemination of their work. Assessment is based on a clear demonstration of active, ongoing, and substantive commitment to the practice of the art of film and/or other media arts and/or on scholarly research that principally includes electronic or print publication by a scholarly press or organization.

- 1) *Evidence for evaluation of creative and/or scholarly research:* Faculty members are expected to create a coherent agenda of creative and/or scholarly research from activities that may include:
  - a. Active record of screenings or performances or alternative exhibition methods for films and/or other media arts—whether solo or collaborative—in wide and/or peer-reviewed distribution or dissemination contexts, including in film festivals, theatrical runs, streaming and other digital platforms, invited screenings, and at conferences and symposia, and/or in reputable, rigorous web-based formats. (In all instances it should be clear exactly what role or roles the candidate has played in each piece of work).
  - b. Publication of a single or co-authored scholarly text.
  - c. Publication of a single- or co-edited scholarly book or journal special issue.
  - d. Publication of essays or substantial entries in peer-reviewed journals, scholarly books, and/or conference proceedings.
  - e. Review(s) of books, film festivals, individual films, and other media arts authored by the faculty member and published in peer-reviewed publications.
  - f. Presentation of a juried paper at a conference or of an invited public lecture at a college or university, symposium, or gallery.
  - g. Commissions, options, awards, residencies, grants, and/or fellowships for research.
  - h. Publishing curriculum or other educational materials, including textbooks.
  - i. Curation or programming activities.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in creative and/or scholarly research, a candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate activities not listed here. In this case, the candidate shall describe the impact of the work. Throughout the review process, each level of review will consider the weight of such activities and will describe this consideration in their report/letter.

2) *Assessment factors.*

- a. *Assistant Professor.* An assistant professor has command of creative and/or scholarly aspects of the discipline of film and media arts and demonstrates comprehension of the discipline as a whole.
- b. *Associate Professor.* In addition to the qualifications listed above for an assistant professor, an associate professor should be an emerging expert in their area(s) of

the discipline of film and media arts. Expertise is evidenced by substantial creative work and/or publication beyond that demonstrated at the Assistant Professor rank.

- c. *Professor*. In addition to the qualifications listed above for associate professor, a professor shows evidence of substantial command of the discipline as well as continued growth within their area(s) of specialization. Expertise is evidenced by substantial creative work and/or publication beyond that demonstrated at the Associate Professor rank. The individual should be an acknowledged expert in their area(s) of specialization.
- d. *Quantity of research activity*. For assistant professors, both continuous and new creative and/or scholarly productivity is expected. For associate professors and professors, substantive new work annually along with continuous, regular creative and/or scholarly productivity is expected.
- e. *Quality of research venue*: Quality of venue is highly variable and is assessed in relationship to the type of project being presented. Quality of creative work can be judged by the inclusion of that work in established regional, national, or international festivals and alternative venues; and/or critical review of the creative works in professional publications. Quality of scholarly work can be judged by the inclusion of that work in peer-reviewed publications, especially by peer-reviewed journals and/or university or professional presses.
- f. *Impact on the field at large*. For assistant professors, it is encouraged that the research extends the understanding of film and/or media arts and/or upholds standards as defined by the current field. Local and regional research is expected of all candidates for retention at the rank of Assistant Professor. For associate professors, it is expected that the research extends the understanding of film and/or media arts and/or upholds standards as defined by the current field. Regional, national and/or internationally research is expected of associate professors. For professors, it is expected that the research extend the understanding of film and/or media arts and/or uphold standards as defined by the current field. National or internationally acknowledged research excellence is expected of professors.

b. Research Funding.

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this Department and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the University. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding will be considered as appropriate to contributing positively toward one's research.

c. Summary Rating Scale for Creative and/or Scholarly Research. Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of creative and/or scholarly research as described above.

*Excellent*: The candidate has established an extended record of meritorious contributions over time in one or more topic areas of research, and there is evidence of making a significant impact on the profession at large. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent and substantial agenda.

*Effective*: The candidate has made notable contributions in one or more topic areas of research,

and there is evidence of making an impact on the profession at large. 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 substandard contributions, and there is no particular impact beyond the University or immediate community.

### **3.3 Evaluation of Teaching**

Teachers in the Department are expected to understand and practice sound pedagogical principles and techniques. Teachers are therefore expected: (1) to promote students' learning, (2) to continue to question, grow, and learn themselves, and (3) to serve as models of curiosity and creativity for students and colleagues.

Teaching ability is, in part, demonstrated by: (1) a current understanding and knowledge of film and media arts as a discipline; (2) an ability to demonstrate a connection between scholarly and artistic research and teaching; (3) an ability to give clear, articulate, verbal form to abstract and/or subtle ideas; (4) an ability to present materials in a well-organized manner, both orally and in writing; (5) an ability to understand university students and to work effectively with them, including as a mentor; (6) an ability to stimulate students' desire to learn as evidenced by students' accomplishments; and (7) an availability for student interaction and counseling, including in accord with departmental advising policies.

An assistant professor is expected to exhibit all of the indicators of teaching ability listed above.

An associate professor must offer evidence of continual innovation and maturity and should be able to contribute substantially to the graduate program and to graduate students' theses and committees, and is expected to become more masterful of the indicators of teaching ability listed above.

A professor must be an authority in their areas of teaching and must possess the kind of teaching expertise and professional dedication that will serve as a model for both students and colleagues. Likewise, a candidate for professor must possess multiplicity of teaching expertise within the undergraduate and graduate curricula, and should be able to contribute substantially to the graduate program and to graduate students' theses and committees. A candidate for professor is expected to become definitively masterful on the indicators of teaching ability listed above.

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, counseling and advising of students in general, and other pedagogical activities. There are therefore four components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, (3) student advising and mentoring, and (4) additional activities.

#### **a. Description of teaching.**

- 1) *Course instruction.* Course instruction encompasses (a) classroom instruction, (b) online and distance education teaching, (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs, and/or (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 their personal



statement; (b) the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and/or other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and/or other public presentations (formal reviews only), (d) information from student course feedback forms; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports (formal reviews only).

Periodic and systematic student course feedback via University- approved instruments will also be considered as performance indicators applicable to teaching, but the Department recognizes that student feedback is vulnerable to various forms of bias and may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction. Therefore, feedback scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence. In particular, written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used by the instructor for improvement, but must be understood as one of several evidence sources.

Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, samples of student work, 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.

- 2) *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. An example of this kind of contribution is the development and teaching of new courses.
- 3) *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, as collaborators in creative work, and/or as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.
- 4) *Additional activities.* Teaching may also include invited teaching inside or outside the University or other relevant activities.

b. Summary rating scale for teaching. Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the four components of teaching described above.

*Excellent:* The candidate has established an extended record of meritorious contributions over time in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring, and may have engaged in additional teaching activities as well.

*Effective:* The candidate has made notable 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 substandard 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.

The Department encourages assistant professors to limit their service activity to the Department during their first year on the tenure track. Service activity for an assistant professor would be at least at the Department and/or College levels but could also be at the University, community, regional, or national levels.

Service activity for an associate professor would be at the Department, College, University, and/or community or regional levels, but could also include service at the national and/or international levels.

A professor must have made notable contributions and must be generally regarded as a significant contributor in the area of service locally and/or nationally. A professor is expected to serve actively as a mentor for the junior faculty. A professor is required to exhibit a willingness to assume and fulfill service responsibilities not only in the Department, University, and/or community, but also at national and/or international levels.

a. Description of service.

- 1) *Professional service.* This refers primarily to professional participation at a national and/or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices, especially within organizations that represent the discipline, such as the Society for Cinema and Media Studies; participating in the organization or operation of conferences, competitions, or festivals; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); presenting professional workshops; and serving as an artist or consultant (as appropriate within University guidelines) for other colleges, universities, professional organizations, or arts entities. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals or presses; and adjudication for professional organizations and competitions.
- 2) *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; serving in administrative positions; or serving as a participant in official events at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.
- 3) *Public service.* This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and/or 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; or presenting lectures, demonstrations, master classes, workshops, or films or creating and directing community-based work for state or community organizations.

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

*Excellent*: The candidate has established an extended record of meritorious contributions over time to the profession, the University, and/or the public.

*Effective*: The candidate has made notable contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area to have established a record of continuing contributions in and commitment to that area.

*Not Satisfactory*: The candidate has made substandard 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, University Policy determines membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The Committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.
- c. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Department faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure- line faculty members eligible to participate in the election.
- d. Department Chair. The administrative head of the Department.
- e. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of undergraduate and graduate students in the Department.
- f. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the Department Chair.
- g. External Evaluators. These are creative artists and/or scholars from outside the University of Utah or from the University of Utah but from outside the Department selected by the Department Chair—in consultation with the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair and the candidate—to evaluate the candidate's creative and/or scholarly work. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of research excellence. Additionally, they shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review, or they shall be professionals in the field with commensurate experience with that academic rank. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with

the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

## **4.2 Informal Review Procedures**

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

a. 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; (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of creative and/or scholarly research, teaching, and service; a description of the research agenda; a description of teaching philosophy; and a description of future plans in creative and/or scholarly research, teaching, and service; (iii) evidence of research, and (iv) course syllabi. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 30.

In the case of a candidate having a joint appointment in another academic department or a shared appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Department 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 may 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 will meet to discuss the file, and the RPT Advisory Committee Secretary (appointed by the Committee Chair) shall prepare a summary report of the meeting. 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, all members of the Committee shall sign the report, and then 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. After reviewing the candidate's file and the RPT Advisory Committee report, the Department Chair shall prepare their written recommendation to be included in the file. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee and/or the recommendation of the Department Chair. After all informal reviews, the Department Chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and their progress, and the Department Chair shall forward the file to the Dean. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Department Chair, a majority of the members of the RPT Advisory Committee, or the Dean 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 review is intended to encourage active, fruitful dialogue with new faculty. The Department Chair, RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and the candidate's faculty mentor (if applicable) will review the candidate's CV, creative and/or scholarly research, teaching evaluations, course syllabi, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The Department Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file no more than ten business days following the meeting. The candidate has the opportunity, but not the obligation, to make a written response to the review within seven days of receiving the report, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

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

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format, except that external evaluation letters from outside the University are not solicited for a mid-probationary retention review. External evaluation letters from within the University but outside the Department are solicited for all formal reviews.

a. Department Chair Responsibilities. By April 1, the Department Chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year, will notify in writing the faculty members required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing to be reviewed formally 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 the appropriate type of external evaluators and request that they 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 joint appointment in another academic department or a shared appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, 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 joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Department Chair will notify the Student Advisory Committee of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform the SAC that reports shall be due to the Department Chair no later than September 15. The Department Chair must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than August 25. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and mentoring, and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for

each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The elected RPT Advisory Committee Chair will convene the RPT Advisory Committee and assign a secretary for each candidate.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chair shall ensure that two or more Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct one peer teaching review each and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. By June 1, candidates must provide a list of two potential external evaluators from within the University but outside the Department (this may include persons internal to the College of Fine Arts), and—for tenure and/or promotion reviews—four potential external evaluators from outside the University. Candidates must provide any information about potential conflicts for any potential reviewers. For the formal mid-probationary retention review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the RPT Advisory Committee Chair and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit and acquire no fewer than one external evaluation from within the University, but outside the Department (this may include persons internal to the College of Fine Arts). For tenure and/or promotion to either Associate Professor or Professor, a minimum of one external evaluation from within the University, but outside the Department (this may include persons internal to the College of Fine Arts); and a minimum of three evaluators from outside of the University, at least one of whom shall come from the candidate's list, shall be solicited and acquired. 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, the department RPT standards. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for any report from a joint/shared unit, which is due October 5, and materials specified 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 Department Chair to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current CV, (ii) copies of publications and/or other forms of creative and/or scholarly work, (iii) course syllabi, and (iv) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of creative and/or scholarly research, teaching, and service; a description of the research agenda; a description of teaching philosophy; and a description of future plans in creative and/or scholarly research, teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit other relevant materials.
- 2) *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 joint/shared appointment units, (v) the appropriate type of external evaluator letters (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 their file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.

g. 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 or joint appointing unit, but no later than October 15. A quorum for any meeting of the RPT Advisory Committee shall consist of 2/3 of its members. 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 (creative and/or scholarly research, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Department Chair may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote (by secret ballot, if requested by at least one member of the RPT Advisory Committee) 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 Committee's report 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 a sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be 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, each member of the Committee shall sign the report, and then the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Department Chair and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

The candidate is to be informed of the Committee recommendation by the Committee Chair as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or

outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chair about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

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



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

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

### **Candidate's Responsibility**

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

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:
  - a. All creative works and/or research publications since the candidate began their professional career. Please state if acceptance was based on peer review or another selection method. For publications, please list inclusive page numbers.
  - b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.
  - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
  - d. Honors received for creative and/or scholarly work.
  - e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.
  - f. Individual student research supervised.
  - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
  - h. All courses taught.
  - i. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.
2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in creative and/or scholarly research; teaching; and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy and of the research agenda.
3. Copies of or URL links to recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.
4. Documentation of or URL links to creative works, such as still images, video, and/or sound files.
5. 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. Candidates should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and the SAC to use this material

for their reports.

6. Other relevant materials may be included, 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.
7. 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 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/shared appointment.
5. All previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal and informal reviews, i.e. SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present).
6. For promotion to Professor, the candidate's CV at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as an associate professor).
7. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
8. 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.
9. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived their 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, RPT Advisory Committee Chair, or RPT Advisory Committee member)

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


### **Revision 1 Approvals:**

*Review Committee Approval:*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Trina Rich, SFRSC Committee  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
April 22, 2025  
Date

*Senior Vice President Approval:*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah Projansky, Designee

\_\_\_\_\_  
May 9, 2025  
Date

### **Revision 0 Approvals:**

*Review Committee Approval:*

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
09/16/16  
Date

*Senior Vice President Approval:*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Amy J. Wildermuth, designee

\_\_\_\_\_  
07/01/17  
Date