COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

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

Approved by Department of Linguistics Tenure-line Faculty: January 15, 2019

Approved by Dean: September 10, 2018

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on March 16, 2019 and the Senior Vice President on April 25, 2019 for implementation on July 1, 2019.

This document serves as the Department of Linguistics 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

The aims of the Department of Linguistics are to provide the highest quality possible teaching for undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Utah; to encourage and sustain excellent research in the discipline by faculty members, graduate students, and undergraduates; and to provide appropriate professional service to the University and off-campus communities. Tenure-line faculty members are appointed after extensive national searches, and their work is reviewed periodically (see U Policies and Procedures 6-321) to assist them in career development and to evaluate their contributions in research, teaching and service. Appointments, promotions, awards of tenure, and post-tenure reviews are governed by university regulations (see 6-303 and 6-311 http://www.regulations.utah.edu/info/policyList.html) and the following departmental guidelines. This document serves as the departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures required by University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-a.

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of [date]. 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 Department Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations.

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

2. Informal and Formal Reviews

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

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

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

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

Table 1: Normal Review Schedule

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

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be "triggered" by the College RPT Advisory Committee or the Department 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 Rank Without Tenure

The Department 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 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. As permitted by Policy, this unit will use a four-level scale for evaluating performance: excellent, very good, effective, and not satisfactory. On this scale, the standard very good is located between the standards of excellent and effective in University Policy.

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

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

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

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

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

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.

We expect candidates to contribute significantly and distinctly to the development and dissemination of new knowledge. In order to do so, we expect candidates to produce high quality scholarly work at an appropriate rate for the discipline. Quantity of research/creative activity is not judged by simple publication counts or impact factors. A series of publications over time that represents sustained research in one or more topic areas is expected. We also expect the candidate to demonstrate that his or her research program is on a positive and productive trajectory over time and is sustainable. Evidence of a sustainable trajectory may include, for example, internal grants obtained or external grant applications.

The following will be considered in evaluating the quality of a candidate's research and scholarship according to accepted publishing patterns in the candidate's own research area:

  • Publication of original research papers in peer-refereed journals and peer-refereed proceedings of a conference. The prestige of the journals and conferences and the quality, as well as number, of publications will be considered.

  • Publication of scholarly books, research monographs and edited volumes.

  • Publication of book chapters (both peer-reviewed and invited) and encyclopedia articles.

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

  • External research grants obtained[1].

b. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

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

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, 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, and there is strong evidence of impact on the field, both nationally and internationally. In measuring impact, we consider visibility of the research and the candidate's reputation of advancing the field. A candidates accomplishment of excellence in research is demonstrated by an established record of high-quality publications[2]. We consider the quality and professional status of the presses, journals, and venues in which a work is published or presented; how the work is evaluated or selected for publication or presentation, as well as its subsequent impact and how it is received. To help measure quality and impact as accurately as possible, we seek the opinions of both external evaluators and department faculty.
Note: Evidence of *sustained* contributions is found in the quality and quantity of research that reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. In order to meet the standard of a *substantial* contribution, the candidate's record must provide strong evidence of high quality published research, which has a demonstrable positive impact on the field. The fact that a faculty member is engaged in continuing and on-going research activities over the period of time under review

---

[1]   These grants are limited to those which are awarded through a peer-review process.
[2]   A publication is typically considered high-quality if it appears in a respected professional venue and has been subject to a rigorous blind or double-blind peer-review process.

provides evidence of a commitment to the production of new knowledge, but it does not provide evidence of quality.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. While there is a record of the impact of the candidates research on the field, it need not rise to the same level as that in the ranking of excellent. Note: Evidence of *sustained* contributions is found in the quality and quantity of research that reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. A *significant* contribution exceeds what is considered acceptable, but does not rise to the same level as a substantial contribution.

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 continue to be made over time and that the candidates rating will increase as a result. Note: Evidence of *sustained* contributions is found in the quality and quantity of research that reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. The expectation that significant contributions will be made over time and that the candidate's rating will increase as a result represent *acceptable* contributions.

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.

1. Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review 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.

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. 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.

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 and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.

Summary Rating Scale for Teaching

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

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. The candidates contributions in these areas have had a demonstrable impact on the program, and/or the candidate has achieved national/international recognition, as evidenced by such things as publications on pedagogy or program development or awards from recognized organizations. Note: For a rating of *excellent*, *sustained* refers to contributions in all three areas of teaching— course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. In order to meet the standard of a *substantial* contribution, the candidate's record must provide strong evidence of high quality teaching, a demonstrable impact on the program, and successful student advising and mentoring.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. The candidates work in this area has improved or maintained the program and/or resulted in publications on pedagogy or program development. Note: For a rating of very good, sustained refers to contributions in all three areas of teaching—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, or student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions will be significant, i.e., rise to the level of very good. For a rating of *effective, sustained* refers to contributions in course instruction

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

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

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession and the University, and/or the public, and has demonstrated leadership in one or more areas of service. For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must have made substantial, sustained contributions in university service, and either the profession or public service, or both. Public service will only be considered if it is tied to the candidate's research or teaching. *Sustained* contributions are determined by the quality and quantity of service. *Substantial* contributions are determined by the candidate's leadership in one or more areas of service. For service to be considered excellent, it must extend beyond administrative appointments for which one receives additional compensation: this includes appointments in any of standard administrative ranks, including department chair, program director, dean, associate dean, vice president, and associate vice president.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. For a rating of very good, the candidate must have made sustained contributions in university service and either the profession or public service, or both. Public service will only be considered if it is tied to the candidate's research or teaching.

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. <u>Department RPT Advisory Committee</u>. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.

c. <u>RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson</u>. The Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Department faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.

d. Ad Hoc Subcommittee. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee prepares a report about an RPT candidate for consideration by the RPT Advisory Committee. Two of members are appointed as a subcommittee for a candidate's informal review, and three for a formal review. The members of the subcommittee are tenured and are qualified by rank to vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the candidate. They are selected in consultation with the candidate by the Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee, who also designates a chairperson for the subcommittee.

e. Department Chairperson.

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. <u>Peer Teaching Reviewers</u>. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee Chair.

i. <u>External Evaluators</u>. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and Department Chair in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, the advisor or mentor of the candidate, or a close collaborator with the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

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

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

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae and (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the

candidate's progress to date, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans, in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 15.

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track 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 August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

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

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

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

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

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will review the candidate's research/creative activity, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The Department Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

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

a. Department Chair Responsibilities. 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 candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track 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 Committees of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform 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 1. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint members to and select a chairperson for the Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Department Chair shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. The candidate and the Ad Hoc Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, will each prepare a list of at least five and no more than seven names of possible external evaluators along with their qualifications to be evaluators, their addresses, telephone numbers, and their relationship to the candidate. The Department recognizes that the best external evaluators will be leading experts in the candidates field of research. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee will present the candidate with the entire list and inform the candidate in writing of the candidates right to submit written comments on the advisability of using each of the proposed reviewers. The candidate will have seven days from the time of receipt of the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committees written notice to submit any such comments. The written notice from

the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, the list of proposed external evaluators, and any comments from the candidate on the list of proposed reviewers will be placed in the candidates file. Taking the qualifications of the proposed evaluators and any comments submitted by the candidate into careful consideration, the Department Chair will choose three external evaluators from the full list of proposed evaluators; at least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. Although every effort will be made to solicit and use different external reviewers for the 7th than for the 4th year formal review, one or more of the same external reviewers may be used for these two formal reviews if the candidates field in linguistics is small.

e. <u>RPT File Contents and File Closing Date</u>. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

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

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

f. <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.

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

1. *Department RPT Advisory Committee Action*. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but no later than 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 minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Department 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 Chairperson as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chairperson about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

2. Department 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.

3. Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the *Department* L*evel*. 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 blind review, or other selection method.

   b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.

   c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.

   d. Honors received for research/creative work.

   e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.

   f. Individual student research supervised.

   g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.

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

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

3. Copies of recent 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, 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.

Departments Responsibility

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

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

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

3. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).

4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.

5. Copies of all prior years' RPT files.

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

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

9. Report of RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Appendix B: Notice of Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Vice Presidential Final Approval.

Review Committee Approval:

Lincoln L. Davies, Chair	3/16/2019
	Date

Senior Vice President Approval:

Harriet W. Hopf, Designee	4/25/2019
	Date