

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR USE IN
RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

PREAMBLE

The Department of Family and Consumer Studies is composed of faculty from a variety of disciplines. While some discipline-based differences may exist in the criteria by which faculty members are evaluated, all faculty members will be judged in terms of their contribution to the goals and development of an interdisciplinary department.

Essential to any system for retaining, promoting, and tenuring faculty members is the determination, at each level of review, of what faculty activities are to be considered and what constitutes acceptable performance of these activities. The traditional categories of (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service to department, university, profession, and community encompass what is expected of a faculty member.

The importance attached to the areas of research, teaching, and service will necessarily vary on a case-by-case basis. Nevertheless, the governing assumption is that minimum standards of performance exist for each of the areas of research, teaching, and service; excellence in one of these areas cannot compensate for performance that falls below minimum standards in another area. Because of the importance of a candidate's total profile of achievement, the department advisory committee and department chair make a single overall judgment of the candidate's superior intellectual attainment rather than specifically assess the candidate's adequacy within each area or sub-area of performance.

This document describes the general criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions; the major dimensions of performance in the three basic areas of research, teaching, and service; and the potential indicators by which achievement in these areas is judged. This list of performance indicators in no way implies that every faculty member must perform at a specific level on all indicators. Rather, the list illustrates the kinds of indicators that may be appropriately applied in a given case. Moreover, the importance of particular indicators may vary according to the stage of a faculty member's career. Whether or not a faculty member achieves some Acceptable level of performance based on these indicators is a judgment to be reached by members of the departmental advisory committee and the department chair. This judgment shall consider the stage, history, and likely course of a candidate's career relative to the needs of the Department.

In addition to the description of performance dimensions and indicators, this document provides a set of procedures by which formal and informal reviews shall be conducted. The assumptions underlying these procedures are that communication among the candidate, departmental advisory committee, and department chair should be ongoing and that the process should be open and iterative.

FCS
August 2010

CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE DECISIONS

Retention

A decision to retain an untenured faculty member during a formal review in the probationary period will occur in cases where the candidate shows evidence of making adequate progress toward tenure commensurate with the number of years s/he has completed. A decision to not retain an untenured faculty member could occur if at the time of any formal review during the probationary period the candidate offers very little or no evidence of sustained research activity, and/or fails to provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to associate professor and tenure require (a) a sustained record of high-quality research and scholarship, (b) effectiveness in teaching, and (c) evidence of professional and institutional service. In rare instances, service activities may also be deemed of central importance in personnel decisions, as when service involves the administration of a large-scale department program or the rigorous and extensive application of scholarship.

Tenure After Promotion

In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of associate professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve that standards expected of an associate professor. In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a professor.

Promotion to Professor

There are both quantitative and qualitative changes in expectations with respect to promotion at the level of Professor. With respect to scholarship, a Professor is expected to have national and/or international visibility; high status and impact as a scholar; an original and productive research program supported by sustained and high quality publications. With respect to teaching and service, promotion to Professor requires demonstration of continued quality and growth in these areas. In short, a Professor is expected to have achieved significant recognition and prominence as a scholar, educator, and member of the University of Utah community. Time in the rank of associate professor is not a factor in consideration to Professor.

In addition to the indicators listed above, the significant national recognition expected at the Professor level can be reflected in numerous and diverse activities/accomplishments. Examples may include: regular publications of important articles in major journals and/or research monographs; invited chapters in important scholarly books; citation frequencies; external grants; appointment to editorial boards of major journals; service on grant review panels; and/or other leadership contributions to the profession.

AREAS OF PERFORMANCE: DIMENSIONS AND INDICATORS

Faculty performance will be judged in the three areas of research, teaching, and service. Separating performance in these three areas is especially helpful in applying standards consistently across candidates. Nevertheless, the three areas of performance are often closely linked. For example, research frequently addresses community needs and problems; similarly, teaching methods can be the subject of written scholarship. The department advisory committee and department chair shall therefore attempt to balance the need to separate areas of faculty performance and the need to acknowledge their possible linkages. In addition to viewing performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service as interconnected, candidate performance will also be analyzed in terms of its contribution to the development of an interdisciplinary department.

RESEARCH

Dimensions:

Faculty performance in the area of research will be assessed along four dimensions. Research should be: (1) sustained, (2) high in quality, (3) programmatic, and (4) indicative of intellectual independence. In addition, as a candidate=s career progresses in the post-tenure period, there is an increasingly strong expectation that the candidate=s research will have a positive and documented impact on his/her fields of specialization.

Indicators:

1. Professional judgment of research by department colleagues;
2. Professional judgment by experts in the field outside of the Department and University in the form of:
 - a. letters of reference,
 - b. published reviews of candidate=s publications,
 - c. citations of the candidate=s work,
 - d. special awards/honors in recognition of scholarly contributions and,
 - e. invitations or elections to serve in professional Agatekeeper@ positions, such as being a journal editor, a member of an editorial board, or a conference organizer;
3. published work (both refereed and non-refereed) and the quality of the outlets in which it appears;
4. presentations, lectures, and addresses at international, national, regional, and local conferences;
5. extramural and intramural research grants, both funded and unfunded; and
6. unpublished work, including technical reports, unpublished manuscripts, and work in progress.

TEACHING

Dimensions:

Because there is substantial diversity in ways of learning, student talents, and faculty styles, there is no single formula for successful teaching. In addition, the needs of undergraduate and graduate students vary as well. Nevertheless, quality in teaching performance will typically refer to some combination of a person=s ability to:

1. communicate knowledge in an effective manner;
2. maintain rigorous standards of course content and student performance;
3. stimulate student interest, sharpen the ability to apply knowledge, and prepare students for life-long learning;
4. incorporate scholarship, both classic and recent, into coursework;
5. promote interaction with (and among) students outside the classroom through feedback on written work, supervision of independent study and internships, membership on graduate committees, and informal guidance and mentoring of students;
6. encourage student application of knowledge in setting outside the classroom, **including service learning**;
7. demonstrate competence in teaching a variety of courses, from large introductory classes to smaller, more specialized ones;
8. supervise student theses and other research activities;
9. discuss, design, and offer courses consistent with the needs of program areas and the Department;
10. articulate and implement a coherent teaching philosophy;
11. participate in non-departmental programs (e.g., Liberal Education, Honors, Women=s Studies, Ethnic Studies) and professional teaching forums; and
12. pursue self-improvement in teaching and assist in the improvement of peers.

Indicators:

1. judgment of students as evidenced by course evaluations and reports of student advisory committees;

2. professional judgment by department colleagues based on review of;

- a. statement of teaching philosophy and goals,
- b. course requirements and materials,
- c. student work, including supervision of graduate students,
- d. peer observation, and
- e. department honors and awards;

3. professional judgment by outside experts expressed by:

- a. letters of reference.
- b. peer observation,
- c. publications and presentations based on teaching experience or philosophy, and
- d. Non-departmental honors and awards.

SERVICE

Dimensions:

In most instances and especially during the pre-tenure probationary period, service will be subordinate to research and teaching in the evaluation of superior intellectual attainment. In rare instances, as when candidates hold appointments involving major administrative duties or apply scholarship in a particularly rigorous and extensive manner, additional weight may be attached to service in the overall judgment of a candidate=s profile of achievement. Nevertheless, all candidates are expected to demonstrate a moderate degree of breadth and depth in their service activities. Breadth involves blending contributions to internal constituencies (department and university) and external ones (profession and community). Depth refers to the intensity, quality, and impact of a candidate=s involvement in any particular service activity.

Two types of service activities are relevant to faculty reviews: (1) those that involve the administration and governance of departmental programs, the Department as a whole, and the University; and (2) those that apply and/or extend a candidate=s professional role. Other service commitments, regardless of their duration or impact, are not deemed relevant to the evaluation of a candidate=s performance as a faculty member.

Indicators:

1. professional judgment by department colleagues based on:

- a. statement of service philosophy,
- b. evidence of participation and leadership in service roles,
- c. evidence of results and products of service activities, and

- d. peer review of service activities; and
2. professional judgment by outside experts expressed by:
 - a. letters of reference,
 - b. publications and presentations on the subject of service,
 - c. evaluations of products of service activities, and
 - d. honors and awards.

REVIEW PROCEDURES

In undertaking reviews for the purpose of retention, promotion, and tenure, departmental procedures must be consistent with university policies as expressed in the relevant sections of the University of Utah Policy and Procedures (<http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/9/9-5-1.html>). The Department of Family and Consumer Studies' policy is that a formal review will be held in the third year of the pre-tenure probationary period and in at least one subsequent year prior to the seventh probationary year. The Department of Family and Consumer Studies' policy is **that formal reviews will typically occur in the third, fifth, and seventh years** of the pre-tenure probationary period; either the department advisory committee or the candidate may request an additional formal review at any time between the third and seventh year. When a candidate believes he/she can demonstrate achievement of the tenure standards in less than the normal probationary period, that candidate may seek permission from the department chair and RPT chair for an early tenure review under procedures of **PPM 8-6, Sec.3.C.1**. In an early review, the evidence in the file should demonstrate that the candidate unequivocally meets the tenure standard.

The major source of documentation for every review action is the faculty member's review file. The file should contain a complete, up-to-date curriculum vita; a statement of philosophy and goals in the areas of research, teaching, and service; publications and manuscripts; conference papers; research proposals (both funded and unfunded); examples of reviews written for journals and textbook publishers; teaching materials; summaries of student evaluations; letters of commendation related to professional activities; copies of past formal and informal reviews, **including letters or reports from all levels** and other relevant material. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to see that such materials are submitted to the department by the deadline set by the department advisory committee. It is the responsibility of the department staff to see that the submitted materials are placed on file immediately upon submission. All materials submitted by the candidate for review by the department advisory committee shall be made available at least two weeks prior to the first formal meeting of the committee.

The department file will also contain letters and statements of evaluation, both confidential and non-confidential, solicited and unsolicited by the department. The confidential letters will be maintained as such and will be released verbatim and with identifying material only to members of the department advisory committee, the department chair, and members of higher-level individuals and bodies in the review process. Portions of these letters, edited to preserve confidentiality, will be made available to the candidate at the end of the review process.

Any other written statements from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, the department student advisory committee, staff or interested individuals which are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate, should be placed in the file by the end of the third week in September. The candidate is entitled to see his/her review file upon request, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comments or exception must be added to the file **before** the file closes on the fourth Friday in September.

The following are the steps involved in a FORMAL review:

1. The chair of the department advisory committee notifies the candidate, at least three months in advance, of the necessary timing of the candidate's file for review. The Department Chair will request the candidate's current vita; professional statements for research, teaching, and service; copies of published research; and a list of potential outside reviewers detailing their qualifications and relationship to the candidate (if any) and copies of published research. The candidate also will specify in writing whether he/she waives the right to read the external letters of review and know the identities of their authors. The Department Chair may request additional information from the candidate within a reasonable period of time prior to the final due date when the additional information will facilitate and expedite the review process.
2. The department advisory committee submits a list of potential outside reviewers, detailing their qualifications and relationship to the candidate (if any) by the end of the Spring semester. The department chair merges the lists from the candidate and the committee and, adds names when necessary to properly cover a candidate's work. At least one reviewer must appear from the candidate's list, and at least one must come from the committee's list. At least three (3) external reviewers must be used in the review. In soliciting reviews, the letter from the department chair must describe the department's intent to share with the candidate, to the maximum extent consistent with the preservation of reviewer confidentiality, the contents and exact wording of letters.
3. The chair of the department advisory committee requests a formal report from the departmental student advisory committee(s) and sets a deadline for the report, the end of the Spring semester. The deadline for this report must be at least one week in advance of the closing of the file so the candidate may have sufficient opportunity to examine and respond to this report.
4. The faculty member submits his/her complete file to the chair of the department advisory committee by the end of September. The file is kept in the main office. No additions to the file may be made by the candidate after this time without the written permission of the chair of the department advisory committee **after consultation with the Associate Vice President for Faculty.**

5. The secretary of the department advisory committee prepares a summary sheet of the primary factual items from the file.
6. The candidate reviews the summary sheet and discusses with the secretary any discrepancies. The secretary reports this discussion to the department advisory committee.
7. The department advisory committee meets to review the file, write a report, and vote.
8. The department chair reviews the entire file and makes a formal recommendation to the dean.
9. The candidate and the chair receive a copy of the report from the department RPT committee. After the candidate receives the chair's letter, the candidate then has 7 days to add a formal response to the file. The response may address issues in either **or both** the reports of the department advisory committee or the letter from the department chair.
10. The entire file is forwarded to the dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science by the beginning of the third week in November.

INFORMAL REVIEW PROCEDURES:

Except in the candidate's first year, informal reviews during the pretenure period occur in any year when a formal review has not occurred. The department advisory committee meets late in the spring semester to review the candidate's file and prepare a written report. These reviews do not involve external letters of review and do not involve a vote by the department RPT committee. Informal reviews conducted during the candidate's second year will typically focus on issues of file structure and content and the development of professional statements concerning research, teaching, and service. Thereafter, informal reviews provide feedback to the candidate and guidance for the future, particularly as this pertains to preparation for the next formal review. **After the advisory committee's report is made available to the candidate and department chair, a face to face meeting is scheduled by the chair to discuss the report with the candidate.**

RPT Time Line

It is difficult to assign exact dates to the RPT time line because some elements of the review are outside of the department's control (e.g., an external reviewer may be late in sending his/her letter). Nevertheless, FCS will attempt to meet the following time line for all formal RPT reviews:

1. The RPT Chair is elected by the March faculty meeting.
2. In March of the preceding academic year, the department chair notifies the candidates (and RPT chair) in writing of the time line for the formal reviews that will occur in the fall.
3. Letters are also sent out in March to SAC and student senator regarding reviews.
4. Candidate submits current vita and list of suggested external reviewers to the chair by the

end of Spring semester and signs a waiver/non-waiver form. The RPT committee generates a list of external reviewers at the Spring informal RPT committee meeting and also submits it to the chair by the end of Spring semester.

5. RPT chair organizes the SAC to review the candidates teaching materials and the SAC report for the following year is complete by the end of Spring semester. A copy of the report is put in the candidate's file and a copy is given to the candidate. Candidate has 7 days to respond to the SAC report.
6. Reviewers are contacted early in the summer term.
7. Candidate submits the research portion of the file and professional statement by **July 15th**.
8. Chair sends out materials for review by the end of **July**. External reviewer letters are due back in the department by the **end of September**.
9. Candidate submits completed file by the first **Tuesday in September**.
10. The file officially closes on the **fourth Friday in September**.
11. RPT committee reviews the file and submits the report to the chair by the **end of October**.
12. The RPT report is given to the candidate and the chair. Chair writes his/her letter. This letter is given to the candidate by the **beginning of the second week in November**.
13. The candidate has one week to provide a formal written response to the RPT report or the chair's letter (one response).
14. The entire file is forwarded to the college by the **middle of November**.