

Approved by Department Faculty [1-13-2011]

Approved by Dean [1-16-2011]

Approved by University RPT Standards Committee 2-7-2011 for implementation as of July 1, 2011

RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE CRITERIA FOR
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY (Revision 1-13-2011)

I. Preamble

The Department of Psychology is dedicated to the generation and dissemination of knowledge in both core and emerging areas of the discipline of psychology. In addition, the Department has demonstrated a long-standing commitment to offer a meaningful and diverse education for graduate and undergraduate students. The Department takes pride in its traditions of academic and scholarly excellence and in its support for academic freedom. We believe that academic freedom and autonomy come with responsibilities to maintain high standards. Pursuant to these goals, this statement defines the Department's rules regarding retention, promotion and tenure. Because the department does not consist of non-tenured Associate Professors, this statement applies to retention, promotion and tenure to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor, in accordance with University Policy 6-303, Revision 20, July 1, 2010 and Policy 6-311, revision 15, November, 2007
<http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/guides/faculty/reviews/reviewsFaculty.html>).

The Department holds two formal reviews during the probationary period, a retention review at the beginning of a candidate's 3rd year and a 6th year tenure and promotion review. As specified by University Policy 6-303-III-A-1-c, tenure cannot be achieved prior to promotion except in extraordinary circumstances. Promotion to Associate Professor and tenure can be achieved any year after the first year and up to the 6th year, depending upon the candidate's accomplishments. Faculty seeking promotion and tenure prior to the 6th year must consult procedures in U Policy 6-311-Sec. 4-c for such a request no later than the spring before the intended promotion and tenure review (<http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.html>). At the 6th year tenure review, the outcomes possible are award of tenure and promotion or final denial of promotion and tenure. In instances in which there is a final denial of tenure, under University Policy 6-311 the faculty member is then afforded a "terminal appointment" year of employment.

Promotion and tenure must be achieved by the 6th year (barring leaves of absence, extended sick leave, or extraordinary circumstances as governed by University Policy 6-311- Sec.-4-c). Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor can occur at any time, and these decisions are based upon accomplishments rather than time in rank. U Policy 6-303-III-A-1 states that:

Promotion. Promotion in rank is the acknowledgment by the University of continuing and increasing professional competence and responsibility in teaching, research and creative work, and University and public service.

U Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c states, in addition, that:

Standards. Insistence upon the highest attainable standards for faculty members is essential for the maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery as well as the assimilation and transmission of knowledge. Departmental RPT Statements and the decisions based upon them shall emphasize the University's commitment to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence.

The Department endorses these policies. This document defines in broad terms what is meant by “excellence in performance” for Psychology Department faculty.

In evaluating performance, we strive to develop and implement reliable and valid indicators; however, judgments about performance are based on both qualitative and quantitative information and on values about what constitutes important research, educational and service goals, so no single indicator or even multiple indicators can replace professional judgment from local colleagues and national / international scholars in the field. In addition, as described subsequently, there are qualitative and quantitative differences in performance necessary for successful reviews at each stage of faculty development.

II. General Assumptions

- A. The Department expects faculty to perform their duties in an ethical and responsible way, in keeping with the American Psychological Association’s statement of Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct. As specified in U Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b, assessments of teaching, research/other creative activity, and service may consider the candidate’s conduct as a responsible member of the faculty. In addition, any letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from university committees or officials, arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the faculty member’s permanent file.
- B. Retention and promotion decisions require judgments about the total professional performance of an individual, and we evaluate performance on a case-by-case basis.
- C. The relevant RPT Advisory Committee’s decision is based on the question “is retention warranted” or “has Associate Professor or Professor stature been achieved?” rather than “are there reasons not to retain or promote this individual?” Candidates are expected to present their accomplishments to the RPT Advisory Committee with this decision in mind.
- D. The Department believes that it is important to have first-hand knowledge about a candidate’s research program so that we can make informed judgments. Faculty engaged in departmental RPT decisions are expected to familiarize themselves with candidates’ research by reading their scholarly writing, attending their colloquia or brown bag presentations, or through discussions with the candidates.
- E. Votes and deliberations of RPT Advisory Committee meetings are treated with

confidentiality in accordance with policy and law. No information about that meeting is shared with any individuals who are not members of the advisory committee. In particular, those at the meeting should refrain from informing the candidate of the committee's vote, which is the responsibility of the RPT Advisory Committee chair and the Department chair.

III. Promotion Criteria

Departmental RPT Advisory Committee members consider both how to evaluate performance in research, teaching, and service, and how to integrate these evaluations into an overall assessment of performance. Below are sets of potential indicators of performance at each faculty rank in the department. The basic departmental standard is that in each domain, a candidate shall achieve visibility and impact appropriate to his or her career stage. We expect that different subsets of indicators may be applicable in different cases, depending upon the candidate's interests and responsibilities. Therefore, in providing this list of potential standards and performance criteria, the Department does not imply that every faculty member must perform at some specific level on all criteria; instead, the applicability of these criteria are based on the professional judgment of their peers and colleagues. For most quantifiable indicators (whether in the research, teaching, or service domain), the Department RPT Advisory Committee is provided with a candidate's performance as well as the range of performance achieved by recent successful cases at the same rank as the candidate. These numbers are provided as important comparisons and the Department is unlikely to retain or promote a candidate whose profile across these quantitative indicators is marginal in all areas (at the low end of the range of accomplishment of successful candidates). Potential candidates are allowed access to these comparative data at any time by requesting it from the departmental executive assistant who is responsible for keeping the information current. If not requested earlier, comparative data are provided in the formal review document prepared by the department Personnel Committee (PC, see procedures, section IV, below) and include total published works (i.e., journal articles and book chapters) over the past 15 years of successful departmental RPT decisions. Data concerning teaching evaluations of the candidate are compared to departmental mean teaching ratings. Data on grant proposals, both submitted and those successfully funded, will be collected for those hired in fall 2010 and beyond. These data are gathered by the PC of the department from each candidate's current vita.

In hiring and in retention, promotion, and tenure decisions, the Department gives heavy weight to research and scholarly productivity (as defined in A-E, this section). The Department also expects effective undergraduate and graduate education, and positive action for retention, promotion, or tenure will not be taken unless the candidate is an effective teacher (as indicated, for example, by course ratings that are within the range of the Department's teaching ratings and successful mentoring of graduate students). Participation in professional, departmental, college, university, or community service is also expected. The Department has the following general expectations:

- A. Retention (third year). This judgment is based on two years of work so that there is sufficient information to provide an adequate basis for a decision. Faculty look for

evidence of teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and evidence of the beginnings of an independent, original, high quality, sustained and productive research program with the potential to have an impact on the field. Effectiveness in teaching is evaluated by examining both online qualitative and quantitative student evaluations of classroom teaching as well as confidential interviews with other faculty and with graduate students familiar with the candidate's teaching and mentoring. Effectiveness is indicated by sustained high or a steady change toward higher, qualitative and quantitative evaluations online. Negative comments and quantitative ratings below the department average are flagged for feedback and remediation to candidates, and in the worst case, as reasons to vote against retention. To support their developing research and teaching, junior faculty have limited service responsibilities. They have begun to function as integral members of their administrative areas (currently Clinical, Cognition & Neural Science, Developmental, and Social).

- B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (6th year). According to University policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i, "For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas." A successful candidate should have an established record demonstrating excellence as a researcher and effectiveness as a teacher. The research program is independent, original, of high quality, sustained and programmatic in reference to comparative data from other successful candidates as well as judgments by local colleagues and national / international scholars in the field. The research is beginning to have impact and the candidate is forming a positive national reputation. Classroom teaching is evaluated at all levels in the manner described above, in III-A. At this level compared to the 3rd year retention, however, more weight is placed on graduate student mentoring. Departmental service is evaluated by active and committed participation in no more than two faculty committees, and by whether the candidate has played a constructive role in area and departmental decision-making. The Departmental RPT Advisory Committee recommendation is based both on past performance and on expectations for continued high quality performance.
- C. Promotion to Professor (no set time deadline). There are both quantitative and qualitative changes in expectations with respect to promotions at the Professor level, especially with respect to scholarship. A Professor has an established record as an effective teacher and an excellent researcher with an independent, original, programmatic, productive, sustained, and high quality research program. Teaching is again evaluated in the manner described above in III-A, with a special emphasis placed on having established a record of successful mentoring of graduate students through completion of the PhD and contributing to their professional development. A Professor has national and international visibility, high status as a scholar, and clear and important impact; he or she has achieved significant recognition and prominence as a scholar in psychology. A Professor has an established record of responsible service.
- D. Research and Scholarship. The following five criteria are used in determining whether excellence or progress toward excellence has been achieved appropriate to the type of

review (3rd year, tenure, or promotion to Professor):

1. The five criteria are
 - a. Research/scholarship is programmatic and cumulative.
 - b. Research/scholarship is of high quality, showing originality, depth, and impact.
 - c. Research/scholarship is independent. The Department accepts and encourages inter- and multi-disciplinary work, but a candidate is expected to demonstrate his or her independent, identifiable, and significant contribution to the research team. Some examples of independence include first authored (or student first-authored) publications, publications or grant proposals independent of advisors, and a line of research based on data initiated while at the University of Utah.
 - d. Research/scholarship is sustained and ongoing, with evidence of work at all stages of the research process (e.g., publications, submitted manuscripts, draft manuscripts and conference presentations, collected data sets, plans for future work, intra- and/or extra-mural funding, and so on).
 - e. The candidate has achieved national recognition and prominence for research and scholarship in Psychology appropriate to his or her review level.
2. Specific sources of information for research and scholarship include but are not limited to:
 - a. Opinions of department and university colleagues.
 - b. Opinions of colleagues and experts in the field outside of the department and university, including letters of evaluation (see attached information on selection of external evaluators), published reviews of candidate's books and articles, citations of the candidate's work in the literature (especially citations that indicate serious, positive consideration of the candidate's work), and appointments to editorial boards of major journals, service on grant review panels, etc.
 - c. Published works. In their scholarship, some candidates may pursue a broad number of areas; others may focus on a single topic. In either strategy, however, it is expected that the work will show thoroughness, adherence to relevant standards of rigor and research quality, and other evidence of excellence, as described above.
 - d. Participation in professional organizations, meetings, and conferences; invited lectures and papers.
 - e. Contribution to the training and productivity of students. Reference here is to the number and quality of theses and dissertations directed, publications with students, high quality mentoring, and to the subsequent scholarly works of students.
 - f. Research grants. Research grants are important to scholarly activity. They allow individuals to pursue research questions that might be difficult without such funding and thus contribute to the research / teaching mission of the Department. Receipt of a grant is not required for either 3rd year retention or promotion with tenure. For hires beginning in Fall of 2010, it is expected that the candidate submit an external grant prior to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Full Professor it is important that the candidate show a record of sustained grants received and/or grant submissions, thereby increasing the probability of research and scholarly contributions.
 - g. Awards, honors, and other recognition of contributions resulting from the

candidate's research or scholarship.

- h. The significant national recognition expected at the Professor level might be reflected by various combinations of the following: federal grants; appointment to editorial boards or major journals; invited chapters in important scholarly books; service on grant review panels; high citation frequencies; and regular publication of important articles in major journals.
- E. Teaching. The Department expects a strong commitment to undergraduate and graduate education, both in and out of the classroom.
1. The Department considers a candidate's competence as an educator, knowledge of and ability to transmit recent developments, judgment in selecting and emphasizing material, and ability to provide students with a broad scholarly perspective.
 2. Candidates are also evaluated on their ability to provide constructive feedback to challenge students to do their best.
 3. Consideration may also be given to a candidate's openness and receptivity to students and their ideas, as well as his/her fairness as an evaluator of students.
 4. Given changing curricula, candidates should be willing to take on new and special teaching arrangements and assignments.
 5. Candidates need to demonstrate an ability to guide students successfully through the graduate program.
 6. Specific sources of information for teaching include but are not limited to:
 - a. Departmental colleagues' observations of teaching, colloquia and other public presentations.
 - b. Undergraduate and graduate student opinions about course content and presentation style as determined by interviews with students, teaching evaluations, and undergraduate and graduate Student Advisory Committee reports.
 - c. Departmental analysis of course content, exams, etc.
 - d. Input from graduate students on teaching, research, and – where appropriate – clinical supervision.
 - e. Interviews with the candidate regarding teaching philosophy, plans, techniques, attempts at innovation and growth, and so on.
 - f. Unique contributions to the educational aims of the Department in relation to undergraduate and graduate program needs. As appropriate, consideration may be given to educational contributions that serve the broad interests of other programs in the University or the residents of Utah.
 - g. University or national recognition for teaching activities.
 - h. Scholarly writings on teaching and education, the role of the University, and so on.
 - i. Demonstrated teaching products, e.g., experimental courses, various media products, student exhibits.
 - j. Participation in University and community activities concerning teaching and education.
- F. Service. Faculty members are expected to share the service burden at departmental, college, and university levels, as well as in professional organizations or community

organizations where the contribution is professional in nature. Effectiveness in service can be demonstrated in various ways, including but not limited to the following:

1. Administrative contributions to the Department, College and University.
 - a. Service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc.
 - b. Service as committee chair of a major committee.
 - c. Elected positions.
 - d. Service as university representative to other universities, organizations, etc.
 - e. Informal service (e.g., mentoring junior faculty, reading grants and papers of colleagues).
2. Administrative contributions to the profession.
 - a. Service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc.
 - b. Elected positions.
 - c. Service as committee chair.
 - d. Conference chair or organizer.
 - e. Editorial work on journals.
3. Community service
 - a. Unpaid consulting for bureaus, commissions, agencies, legislative bodies, etc.
 - b. Participation in special community projects and studies.
 - c. Professionally related community positions, e.g., school board membership, participation in education groups, professional advisor to various groups, public service agencies, etc.
 - d. General community educational contributions: lectures, workshops, community clinic work, etc.
 - e. Leadership roles on local or national committees.

IV. Psychology Department Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Process

A Personnel Committee (“PC”) consisting of five or six regular tenured faculty members, including the RPT chair, is elected each spring via ballot by all regular faculty members (tenured and tenure-eligible) whose primary appointment is within the Department. The elected chair of the department RPT Committee also serves as chair of the Departmental PC (see IV-A-11). At the invitation of the PC committee, the Department chair attends the PC- meetings but does not participate in writing the PC report.

Prior to tenure, there are two levels of review: informal and formal. Informal reviews (described more fully in IV-B below) occur in the 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 5th years. In the 1st and 4th years, the informal review is accomplished by having a member of the PC meet with the candidate to review the CV and recent accomplishments, update the candidate’s file, and identify any issues that should be brought to the attention of the PC. In the 2nd and 5th years, a more comprehensive informal review is completed that may include the above as well as interviews with faculty and graduate students. In the 3rd and 6th years, a formal review is conducted. A candidate’s review file includes any past reports (see section IV-A and IV-B) and is completed by the end of the semester in which the review is initiated. It is updated by the PC and maintained by the administrative secretary in a locked departmental file cabinet.

For formal reviews (see IV-A), during Autumn semester, two-member review teams gather information and write PC reports on faculty members being formally reviewed; these reports are the basis of the RPT advisory committee's discussion held in the middle of the semester (mid-October). Review teams are composed of a PC member, chosen by the PC, and a faculty member chosen by the candidate who is not a member of the PC. When possible, the PC team member is not from the candidate's Area (although the candidate's choice can be from the same area). The team's report is discussed and ratified by the PC to create a final report. This final PC report, along with the minutes of the RPT advisory committee meeting are forwarded to the department chair and dean by the end of the Autumn semester.

A. Formal review procedures.

1. The process begins the previous spring semester: No later than April 1st, each candidate and his/her Area (i.e., faculty members of the clinical, cognition & neural science, developmental, or social area) independently provide the names of potential external evaluators. Previous graduate and postdoctoral advisors are typically not selected as external evaluators. The Area recommendations for evaluators are coordinated by the Area chair (elected by their faculty) and made in consultation with area faculty. The PC meets and rank orders the evaluators; the PC then contacts evaluators until a sufficient number agree to participate. We seek three letters for retention reviews and up to five letters for promotion and tenure reviews, with evaluators from both the candidate's list and the area's list, and at least one individual common to both lists, if possible. The candidate's materials are submitted by about June 1st for mailing to the external evaluators. In accordance with U Policy 6-303-III-D-9, each candidate will be provided with the option to waive or retain his/her right to review the external evaluations prior to letters being requested (to be included in candidate file). External evaluators will then be informed regarding the anonymity of their letters in advance.
2. The candidate's materials that are sent to the external evaluators during the summer semester include the CV, 3-4 scholarly products, a research statement or cover letter explaining the context of the selected products and the future direction of the research, and a teaching statement. Evaluators are asked to comment on the candidate's record in light of the research and scholarship expectations of the Department as laid out in this document (see III-A).
3. During the beginning of the Autumn semester, the Undergraduate and Graduate SAC's are contacted and asked for input; the Graduate SAC administers a questionnaire to all graduate students seeking informed comments about each candidate.
4. In the beginning of Autumn semester, Department faculty, graduate students and staff also receive a memo stating which faculty members are being reviewed and inviting them to contact review team members if they wish to be interviewed about any candidates. This memo also describes how to access the departmental web page that lists materials relevant to each candidate being reviewed (see section IV-A-6).
5. The candidate is interviewed during the Autumn semester and invited to suggest names of faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and any others whom s/he believes should be interviewed for the PC report.

6. Prior to interviews, all interviewees have access to the candidate's curriculum vita (CV), research statement and teaching philosophy and copies of manuscripts and publications so that they can read them before the interview. These materials are posted on the department's web site, and information about how to access these materials online is sent in the departmental memo describing which faculty will be reviewed (see section IV-A-4), and reiterated by the review team prior to the scheduled interview.
7. Written statements are solicited or interviews are held with every member of the candidate's area, key collaborators, and all graduate and undergraduate advisees. The review team gathers comments regarding the candidate's research, teaching, and administrative contributions. In addition to these extensive one-on-one interviews, the review team also reviews the candidate's research statement, teaching philosophy, course materials, course evaluations, the two SAC reports, and the letters from external evaluators.
8. In the case of a joint appointment, the director of the other program is contacted during the Autumn semester and invited to provide a written evaluation of the candidate or the names of individuals to be interviewed.
9. The PC team writes a draft of a PC report summarizing the information they have gathered. Each report is reviewed by the entire PC for accuracy, balance, and comparability across candidates (these reports generally follow the same format, although they are individualized somewhat to fit emerging circumstances). As needed, the candidate or others are contacted for clarification or for additional information. No later than two weeks prior to the RPT meeting, each candidate receives a draft PC report and is invited to correct errors of fact. No later than one week prior to the RPT meeting, each candidate receives a copy of the final PC report and information about responding if he or she desires. It is rare but not unprecedented for a candidate to write a response, within 7 business days, to the faculty clarifying his or her case.
10. Several days before the RPT meeting, each regular faculty member in the Department (both tenured and tenure-eligible) receives a copy of each PC report and any candidate responses. The faculty members read the PC reports and candidate responses (if any) so that they are prepared for discussion.
11. Immediately prior to the RPT meeting, we hold a general faculty meeting that is headed by the RPT committee chair (who also serves as the PC chair). This person is elected by all regular faculty members (tenured and tenure-eligible) in accordance with U policy 6-303-III-A-3-b. A departmental secretary is also designated by the RPT chair to take notes and prepare a summary in compliance with U Policy 6-303-II-E-2.
12. During the general faculty meeting that precedes the RPT meeting, all regular faculty members except the candidate under consideration are invited to attend. The regular faculty who are not eligible to vote on the RPT decisions can participate in discussions, contribute their views, and learn departmental values and criteria. All faculty who are eligible to attend the general meeting have access to the PC committee reports, prepared in advance of the meeting, but they do not have access to confidential letters written by external evaluators. The RPT Chair opens and closes the meeting with a reminder that matters disclosed at the meeting are to be treated as

confidential and not to be discussed with the candidate.

13. Following the general faculty meeting the RPT meeting occurs, during which only voting eligible members of the RPT Advisory Committee convene. Which faculty members are eligible for the RPT committee are specified in U Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a and include all regular faculty of equal or higher rank for promotion decisions or all tenured faculty regardless of rank for retention or tenure decisions. As stated in U Policy 6-303-III-E-5, the Department chair may attend both the general faculty and the subsequent RPT meeting and, upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, or participate in the discussion of the candidate. However, the chair is not allowed to vote with the RPT Advisory Committee. The RPT chair assures that the discussion covers the criteria of research, teaching, and service laid out in the criteria above. The RPT Committee also votes to include relevant portions of the preceding general faculty meeting minutes into the RPT minutes, along with the minutes of the RPT meeting itself (which also covers the RPT criteria laid out above). The candidate's vita, two SAC reports and the external evaluators' letters are available and passed around at the RPT meeting. The RPT vote is taken at the end of the meeting via secret ballot. Absentee member's written opinions and votes are collected in advance of the RPT meeting by the RPT chair from voting faculty who are not able to attend the meeting, and their opinions are disclosed and votes are counted in accord with U Policy 6-303-III-E-4. The Department chair and the RPT chair meet with the candidate as soon as possible after the meeting to discuss the outcome of the vote.
14. As soon as possible after the meeting, a summary of the RPT meeting (organized by the criteria of research, teaching, and service) is made available for corrections and comments by RPT members of appropriate rank. They are notified via email when the hardcopy summary is available and it will be available for a period of no less than 3 but no more than 5 business days. After any needed modifications made by the secretary (in consultation with the RPT chair), RPT members of appropriate rank will vote whether to approve the minutes (RPT members who do not respond will be considered as having voted to approve the minutes). A majority vote in favor of accepting the minutes will signify RPT committee approval. As stated in U Policy 6-303-III-F-3, candidates will then have the opportunity (but not obligation) to add a written statement two times to his/her formal review file 1) within seven business days of the chairperson's evaluation (in response to the RPT committee and Chairperson's recommendation) and 2) within seven business days of the Dean's evaluation (in response to the Dean's and College Advisory Committee's evaluation). Procedures for the multiple stages subsequent to the departmental RPT Committee recommendation are described in U Policy 6-303-III, and in particular procedures for appealing RPT recommendations are specified in U Policy 6-303-III-I.

B. Informal Review Procedures.

The Department conducts two kinds of informal reviews, 1st and 4th year reports, and 2nd and 5th year reviews. For both kinds of informal reviews, the report is written by a member of the PC of higher rank to the candidate, and is made available to the candidate, Department chair, and RPT committee. No external evaluator letters are

- required, and no SAC reports are obtained.
1. First and Fourth Year Reviews.
 - a. For 1st year faculty, there is no formal PC report and no formal RPT committee discussion. Instead, during December or January of the first year, the RPT chair meets with the candidate to review and answer questions about departmental RPT procedures. The RPT chair also discusses the candidate's progress with respect to research, teaching, service, and integration into the Area. The RPT chair follows up on issues as needed. The PC helps the Department chair assure that the candidate has reasonable resources and time for developing a research program that can lead to retention, promotion, and tenure. The RPT chair writes the summary typically within a month of the meeting from which future PC teams can base their reports. This report also includes the candidate's concerns and how they were addressed. This report is made available to the RPT committee via email and to the chair and a copy is placed in the candidate's file.
 - b. Fourth year reviews typically follow a successful 3rd year review. The review is conducted by one member of the PC, chosen by the RPT chair, early in Spring semester and completed by the end of the term. In most cases, there are no interviews with faculty or students. The reviewer updates the prior PC report (e.g., with new publications) and checks in with the candidate. The report is made available to the RPT committee via email. If issues were raised in the third year, they are revisited as appropriate (including the possibility of selected interviews with faculty and/or students and possible discussion at an RPT meeting that may include information from the informal reports).
 2. Second and Fifth Year Reviews.
 - a. These reviews are conducted during the Autumn term and completed by the end of the semester. Their purpose is to prepare the candidates for their formal reviews in Autumn of their 3rd and 6th years. As such, these reviews are more extensive than 1st/4th year reviews, but not as detailed as a formal review.
 - b. The PC member in charge of the review, chosen by the RPT chair, interviews small numbers of faculty and students (typically, Area Coordinator, 1-2 colleagues, 2-3 students, and anyone who requests an interview) and inquires about the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The main purpose of such interviews is to gauge whether the candidate is perceived as "on track" to be retained/promoted the following year, and, if needed, what changes would lead to a positive judgment.
 - c. The previous year's informal PC report is updated with respect to publications and presentations, grant activities, teaching evaluations, and service activities. The report is discussed at the RPT Committee meeting. The Department chair and the RPT chair meet with the candidate after the RPT meeting where the report is discussed, to review any issues raised by the report or the candidate.
- C. The review procedures for "triggered" reviews are the same as for formal reviews, except, as stipulated in the U Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, either the Department Chair triggers or the RPT committee votes to trigger the review and provides a written notice to the candidate. This policy states:

“If a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the [PC]reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the [PC] reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.”

Timeline of formal RPT reviews

April 1 Candidate and Area Heads submit names for External Evaluators to Personnel Committee.

June 1 Candidate submits materials to Personnel Committee

June 1 Candidate's materials sent to External Evaluators

Beginning of Autumn Semester

1. Faculty and students receive email notifying them of the candidates to be reviewed and the faculty members conducting each candidate's review should they wish to request an interview.
2. Undergraduate and graduate SAC reviews are requested, graduate SAC surveys are distributed.
3. PC team (PC member and candidate's representative) meet with candidate.

2 Weeks prior to RPT Advisory Committee Meeting

Candidate given PC report (has 5 business days to correct errors).

Few Days prior to RPT Advisory Committee Meeting

PC report distributed to full faculty.

Mid-October RPT Meeting. Within 3 business days of meeting, minutes of meeting are available for a 3-5 day period. Candidates may (but are not obligated to) write a response within 7 business days of the chairperson's evaluation (in response to the RPT advisory committee's and chairperson's evaluation). Mid-November Candidate's file goes to the Dean with Department chair's letter. Further steps follow as described in Policy 6-303.

V. Appendices

A. University RPT Standards Committee notice of final approval



Memorandum

To: Cynthia Berg, Chairperson, Department of Psychology
Cc: David Rudd, Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science
Susan Olson, Associate V.P. Academic Affairs

From: Hank Liese, College of Social Work
Chairperson, University RPT Standards Committee 2010-2011

Subject: Approval of RPT Statement
Date: February 7, 2011

This is to confirm that the attached version of the departmental RPT Statement, dated as approved on February 7, 2011 by the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee, has been reviewed and approved by the Committee pursuant to University Policy 6-303. The Statement may be implemented for RPT Proceedings in your department for the academic year 2011-2012 (as of July 1, 2011).

Congratulations on completing the approval process, and revising your Statement to comply with University Policies and to serve well the missions of your department and the University.

Please ensure that a copy of this approval notice is attached to all copies of the final approved version of the RPT Statement.