

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**

Revised Spring, 2011

Approved by Department Faculty April 22, 2011

Approved by Dean: April 25, 2011

*Approved by University RPT Standards Committee April 25, 2011 for
implementation as of July 1, 2011.*

Contents

- I. Introduction and Overview
- II. RPT Criteria, Standards, and Evidence.
 - A. Research/Scholarship
 - B. Teaching
 - C. Service
 - D. Standards of Research, Teaching, and Service for Each Career Stage.
 - 1. Retention Reviews and Mid-Probationary Formal Review
 - 2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
 - 3. Promotion to Full Professor
- III. RPT Process and Time-Table
 - A. Process and Players: An Overview
 - B. Monthly Time-Table of Formal Reviews
 - C. Time-Table of Informal Reviews
- IV. Appendices (URPTSC notice of approval)

I. Introduction and Overview

This document is designed to provide: (1) the policies and procedures for faculty decisions related to retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT); (2) an explanation of both the process and the criteria and standards used in the evaluation of tenure-track faculty members undergoing RPT review; and (3) a time schedule for achieving an efficient, fair, and orderly process.

University and Department RPT Guidelines. The Department of Sociology observes University regulations regarding the RPT process as defined in University Policy 6-303 (www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html; also, 6-311), as well as the Parental Leave Policy stipulated in University Policy 6-315 (www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-315.html). The Department chair will provide each tenure-track faculty member with a copy of these Department policies and procedures (RPTP&P) at the time of the initial appointment, and the preceding sentence of these guidelines will serve to refer each tenure-track faculty member to the current University guidelines governing retention, promotion, and tenure. Of course, the Department guidelines are available anytime upon request, including at the time of a scheduled review, and they will be posted on the Department's shared faculty drive. For Candidates who were hired when different guidelines were in effect, the Department Chair will ask them to choose to be evaluated under those guidelines or current RPTP&P guidelines. They must make this choice in writing within 30 days of notification of approval of the new guidelines.

Formal Reviews. Departmental procedures vary in the cases of formal and informal reviews. Formal reviews are required for formal mid-probationary retention reviews, consideration for tenure, for triggered reviews in consideration of possible termination at any point in the probationary period, and for promotion decisions. **The normal probationary period is seven years** for those faculty members whose initial regular appointment is in the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor.

Formal Mid-Probationary Review. All tenure-eligible faculty members (henceforth "Candidates") shall have **one formal, mid-probationary review which will ordinarily occur in the fourth year, but a candidate may elect to do it in the third year** by submitting a written notice to the Department Chair by April 30th of the second year. Having a choice of the mid-probationary review either in the third or fourth year will allow Candidates to have some degree of flexibility as they move through the probationary period and in consideration of the fact that timing of the first formal review can be a crucial factor with regard to faculty research agendas.

Promotion and tenure recommendations. The Department conducts two formal reviews during the probationary period, a retention review at the beginning of the candidate's 3rd or 4th year (see immediately above) and a 7th year tenure and promotion review, unless the University has granted the Candidate an extension of the probationary period in accordance with University Policy (6-311). Typically, candidates are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor without tenure and then are formally reviewed for both promotion and tenure in the seventh year. Candidates may request an early formal review for promotion and tenure by meeting the requirements of Policy 6-311, including obtaining approvals for early review, and then meeting **the burden of showing that their records "unequivocally" satisfy the tenure standards.** All early review requests require approval by the Department Chair and RPT Advisory Committee

Chair. The RPT Committee Chair will ordinarily give approval for early review only after consulting with the available members of the committee. Reviews earlier than the sixth year additionally require approval by the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs (Policy 6-311).

In the Department, the decisions to promote and to tenure an Assistant Professor are always made within the same deliberative process and at the same time. That is to say, a decision to promote an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor involves the same considerations and the same standards as the decision to grant tenure to such a Candidate.

Promotion to Professor can occur at any time and is a decision based upon accomplishments rather than time in rank. For individuals hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor before achieving tenure, the probationary period before becoming a Candidate for tenure is ordinarily five years, and may be shorter based on credit for prior accomplishments as governed by University Policy 6-311, Section 4-1-C-1.

Informal reviews. Informal reviews for tenure-track faculty members are held each year in which they are not formally reviewed. Typically, the first, second, fifth and sixth year reviews are informal. Either the third or fourth year will also be an informal review, depending on when a Candidate has chosen to have the mid-probationary review. The criteria considered in the informal reviews are those that would apply at the time of the next formal review.

The Department Chair provides the RPT Advisory Committee with the review materials for each Candidate, after which the Committee meets and by consensus, but without formal votes, develops a report. The Department Chair also develops a report. An informal review is concerned specifically with the progress being made in meeting the criteria and standards for tenure and promotion (see Section II, below). In addition to identifying the Candidate's strengths, the review is intended to identify and communicate to the Candidate any concerns the RPT Committee and Department Chair have about progress toward tenure and promotion that seem to require remedial action in advance of the next formal review. Thus the Chair provides the Candidate with both the Committee report and the Chair report. Within two weeks of being given these reports, the Candidate must schedule a face-to-face meeting with the Chair, the purpose of which is to discuss the Candidate's progress based on the file and the Chair's and Committee's reports. The Candidate may also ask for a meeting with the Committee chair. The Candidate may provide a written response to the reports, and the Department Chair will include this response in the Candidate's cumulative file. (See University Policy 6-303, III-B-1).

II. RPT Criteria, Standards, and Evidence

“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” (University Policy 6-303, III-A-2).

This section of the Department RPTP&P provides a discussion of the criteria, standards, and evidence that we regard as demonstrating academic excellence sufficient to warrant tenure and promotion in rank in the Department of Sociology at the University of Utah.

The Department accords research and scholarly productivity primary emphasis in all hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. This is to say that the most critical RPT decision, the granting of tenure, cannot be achieved without an excellent research record (see below). The Department also expects the Candidate for tenure to have an established record as an accomplished and effective teacher. In addition, the Candidate is expected to participate in professional and departmental service. Community service is also encouraged. For retention, the Department, following Policy 6-303, requires a record of teaching and research demonstrating "reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure," and a record of "effective service at a level appropriate to rank." Department RPT Advisory Committee members evaluate performance in these three areas (research/scholarship, teaching, and service) and integrate these evaluations into an overall assessment of performance. Thus, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions require judgments about the total professional performance of an individual. The Departmental standard is that in each of the three areas a Candidate shall achieve visibility and impact appropriate to that individual's career stage according to the expectations of the discipline, the Department, and the University. The Department also demands that faculty members adhere to the University of Utah Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (University Policy 6-316; www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-316.html) and the American Sociological Association's Code of Ethics (www.asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/ethics/code_of_ethics_table_of_contents).

Below are sets of standard indicators of performance in each of the three areas: research/scholarship, teaching, and service. In creating 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 the criteria. Rather, these are standard criteria that are considered in the evaluation. The exact mix of accomplishments necessary to demonstrate the necessary level of performance depends upon the expectations of the particular RPT decision (i.e., retention, tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Full Professor). The Department RPT Advisory Committee (see below for composition) and the Department Chairperson evaluate the level of performance obtained by the Candidate on these indicators, and each writes a separate report recommending for or against retention, tenure or promotion. These decisions are based on the answer to the question "is retention, tenure, or promotion warranted?" rather than "are there reasons not to retain or promote this individual?"

A. Research/Scholarship.

Achieving excellence in research is a necessary component of the successful Candidate's overall record of accomplishments. The following are the criteria and standards of research excellence as well as the nature of the evidence required to demonstrate research excellence.

1. Standards of Excellence

- a. Research/scholarship is programmatic and cumulative. The Candidate's research is situated within one or more specific areas of research/scholarship; s/he has been working consistently toward building a coherent research program, and her/his

scholarly work is demonstrably relevant to, and has influence on specific scholarly literatures. The Candidate should articulate this relevance in his/her research statement that accompanies applications for retention, promotion, and tenure.

- b. Research/scholarship is of high quality, showing originality, depth, and impact.
- c. Research/scholarship is independent. The Department accepts and often encourages collaborative work, but a Candidate is expected to demonstrate independent, identifiable, and significant contributions to scholarship. Independent contributions are typically demonstrated through a combination of sole or first authorship, working with a variety of research teams and being principal investigator on research projects.
- d. Research/scholarship is sustained and ongoing, with evidence of work at all stages of the research process.
- e. The Candidate has achieved professional recognition and prominence for research in sociology appropriate to that individual's review level.

2. Evidence of Excellence

- a. Published works. Peer reviewed research provides the most convincing evidence of research excellence, and the more esteemed the outlet for a publication, the greater the impact it is likely to have on the research literature. In research/scholarship, some Candidates may pursue a broad number of areas; others may focus on a single topic. In either strategy, however, high quality demands that the work show thoroughness, adhere to relevant standards of rigor and research quality, and other evidence of excellence, as described above. Peer reviewed publications in highly regarded journals (general sociology, interdisciplinary, and subfield) indicate excellence as do books with well regarded University presses. The publication portfolio should include work in journals with high impact factors within the Candidates' fields of research.
- b. Research grants. Research grants are important to scholarly activity. Where appropriate, RPT Advisory Committee members will give positive consideration to the extent to which an individual has submitted grants as a Principal Investigator or a Co-Investigator and has been able to obtain research grant funds and thereby increase the probability of research and scholarly contributions. While having funded research is not a necessary component of most RPT decisions, it contributes to a favorable outcome by helping to demonstrate excellence in research as well as to promote research productivity.
- c. Assessments of Department and University colleagues. The RPT process involves consideration of the Candidate's record by Departmental and College RPT Advisory Committees, each of which is composed of faculty colleagues. Moreover, the process allows others to comment on the Candidate's record and have those comments become part of the RPT file.
- d. Assessments of colleagues and experts in the field who are external to Department and University.

1. External letters of evaluation are required in all formal reviews. The process for procuring such letters is described below in section III.
2. Published reviews of Candidate's books and articles.
3. Appointments to editorial boards of major journals, service on grant review panels, etc.
- e. Citations of the Candidate's work in the literature, especially citations that indicate serious, positive, consideration of the Candidate's work. Of course the Department recognizes that very recently published work (not to mention forthcoming work) will not yet be cited. Therefore, newer scholars are less likely to be highly cited compared to those with more experience. The Department encourages the Candidate to identify citations to her or his work and present them in summary fashion in the RPT file.
- f. Participation in professional organizations, meetings, and conferences; invited lectures and papers.
- h. Awards, honors, and other recognition of contributions resulting from the Candidate's research or scholarship.

B. Teaching.

An established record as an accomplished and effective teacher is a necessary component of a Candidate's overall record of accomplishments in order for a Candidate to be granted tenure and promotion, and the Department expects that as Candidates approach the tenure decision they will have effectively addressed any problems that have been raised with their teaching in the formal and informal review processes. Promotion to higher rank is contingent upon continued effective teaching over the period leading up to that decision.

1. Standards of Teaching Effectiveness. The Department expects a strong commitment to education, both in and out of the classroom. The Department considers a Candidate's contributions and achievements as an educator; knowledge of and ability to transmit recent developments; judgment in selecting and emphasizing material; ability to provide students with a broad scholarly perspective; ability to provide constructive feedback; and ability to challenge students to do their best. Consideration may also be given to a Candidate's openness and receptivity to students and their ideas; comprehensiveness in teaching and planning; fairness as an evaluator of students; willingness to take on new and special teaching arrangements and assignments; and ability to guide students effectively through the graduate program.
2. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
 - a. Department colleagues' positive assessments of teaching, colloquia, and other public presentations. Such assessments are normally made part of the record in the RPT Advisory Committee meeting in which committee members share their informal

- observations about the Candidate's effectiveness in such settings.
- b. Positive undergraduate and graduate student assessments about course content and presentation effectiveness as determined by:
 - 1. interviews with students, for example as described in SAC reports.
 - 2. standard teaching evaluations.
 - c. Positive Department RPT Advisory Committee analysis of course content, exams, etc. which the Candidate makes available in the RPT file.
 - d. Serving as advisors and committee members on graduate student theses and dissertations, documentation of which the Candidate should provide in her or his RPT notebook. These are a matter of Department record, but the Candidate should provide such a list in the materials that they submit with their application.
 - e. Written statements by the Candidate regarding teaching philosophy, plans, techniques, attempts at innovation and growth, etc. Such a written statement should be provided by the Candidate in his or her RPT "notebook," and the Candidate's course syllabi may also provide relevant information.
 - f. Unique, positive 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 positive recognition for teaching activities.
 - h. Scholarly writings on teaching and education, the role of the University, and so on.
 - i. Demonstrated, high quality teaching products (e.g., experimental courses, various media products, student exhibits).
 - j. Participation in University and community activities concerning teaching and education.

C. Service.

The standards for effective service are derived from the fact that 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. With increasing experience, the Department expects its faculty members to increasingly take on leadership roles in terms of service within the Department, the University, and the discipline. Participating and taking leadership roles in civic associations is valued as well. The Candidate provides evidence of service activities by including relevant information in the application materials which they submit. The RPT Committee may also ask the Department Chair to comment on a

Candidate's Departmental service load and effectiveness. Effective service to the Department, college, University is necessary in order to warrant a positive RPT decision, but a record of excellence in service (without achievement of the required standards for research and teaching) is not sufficient for a positive recommendation.

Specific types of service may include but are not limited to:

- a. Administrative contributions to the Department, College and University.
 1. service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc.
 2. committee chairships
 3. elected positions
 4. service as University representative to other universities, organizations, etc.

- b. Administrative contributions to the profession.
 - a. service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc.
 - b. elected positions
 - c. committee chairships
 - d. conference chair or organizer
 - e. membership on editorial boards of journals, etc.

3. Community service.
 - a. unpaid consultant to bureaus, commissions, agencies, legislative bodies, etc. Paid consultantships will be recognized as service to the extent to which the Candidate demonstrates that such activities contribute to excellence in research/scholarship or teaching or to the well-being of the Department, University, or profession. It is the Candidate's responsibility to justify such claims, and, within the Department, it is up to the Committee and Department Chair to evaluate such claims.
 - b. participation in special community projects and studies.
 - c. professional involvement in the community through advising and holding 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, etc.

D. Standards (Expectations) for Each Career Stage

Candidates present evidence of their research, teaching, and service records for the various review stages in the form of a "Notebook" which is described below, in Section III, which also describes the nature of the content of each section of this notebook. The Notebook becomes an important part of the Candidate's RPT file, along with other elements of the file added by the Department and also discussed in Section III, below.

1. Retention Reviews and Mid-Probationary Formal Review

The University requires for retention a record of teaching and research demonstrating "reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure," and a record of "effective service at a level appropriate to rank" University Policy 6-303. This Department expects evidence of progress toward an independent research program with the potential to have an impact on the field. In addition, this research should demonstrate that it is independent, original, of high quality, productive, and sustained over time. The Department expects evidence of effective teaching. To support their developing research and teaching, junior faculty have limited service responsibilities. In short, the standards for retention are based on evidence that good progress is being made toward meeting the standards for tenure and promotion, the basis of which is discussed in the next section, below.

The Department considers the annual retention review process, including the formal mid-probationary review, primarily as an opportunity to provide feedback to Candidates about their progress toward tenure. The written retention recommendations of both the RPT Advisory Committee and the Department Chair are expected to provide both general and specific information to the Candidates about how well they are progressing and what they need to do that they may not be doing in order to meet the standards for tenure and promotion. Typical recommendations include suggestions for strategies to improve a Candidate's publication record, actions they should take to improve their teaching effectiveness, and suggestions about service involvement. Of course these recommendations are opportunities to recognize and commend Candidates who are making good progress toward tenure and promotion. In other instances the informal review will result in suggestions for corrective action on the part of Candidates whose records are not clearly in keeping with expectations. Though all Candidates undergo a mandatory formal mid-probationary review, in rare instances when a Candidate's record is clearly falling short of expectations, an informal review may include a call for a "triggered" formal review to occur in the following year when a formal review would not otherwise be scheduled (see University Policy 6-303).

2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A successful Candidate must provide evidence of consistent and programmatic research that is having an impact on the field in which the research is situated and evidence that she or he is attaining a positive national reputation. In addition to being independent, original and of high quality there must be a rate of publication and a quality of publications sufficient to allow overwhelmingly positive judgments about the impact of the Candidate's body of work. Many of the publications must appear in refereed, prestigious, mainstream sociological and/or interdisciplinary journals that are recognized as covering a broad array of topics or more specific topics within the Candidate's specific area. Peer reviewed book chapters, working papers, non-peer reviewed publications and other types of publications are valued as well but are given less weight and should constitute at most a small part of a Candidates total body of work. Scholarly books published with well regarded University presses or other research-oriented presses also constitute evidence of research excellence. It is not possible to specify precisely a specific, required numerical rate of publishing such articles (or books), because the influence of any

particular article (or book) varies with the impact of the journal (or press) with which it is published. However, given a mix of top-, middle-, and lower-tier journals, as well as a combination of sole-or first-authored and non-first authored publications, the average should be approximately two publications per year, or the equivalent. A large number of relatively unimportant articles in minor journals would not justify a positive decision because the likely impact on a research area would, overall, be insignificant. On the other hand, a smaller number of high quality articles in top-tier journals may have a significant impact on a research area but would be of insufficient quantity, in the absence of other achievements, to demonstrate the Candidate's research program (and thus influence on a research area) will be sustained over the long run. However, a smaller number of high-impact articles in conjunction with some other indicator(s) of scholarly achievement, such as a major, externally-funded grant, several minor publications in less prestigious journals, book chapters, or other such publications would, taken together, demonstrate excellence and provide sufficient guarantee that the Candidate's research will be sustained in the long run. In addition, the Candidate's pattern and pacing of publications should provide strong evidence that research productivity is likely to be sustained over her or his career. At the same time, the department recognizes that different styles of research (e.g. qualitative vs. quantitative) may result in different output trajectories. One style may result in relatively constant output throughout the probationary period whereas another may produce cycles of higher and lower output over this period. In short, demonstrating excellence in research is a matter of quantity and quality of publications as well as sustained productivity over time, and it is not reducible to a precise numeric index. In the end, whether or not the Candidate has met the standards for tenure and promotion is a matter of the professional judgments of those involved in the tenure review process.

A successful Candidate must provide **evidence of an established record as an accomplished and effective teacher**. Evidence of effectiveness in teaching includes good teaching evaluations from students, positive reports from the undergraduate and graduate SACs, positive evaluations from department colleagues based on informal observations (e.g., a guest lecture), course materials (e.g., syllabi) that reflect well organized and up-to-date course content that is faithful to disciplinary standards, a thoughtfully and professionally written Candidate statement on teaching to be included in the "notebook", teaching award nominations, positive commendations on teaching from earlier retention reviews, effective participation on graduate thesis and dissertation committees, and having demonstrated willingness to help the Department meet its teaching responsibilities as indicated in earlier retention reviews (Chair's recommendation). Evidence of unacceptable teaching includes unresponsiveness to continued poor student evaluations, negative reports from the SACs, course materials that appear disorganized and out-of-date, persistent, non-remediated negative feedback from earlier retention reviews, persistent unwillingness to contribute to the Department's teaching responsibilities, and evidence of unwillingness to participate on graduate student committees.

Opportunities for Departmental service are limited, but the Candidate is expected to assume a constructive role in Department decision-making. College, University, and national service are also considered. Evidence of service involvement is provided in the Candidate's RPT "notebook" and confirmed by the RPT Advisory Committee and Department Chair.

In the event that a person is hired at the rank of Associate Professor before achieving tenure, the

subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the Candidate has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an Associate Professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of Professor. In the event that a person is hired at 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.

3. Promotion to Professor

There are both quantitative and qualitative changes in expectations with respect to promotion to the level of Professor, especially with respect to scholarship. A Professor is expected to have national and/or international visibility; high status and impact as a scholar; and an original and productive research program supported by sustained and high quality publications. In short, a Professor is expected to have achieved significant recognition and prominence as a scholar in sociology. The significant national recognition expected at the Professor level is reflected in various combinations of the following: external grants; appointment to editorial boards of 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 and/or research monographs and scholarly books. Where appropriate, a Professor is also expected to have sustained record as an accomplished and effective teacher and to have taken a considerable share of the Department's graduate student mentoring responsibilities, for example by serving as advisor on a number of thesis and dissertation committees. A Professor is also expected to assume leadership roles on Departmental and University committees.

III. Department of Sociology RPT Process and Time Table

The Department's RPT process generates recommendations from the RPT Advisory Committee and from the Department Chair on whether to retain, grant tenure or promote Candidates. The process involves considerable planning and organization—especially for formal reviews—in order to assure that the responsibilities of each are accomplished in accordance with the chronological sequence prescribed in the RPT Workshop manual provided each year by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs office. (Copies of the manual are provided by the Department Chair to the Departmental RPT Chair and to each Candidate undergoing formal review.)

A. Elements and Actors in the Departmental RPT Process (in Addition to Candidate and Department Chair)

1. Candidate's RPT File & Notebook.

“Candidate's file. Proper preparation and completeness of each Candidate's file are essential for the uninterrupted progress of a RPT review through all the stages of the review process... The file is envisioned as a notebook in the Department office, which is growing throughout a faculty

member's probationary period at the University” (University Policy 6-303-III-D).

Candidates for both formal and informal RPT reviews present their qualifications in a file referred to here as a “Notebook”. The Candidate’s Notebook has the same basic structure and format for each review, and it builds and evolves over the probationary period as the Candidate’s record of accomplishments changes and grows. (Candidates may wish to keep updating the same “notebook” after a positive tenure decision for use in subsequent promotion reviews.) Candidates submit their review materials in a notebook provided by the Department. The Notebook should contain an introductory section containing a completed research summary document, the Candidate’s curriculum vita and formal statements on research, teaching, and service. This is followed by sections on research, teaching and service, respectively, in which the Candidate includes documentation for activities and accomplishments in each of these areas. For example, the section on research would include copies of selected papers (published and in progress), copies of correspondence from journal editors indicating the status of papers that have been submitted for publication, any information that the Candidate wants to include on journal or article quality, information on book chapters, papers presented at meetings, letters from collaborators commenting on the relative contributions to a research product, and so on. The teaching section would include teaching evaluations, sample syllabi, documentation on teaching awards, etc. Normally the service section of the notebook would consist of a short list of committees and professional service activities. The Candidate may include an “Other” section of the Notebook to provide information that does not fit logically into the Introduction, Research, Teaching, or Service sections. New faculty members may ask the Department Chair to see examples of these notebooks, and all Candidates may consult with the Chair or any other faculty member, including the RPT Committee Chair, as they assemble their review materials. The Candidate must submit these materials to the Department Chair in accordance with the Schedule provided below.

Once the Candidate submits the Notebook to the review process, the Department Chair adds other elements to the Candidate’s file in the course of the RPT Process within the Department. As described further in III-B, below these elements include Undergraduate and Graduate SAC reports (formal reviews only); external reviewer evaluations (formal; see below); Departmental RPT Advisory Committee vote report (formal) and written recommendation (informal/formal); Department Chair Recommendation; any written response/reaction to these recommendations that the Candidate wishes to include as the file goes forward to the next level of review (i.e., the College); and past review recommendations. In addition, the Department Chair will have invited other Department members to provide written comments on the Candidate’s qualifications (formal), and these will be included in the file, as well, as it goes forward. Finally, in the case of Candidates holding appointment in other programs, written recommendations from those other programs will be submitted to the Chair who will include them in the file, as mentioned elsewhere in this document and in University Policy 6-303-III-D-6.

2. Department RPT Advisory Committee, Committee Chair, and Secretary

The Department *RPT Advisory Committee* is responsible for identifying a list of potential external reviewers for formal reviews and providing this list to the Department Chair. The Department Chair selects at least one name from this list and at least one from the Candidate’s list and is responsible for seeing to it that three or four, in total, will agree to provide written

evaluations of the Candidate. (The details of the process for identifying External Reviewers are described below.) However, the most important role of the Committee is to provide a recommendation and vote on Candidates' retention, promotion, and/or tenure. The composition of the RPT Advisory Committee is determined by the specific RPT decision to be considered. For retention and tenure, the Committee consists of all tenured faculty members of the Department of Sociology with the exception of the Department Chair. For consideration of promotion to Associate Professor, it consists of all Associate Professors and full Professors, less the Chair (as immediately above). And, for promotion to full Professor, it consists of all full Professors, aside from the Chair, also as above (see University Policy 6-303-III-A-3). The involvement of the Chair in the Committee's deliberations depends upon the wishes of the Committee. According to University Policy 6-303-III-E-5, "Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity may attend and, upon invitation by majority vote of the Committee, may submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote the Committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. Department chairpersons, deans and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacities shall not vote at the Department level."

Each academic year, before the end of the second semester, members of the faculty of the Department vote to elect a new *Committee Chair* of this RPT Advisory Committee. Policy 6-303-III-A-3-b provides: "Chairperson. The Chairperson of the Department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the Department. In this election all regular faculty members of the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor shall be entitled to vote. The Department Chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee."

Before the end of the Spring Semester, the Department Chair has the Advisory Committee Chair call the first meeting of the Committee. At this meeting, the Committee appoints from among its members a *Secretary* for each RPT Candidate for that academic year. The Secretary is appointed following discussion and reaching consensus on an appropriate Secretary for each Candidate. In subsequent meetings, called by the Committee Chair, each Secretary takes responsibility for leading the Committee's discussion of the respective Candidate's records, keeping notes on the discussion, and drafting the Committee's written recommendation. The Committee Chair, with the consent of the Committee, is responsible for calling a vote on each RPT decision, and the Committee's vote, which is conducted by secret ballot, is recorded on the final written recommendation form. After drafting the recommendation, the Secretary provides it to the Committee Chair who then circulates it to all Committee members for comments and suggestions. This process continues until the Committee as a whole agrees by consensus (or vote, if necessary) that the recommendation accurately reflects the views of the Committee as a whole. This recommendation is then forwarded to the Candidate and the Department Chair, serving to inform the Department Chair's recommendation on the Candidate's retention, tenure, or promotion. University Policy, 6-303-III-E-6&7 specifies the details of this process, including the timing.

3. External Reviewers

External Reviewers provide crucial input into the formal RPT Decisions. They are well qualified experts in the Candidate's field of expertise whom the Department asks to comment specifically on the Candidate's record of scholarly accomplishments in the form of a written report that becomes part of the Candidate's RPT file. These assessments then serve to inform the recommendations of the Committee, the Chair, and at subsequent steps in the review process once it leaves the Department. Both the Candidate and the RPT Advisory Committee have input into the list of potential reviewers that the Department Chair ultimately uses to secure these evaluations. The Candidate provides a list of at least five potential external reviewers. These individuals should be scholars who conduct research in the Candidate's specialty area(s), are well published in this field, do not have an obvious conflict of interest in providing an unbiased assessment of the Candidate's scholarly record, and are at an appropriate level of accomplishment in the discipline (e.g., at or above the rank to which a Candidate is seeking promotion).

The process by which External Reviewers are identified begins with the Candidate, whom the Department Chair asks to provide a list of at least five potential reviewers before the end of the semester preceding the RPT review year. The Chair then makes this list available to the RPT Advisory Committee, which checks it for the appropriateness of the reviewers (i.e., according to the criteria mentioned above). The Advisory Committee adds three to five names of additional appropriate external reviewers. The Committee then provides the Department Chair with the resulting composite list, identifying which names were nominated by the Candidate and which were suggested by the Advisory Committee. . During the summer, the Department Chair uses this list to secure evaluations from three or four external reviewers, assuring that at least one name comes from the Candidate's list and one name comes from the Committee's list. The Committee may decide to use letters from an earlier review if the earlier review took place in the previous academic year. The Committee or Candidate with Committee approval may ask individuals who participated in an earlier review of the same Candidate to evaluate a Candidate and write a letter for a particular review in subsequent evaluations. However, there must be written evaluations from at least two new external reviewers for each formal review. As a matter of practicality, the Chair may request four reviews in an effort to ensure that at least three reviews will be returned according to schedule (see below). The Candidate will have been given the opportunity to waive rights to see the letters of evaluation, and in the invitation to the external reviewers and in subsequent correspondence with them, the Department Chair will inform each of them whether or not the Candidate has waived rights to access their evaluations. (See waiver form in Policy 6-303).

Once the External Reviewers have been selected and agreed to participate, the Department Chair will provide each with a packet of information on the Candidate's record of accomplishments. This packet will normally consist of the Candidate's C.V., the Candidate's written statements on research, teaching, and service, and examples of the Candidate's written research. As these reviews are most pertinent to evaluating the quality and potential of the Candidate's scholarly work, it is the written work along with the Candidate's C.V. and statement on research that are most important elements of this packet. The Candidate, with the advice of the Chair and Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee, determines what to include in the way of written work. Normally, this portion of the packet would consist of four or five papers, including recently published/accepted papers and, especially for Retention and Tenure Candidates, papers not yet

published but nearly ready to send out for review. Of course a book manuscript, a funded research proposal, or some other significant research-related document authored primarily by the Candidate may also be included as part of this portion of the packet. The Department Chair shall also include a copy of the Department's RPT Guidelines. The Department Chair is responsible for sending out the packets to the reviewers and seeing that their reviews are returned in a timely fashion.

B. Departmental RPT Time Table of Formal Reviews.

Specific Chronology and Procedural Steps in RPT Reviews. Most of the following steps are applicable to formal reviews only. See Part III-C for steps exclusive to informal reviews.

MARCH

1. Department Chair determines obligatory RPT reviews for upcoming year.
2. Department Chair conducts faculty election of Advisory Committee chair for upcoming year.

APRIL

1. Candidates scheduled for formal review in the fall will be informed of projected review by the Department Chair. Candidates requesting formal reviews shall do so in writing to the Department chair no later than April 30th.
2. For Candidates holding jointly funded appointments, the Department chair informs the director of the other program (in writing) of the proposed review. (Policy 6-303-III-C-4)
3. Department Chair and Chair of the RPT committee meet with Candidates scheduled for formal reviews in the fall to review the following:
 - a. review RPT procedures and schedule of events
 - b. secure waiver/non-waiver of confidentiality for external letters of review, inform Candidates under review of University policy and procedures regarding review and appeal procedures, etc., as they pertain to formal RPT reviews and provide copies of the Department RPT Procedures and Guidelines and University Policies relevant to RPT.
4. Candidates scheduled for a formal review provide the Department Chair a list of at least five external reviewers. The Department Chair shares this list with the Advisory Committee.

MAY

1. The Department chair calls meeting of the RPT Advisory Committee for formal reviews, prior to May 10th. Under the leadership of the elected Committee Chair, the Advisory Committee appoints a Secretary for each Candidate. The Committee reviews the Candidate's list of recommended reviewers and, as a committee, identifies three to five of its own

recommended potential external reviewers. The list must be prepared to ensure that names of both the Candidate's and the Advisory Committee are represented among those whom the Chair will invite to evaluate the Candidate's record.

2. The lists are submitted to the Department Chair by the Chair of the RPT committee.

JUNE-JULY-AUGUST

The Candidate for formal review provides chairperson of Department with copies of materials to be sent to external reviewers. The materials to be sent are described above in this section under External Reviews (part III-A-3, above).

From the composite list provided by the Advisory Committee, the Department Chair secures agreement to review from a minimum of three external reviewers, ensuring that this final list includes at least one nominee of the Candidate scheduled for review and at least one name recommended by the Advisory Committee. The Chair sends out materials to reviewers for their evaluation. The Department Chair will request each reviewer to provide a written evaluation and a copy of their vitae. If the Candidate has requested that the materials be solicited on a confidential basis, the reviews and reviewers' vitae will be placed in a separate file, maintained under the direction of the Department Chair but accessible to members of the RPT Committee and, in the case of Candidates holding appointments in another program, accessible to the director of the program and members of that program's RPT committee.

SEPTEMBER

For formal reviews, the Chair sees that reports are provided by both undergraduate and graduate SACs. These reports should be based on the guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the Chair (Policy 6-303-III-C-3). The Chair would normally work through the Chairs of Undergraduate Committee and Graduate Committee who would meet with respective SAC student officers regarding their input into the RPT process.

1. The Candidate completes RPT file by providing Department Chair with the "notebook" described above, which must contain:
 - a. Current copy of curriculum vitae.
 - b. Formal statement of teaching, research, service activities, and achievements and all plans evidencing the basis for a positive recommendation for retention and/or promotion.
 - c. Other materials that the Candidate deems appropriate.
3. Chair sends notice to Department faculty and interested staff of right to submit written comments and evaluations concerning Candidate, time of RPT Advisory Committee meeting, and eligibility to attend.

4. If the Candidate is also a member of a program, pursuant to Policy 6-303-III-C-4, the Chair of the Department shall (a) again, notify the program director of the scheduled review and (b) invite an evaluation of the file and submission of comments, to be submitted prior to the Department's RPT meeting. The Department chair shall inform the program director of the approximate period of the Department's RPT meeting (e.g., approximately the second-third week in October) so that the program has adequate time to review the file and submit its written report in advance of the Department RPT Advisory Committee review. The Department Chair shall provide each program in which a Candidate holds an appointment with a copy of the Department of Sociology RPT Policy and Procedures for reference purposes only.
5. The Candidate's file shall be closed by September 30th. However, the Candidate alone may add relevant new information to the file up until the time the Committee meets in order to vote. The Candidate should do this by giving the information to the Department Chair who will then be responsible for letting members of the Committee know that this new information has been added.

OCTOBER

1. Department Chair calls RPT meeting by October 15th.
2. Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair conducts meeting. RPT Committee votes to invite or not to invite Department Chair's participation in deliberations, though the Chair may attend.
3. RPT committee votes on retention, tenure and/or promotion after discussion of file, with absentee ballots accepted before the meeting is held (as per Policy 6-303-III-E-4). RPT Committee produces and approves a final written recommendation, including information about the vote and attendance. The final report is signed as approved by RPT Committee Chair and Secretary, and it is given to Department Chair and Candidate by October 30th.

NOVEMBER

1. Department Chair writes recommendation and provides it to the Candidate along with notification of option to respond to chair's letter and RPT Advisory Committee report. Candidate is informed that he or she has seven business days to respond from date of receipt of chair's letter. (Policy 6-303-III-F-3).
2. Chair adds Candidate's response, if any, to the file without comment.
3. Chair forwards file to Dean's office by November 15th.

C. Time-Table of Informal Reviews

JANUARY-FEBRUARY

1. Candidate for *informal* retention review completes file by January 30, by providing Department Chair with the “notebook” (as described above) which must include:
 - a. Current copy of curriculum vitae.
 - b. Research summary document, statement of teaching, research, service activities, and achievements and all plans evidencing the basis for a positive recommendation for retention.
 - c. Other materials that the Candidate being reviewed deems appropriate.
2. Department Chair informs the RPT Committee as the informal file(s) is (are) ready.
3. The RPT Committee meeting is called by the RPT Chair.
4. A consensus report is developed by the RPT committee and submitted to the Department Chair.

MARCH-APRIL

5. By end of February, the Department Chair writes his/her own letter of recommendation for retention of informal review Candidates and attaches it to the RPT Committee report, making both available to the Candidate. The Candidate is informed that he or she has seven business days to respond from date of receipt of Chair’s letter. If the Candidate responds, the Chair adds it to the informal review file without further comment. These documents are forwarded to the Dean and also added to the Candidate’s file.
6. Department Chair meets with each informal review Candidate to discuss their evaluation and plans for continued development. The Chair may request the Committee Chair to be present as well at the meeting or to meet separately with the Candidate.

IV. Appendices

- A. University RPT Standards Committee notice of final approval.

Memorandum

To: Jeffrey D. Kentor, Chairperson-- Sociology Department
Cc: M. David Rudd, Dean-- College of Social and Behavioral
Science
Susan Olson, Associate V.P. Academic Affairs

From: Hank Liese, College of Social Work

Hank Liese

Chairperson, University RPT Standards Committee 2010-2011

Subject: Approval of RPT Statement
Date: April 25, 2011

This is to confirm that the attached version of the departmental RPT Statement, dated as approved on April 25, 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.