

Department Of Political Science

Policies and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Regular Faculty

Approved by Department Faculty April 16, 2012

Approved by Dean [date] April 23, 2012

Approved by University RPT Standards Committee April 24, 2012, for implementation as of July 1, 2012.

Amended by Department Faculty April 13, 2018

Amendment approved by Dean [date]

Amendment Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee [date]

This document serves as the departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures required by University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-a. It integrates the department's standards and procedures for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions with the relevant portions of University policy. Through this mechanism both levels of policy are available in the same document. The most important of such University Policies are 6-303 (Retention, Promotion, and Tenure), and 6-311 (Faculty Retention and Tenure), available at the University Regulations Website <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/>. Pertinent passages from each of these policies are included at appropriate places in this document, with sections from University policy written in *Italics*. This Statement follows the order of University Policy 6-303.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty	1
1.2	University Policy Regarding Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure.....	1
1.3	Timing of Formal and Informal Reviews.....	3
1.3a.	Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period.....	3
1.3b.	Timing of Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor.....	4
1.4	Informal Reviews.....	4
1.4a.	First Year Reviews.....	4
1.5.	Overview of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards	4
1.5a.	Promotion from Assistant to Associate with Tenure (Overview)	5
1.5b.	Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor (Overview).....	5
1.5c.	Granting of Tenure to Associate Professor without Tenure	5
1.5d.	Retention.....	5
1.6	Triggering Formal Retention Reviews	5
2.	Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Granting of Tenure ...	6
2.1.	Research	6
2.1a.	Quantity	6
2.1b.	Independence and Contribution	6
2.1c.	Purpose	7
2.1d.	Quality of Publication Outlet.....	8
2.1e.	Impact.....	9
2.1f.	Research Grants and Fellowships.....	9
2.1g.	Future Research Plans.....	9
2.1h	Research Performance Standards Required for Retention	9
2.1i.	Research Performance Standards Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	9
2.2.	Teaching	11
2.2a.	Performance Standards for Teaching.....	11
2.3.	Service	14

2.3a.	Service Performance Standards, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	14
3.	Standards and Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	16
3.1.	Research	16
3.1a.	Quantity	16
3.1b.	Independence and Contribution	16
3.1c.	Purpose	16
3.1d.	Quality of Publication Outlet.....	17
3.1e.	Impact.....	17
3.1f.	Research Grants and Fellowships.....	17
3.1g.	Future Research Plans.....	17
3.1h.	Research Performance Standards Required for Promotion to Professor.....	17
3.2.	Teaching	19
3.2a.	Performance Standards for Teaching.....	19
3.3.	Service	21
3.3a.	Service Performance Standards Required for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	21
4.	Roles and Duties in the RPT Process.....	23
4.1.	Department Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Advisory Committee	23
4.1a.	RPT Advisory Committee membership.....	23
4.1b.	Single vote rule.	23
4.2.	RPT Review Committee & Subcommittees.	24
4.2a.	Formation of Subcommittees.	24
4.2b.	Duties of Subcommittee Chairs.	24
5.	Notice to Involved Parties.....	25
5.1.	Notice to Candidate.....	25
5.2.	Notice to Department Faculty and Staff.....	25
5.3.	Notice to Student Advisory Committee.....	25
5.4.	Notice to Academic Program.....	26
6.	Candidate's File.....	26
6.1.	Structure of the File	26

6.2.	Security of RPT Files	26
6.3.	Contents of RPT File	27
6.3a.	Curriculum Vitae	27
6.3b.	Evidence of Research/Creative Activity	27
6.3c.	Past Reviews and Recommendations	27
6.3d.	Evidence of Faculty Responsibility	27
6.3e.	Recommendation from Academic Program	28
6.3f.	Recommendation from the Department Student Advisory Committee	28
6.3g.	Other Written Statements	28
6.4	External Evaluations	28
6.4a.	Waiver/Non-waiver form	28
6.4b.	Department Rules for Selection of External Evaluators	29
6.5.	Candidate's Rights to See and Comment on File	29
6.6.	File Closing Date & Review of File	30
7.	Department RPT Advisory Committee Meetings	30
7.1.	Committee Member Responsibilities	30
7.2.	Committee Secretary	30
7.3.	Quorum	30
7.4.	Absentee Voting	31
7.5.	Limitations on Participation and Voting	31
7.6.	Vote on Committee Report	31
7.7.	Approval of the Committee Report	31
7.8.	Confidentiality	32
8.	Action by Department Chairperson	32
8.1.	Recommendation	32
8.2.	Notice to Faculty Member	32
8.3.	Candidate's Right to Respond	32
8.4.	Forwarding Files & Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level	32
9.	Post-review Meeting	33
	Appendix A: RPT Timetable	34

Appendix B: RPT File Contents.....	36
Appendix C: Departmental Guidelines for CV's in the RPT Process	38
Appendix D: University RPT Standards Committee notice of final approval of Departmental RPT Statement { <i>pending</i> }.....	40

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Political Science is to pursue excellence in research, teaching, and service in the discipline of political science. The Department seeks to provide adequate breadth in the array of disciplinary specializations appropriate to a large and diverse student body. The Department also seeks to make available to the community whatever resources it can offer with respect to issues of public concern and interest.

The Department assesses its faculty performance in terms of three broad areas of responsibility:

1. Research and scholarship;
2. Teaching; and
3. Service to the Department, the College, the University, the community, and the profession.

The following statement of criteria, standards, and procedure in the Department of Political Science with respect to faculty retention, promotion, and tenure is based on and aims to implement the criteria, standards and procedures stated in the University Regulations, especially Policy 6-303.

1.1 Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The revised RPT standards, criteria, and procedures contained in this Statement will come into effect as of July 1, 2012. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under the new RPT standards. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for promotion with granting of tenure (assistant to associate level) will have the option of choosing the old RPT requirements or the new RPT requirements. Previously appointed candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor may choose the old requirements for reviews completed in or before the 2014-15 academic year. In each case, the new requirements will apply unless the candidate's choice of the old requirements is communicated to the department chairperson by signed letter before review materials are sent to reviewers for external evaluations (See 6.4 below).

1.2 University Policy Regarding Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure

"b. Criteria. Teaching, research/creative activity, and service shall be assessed for retention, promotion, and tenure in terms of both the quantity and quality of work achieved. Departmental RPT Statements shall identify means of assessing quantity and quality appropriate to the discipline or profession. Any departmental expectation of accomplishment of or potential for obtaining external funding support (and the rationale for imposing such expectation) shall be described with particularity in the departmental statement.

In carrying out their duties in teaching, research/other creative activity and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-316). Assessments of teaching, research/other creative activity and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty.

c. 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.

i. Teaching and research/other creative activity.

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. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence.

Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department. A department may select standards higher than these minimum requirements if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank. Departmental RPT Statements shall clearly describe the standards applicable for each rank.

ii. University, professional, and public service. Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their public service. Demonstration of effective service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for retention, promotion, and tenure. A department may select higher standards if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

d. Prior accomplishments. Candidates in a regular faculty appointment may have accomplishments achieved prior to their probationary period at the University of Utah be considered as relevant to the demonstration of their achievement of the RPT criteria. Prior accomplishments, such as research publications or teaching experience, shall not substitute for a continuing record of accomplishments during the probationary period at the University of Utah. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the RPT criteria. (For evaluation process, see Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-1.)” (This is quoted from Policy 6-303-III-A-2-, b to d).

1.3 Timing of Formal and Informal Reviews

“All tenure-eligible faculty members shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/other creative activity, responsibility, and service. Informal annual reviews are required in each year in which a formal review is not held. More extensive, formal reviews are required for mid-probationary retention reviews; final probationary year reviews (consideration for tenure); consideration for termination at any point in the probationary period (such as triggered reviews); and promotion decisions.” (Policy 6-303-III-B)

“Formal reviews must provide a substantive assessment of the candidate’s research or other creative activity, teaching and service to date.” (Policy 6-303-III-B-2)

1.3a. Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

1. Normal probationary period and review schedule. To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Department will conduct a formal review of its non-tenured candidates for **retention in their fourth** and for **tenure in their seventh** year of service, if appointed as assistant professors. Informal reviews will be conducted during the second and all other subsequent years, with the following possible exceptions.

2. Shortening or extending of period, modifying review schedule. An early formal (*i.e.*, “triggered”) review may be requested by the Departmental RPT Advisory Committee or the Department Chair, according to Policy 6-303- III-B-1-c, and Section 1.6 below. Candidates may request early reviews by following the procedures in Policy 6-311-Sec. 4-C-1. Candidates are encouraged to consult with senior colleagues before requesting early tenure.

If the candidate has had an authorized extension of the probationary period (*e.g.*, under Policy 6-300, Sec. 2-D. or Policy 6-311, Sec. 4-C-2. or Policy 6-315), the years of the formal retention review and the mandatory review for tenure shall be adjusted accordingly. Extensions of the probationary period authorized by University policies may postpone

formal reviews, but informal reviews will occur in any year in which a formal review is not held.

1.3b. Timing of Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

Associate professors may request promotion to the rank of professor at any time at which they have met the department's requirements. The department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to associate professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to rank of professor.

1.4 Informal Reviews

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on departmental expectations.

1.4a. First Year Reviews

In the spring semester of a candidate's first year, the department chair shall conduct a brief administrative review of the candidate's teaching evaluations and scholarship to ensure no serious problems have arisen. No written report is required from this review. If such problems appear, the chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss them and is authorized to call for a formal review in the second year if needed.

1.4b Second Year and Subsequent Informal Reviews

In the second year review, a primary function of the RPT subcommittee (described in Part 4 below) will be to provide advice and counsel in connection with the formation of the sort of file that will need to be made available for the formal review process with due attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: teaching, research and scholarship, and service to the Department, profession, University and community.

For the second and subsequent years, the RPT subcommittee shall prepare a report on each probationary faculty member and distribute it to members of the RPT Advisory Committee, which shall meet to discuss the reports. In an informal review the RPT Advisory Committee shall vote either to retain the faculty member or to conduct a formal review.

Candidates shall have the opportunity to make a written response to the report. The report and the response, if any, are then filed in the candidate's cumulative file with a copy of each sent to the Dean. The Department Chair (or Associate Chair) will meet with the candidate to discuss the report and any concerns about the candidate's progress toward the next formal review. The informal review normally concludes at this point.

1.5. Overview of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards

The Retention, Promotion, and Tenure standards of the Department of Political Science reflect the University standards, as quoted in Section 1.2.

1.5a. Promotion from Assistant to Associate with Tenure (Overview)

As more fully described in Part 2, for granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of a cumulative record demonstrating sustained achievement in one of the following combinations of the standards of i) effective, ii) meritorious, or iii) excellent (as defined in Section 2.1i, below):

1. Excellent in research and at least effective in teaching and service, or
2. Meritorious in research, teaching, and service, or
3. Excellent in teaching, and meritorious in research and at least effective in service.

A candidate who is judged to have only been effective in research will not receive tenure. A candidate whose teaching performance is less than effective will not receive tenure.

1.5b. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor (Overview)

As more fully described in Part 3, for promotion to Professor, a candidate must demonstrate continued quality and growth in research, teaching, and service. A candidate's record since tenure and promotion to associate professor must, as a threshold, continue to satisfy the requirements for tenure, and additionally be:

1. Excellent in one (or more) areas of research, teaching, and/or service – and meritorious in the others, or
2. Consistently meritorious in research, teaching, and service.

1.5c. Granting of Tenure to Associate Professor without Tenure

Ordinarily, the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor occur at the same time. In the rare event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an Associate Professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of Professor.

1.5d. Retention

Recommendations for retention will be made for those candidates who are making satisfactory progress in fulfilling the above-described requirements for granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor.

1.6 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

“If a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the 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.” (Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c)

If the department chair or a majority of the RPT Advisory Committee members present at an informal review votes to conduct a formal review, the review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the committee votes again to proceed with the review in the current academic year. A triggered formal review shall include external review letters unless a majority of the committee votes that quality of research is not an issue in the review.

2. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Granting of Tenure

This section provides details of the standards and criteria for promotion to associate professor, and granting of tenure. As described in Part 1.5a (overview), in general the requirements are: (i) excellent in research and at least effective in teaching and service, or (ii) meritorious in research, teaching, and service, or, (iii) excellent in teaching, and meritorious in research and at least effective in service.

2.1. Research

The department employs the standards of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in research, and at a minimum requires research at the standard of meritorious in a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Assessment of research includes five criteria: quantity, independence and contribution, purpose, quality of the publication outlet, and impact.

2.1a. Quantity

As established by Part 2.1i below, the minimum quantity of publications needed for tenure and the rank of associate professor is “one (single or co-authored) book and three articles or book chapters, or seven articles or chapters without a book; or the equivalent. A larger number of publications and/or higher relative ratings for purpose, quality of publication outlet, and impact is needed to elevate a candidate’s research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent.” The department may take into consideration unusually long or unusually short publications in assessing quantity.

2.1b. Independence and Contribution

To qualify for tenure and the rank of associate professor, candidates must demonstrate the ability to conceptualize, design, and conduct research independently. If most or all of a candidate's publications are co-authored, the department will consider the candidate's role in the conceptual development and contributions to the actual research and writing of the body of academic work.

In assessing independence and contribution, the department reserves the right to solicit a letter from one or more co-authors describing the candidate's contribution, especially when all or most of a candidate's publications are co-authored. This is especially likely if co-authors have been mentors of the candidate. Candidates also have the right to solicit such letters from co-authors for the file themselves.

Because of the important value of mentoring students, we affirmatively value publications with students as co-authors and recognize them as a contribution to teaching as well as research.

2.1c. Purpose

The mission of the University, in part, is to create new knowledge. Consistent with this, scholarship is in part evaluated by the degree to which the work contributes to new understanding. Five categories of scholarship purpose are listed below, reflecting a general ordering from greater to lesser significance. This ordering does not imply that the latter categories have no value. All categories represent traditional forms of scholarship that have a place in the various discipline areas contained within political science. However, some scholarship purposes reflect to a higher degree the University mission of creating new knowledge, and the department recognizes the greater significance of these categories of scholarship.

1. **Category 1: Theory Development.** This category includes scholarly contributions that develop significant new theories or methodologies relevant to the field of political science. New theory refers to the elaboration of an original set of interconnected hypotheses with explanatory power, or the development of a new conceptual framework with interpretive significance or critical-normative value. New theory provides novel ways of explaining, understanding, and/or critically appraising political phenomena. New methodological contributions can take many forms but, to belong in this category, contributions must be novel and provide significant new insights into politics.
2. **Category 2: Theory Testing and Application.** This category includes scholarship that advances knowledge in the field of political science through the novel testing, application, and/or critical elaboration of existing theories (or forms of knowledge) with new implications for future research, theory, or practice.
3. **Category 3: New Evidence.** This category includes scholarly contributions that report significant new empirical evidence (qualitative or quantitative), but with little or no development of new conceptual understanding. Empirical, analytic, or qualitative studies that describe phenomena (e.g., events, actors, decisions,

opinions) without providing significantly new theoretical ways of understanding these phenomena fall into this category.

4. Category 4: Literature Review. This category includes scholarly contributions that summarize and analyze the existing knowledge, methods, and significance of a particular field or branch of political inquiry (e.g., textbooks, and state of the field summaries), often with recommendations for the direction of future research, testing, and/or practical application.
5. Category 5: Commentary and Analysis of Existing Knowledge. This category includes scholarly products of limited scope and purpose such as published comments, editorials, or book reviews.

2.1d. Quality of Publication Outlet

Quality is the extent to which the research is consistent with the methods and goals of the field, shaped by knowledge that is current and appropriate to the topic, and well written. Quality is best measured by experts in the field, including peer reviewers for publications, external reviewers solicited for the RPT review, and University of Utah colleagues who have personally read the publications. In the discipline of political science the reputation of various scholarly outlets is a valid surrogate measure of the quality of the scholarship published therein. Thus, the department recognizes the following distinctions among publication outlets, ranked from highest quality to lowest.

Candidates are expected to cite evidence to support claims about the quality of publication outlets. Candidates are encouraged to use evidence such as journal or publisher rankings, journal impact scores, other books in a publisher's list, and/or editorial board composition. Electronic publications count the same as traditional print publications if these indicators of quality are comparable.

1. Tier 1: Examples of this tier include blind-reviewed scholarly books in highly regarded university and trade presses; blind-reviewed articles in top-tier journals in the discipline and within distinct subfields; and blind-reviewed chapters published in books by top-tier presses.
2. Tier 2: Examples of this tier include articles in respected blind-reviewed journals, blind-reviewed scholarly books with respected publishers, blind-reviewed book chapters in a high quality edited book, and the editing of scholarly books.
3. Tier 3: Examples of this tier include articles and chapters in peer-reviewed journals and books, including law reviews; peer-reviewed abstracts; and authored books on public affairs topics for the general public.
4. Tier 4: Textbooks and readers (i.e., edited collections of previously published works)

5. Tier 5: Examples of this tier include articles in non-peer-reviewed journals; unpublished technical reports; and conference presentations and proceedings.

2.1e. Impact

Impact is assessed after publication and thus will be given more weight in promotions to Professor than to Associate Professor with tenure. Impact is the degree to which research has changed the way other scholars, other professionals, or the public thinks about a topic. Recognition should be predominantly positive, though we recognize that valuable scholarly work may be controversial. Non-rank-ordered examples of measures of impact include:

1. Citations
2. Reviews
3. Conclusions from qualified external reviewers
4. Recognition such as awards and honors
5. Publicity in the general media
6. Invitations to give addresses or participate in symposia and workshops at prominent national/international conferences
7. Reprints of articles and subsequent editions of books
8. Adoption of one's publications in other academics' syllabi
9. Consulting (within limits of University Policy 5-204)

2.1f. Research Grants and Fellowships

Although research grants and fellowships are typically not available in some fields and are thus not required, they are often important to scholarly activity in other fields. The extent to which a candidate has been active in seeking and able to obtain research grant funds and fellowships, thereby increasing the probability of research and scholarly publications, will contribute to moving a candidate's research record from effectiveness toward excellence.

2.1g. Future Research Plans

The candidate should include in the personal statement in her/his RPT file (see Appendix B) a section explaining their future research agenda in political science. This statement should explain the track that the candidate expects to take over the next five years in her/his research.

2.1h Research Performance Standards Required for Retention

For retention in rank, candidates must demonstrate that they are making satisfactory progress toward fulfilling the standards for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Candidates should follow the standards in this document as they work to determine if they are on track to meet these requirements during the probationary period.

2.1i. Research Performance Standards Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To achieve tenure and the rank of associate professor, a candidate's research file must be judged meritorious or excellent (See Section 1.5a, and standards noted in Sections 2.1.i.a. – 2.1.i.e). A candidate who is judged to have only been effective in research will not receive tenure.

2.1.i.a. Quantity (minimum, and forthcoming or prior works)

1. The minimum quantity of publications establishing *effectiveness* in research is one (single or co-authored) book and three articles or book chapters, or seven articles or chapters without a book; or the equivalent. A larger number of publications and/or higher relative ratings for purpose, quality of publication outlet, and impact is needed to elevate a candidate's research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent.

2. Forthcoming works will count for all research criteria if the author or editor has completed all work that is her/his responsibility, leaving only production remaining.

3. Works Published Prior to Appointment at the University of Utah. In accord with University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-d (prior accomplishments), works published before appointment to a regular faculty position at the University of Utah may count toward the minimum number needed to establish effectiveness. To receive tenure and the rank of associate professor, the candidate will need to continue a meritorious or excellent publication record after appointment to the department. Determinations as to the specific quantitative value of such prior works, for purposes of meeting the department's required minimum quantity, will be made prior to completion of the candidate's first formal RPT review, and documented in the report of the RPT subcommittee for that review.

2.1.i.b. Effectiveness Standard in Research

Effectiveness in research (*for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*) means that a candidate has met the minimum quantity of publications; has demonstrated some independent intellectual contributions to the field; the purpose of scholarship is primarily in categories 2 and 3; quality of publication outlet ratings are exclusively in tier 2 through 5; and there is at least minimal evidence in support of some scholarly impact. Ineffectiveness in research means that a faculty member has not met these minimum standards for quantity or quality.

2.1.i.c. Meritorious Standard in Research

Meritorious research (*for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*) means that a candidate has met or exceeded the minimum quantity of publications; has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; the purpose of scholarship is distributed among categories 1-3; quality of publication outlet ratings are distributed among tiers 1 and 2; and there is clear evidence of scholarly impact.

2.1.i.d. Excellence Standard in Research

Excellence in research (*for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*) means that a candidate has **met or exceeded the minimum quantity of publications**; has clearly

demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; has made significant contributions to purpose category 1 (as well as 2 and 3); has more than one publication with an outlet quality rating from tier 1; and there is strong evidence of scholarly impact.

2.2. Teaching

The department employs the standards of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in teaching. Assessment of teaching is based on three main criteria. The first two are:

1. course preparation and delivery, and
2. directing student research, and advising students in general.

Quality in these two areas consists of comprehensive planning, clear communication, openness to student opinions and concerns, fairness and timeliness of evaluation of student performance, awareness of scholarly developments in the appropriate disciplinary subfields, and willingness to accept new teaching assignments and advising arrangements.

3. A third category, curriculum or program development, will be utilized as a criterion for identifying meritorious and excellent teaching.

2.2a. Performance Standards for Teaching

2.2a.a. Effectiveness Standard in Teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is the minimum acceptable performance standard for granting of tenure (see Section 1.5a). Effectiveness in teaching will be determined based on evaluations of the sub-criteria of (1) course preparation and delivery, and (2) directing student research, and advising students in general.

1. Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in course preparation and delivery will consist of:

(a). Departmental Evaluation of Course syllabi: Course syllabi should be clear, well organized, with specified learning objectives and means of evaluation, and appropriately rigorous for the course level. These departmental evaluations of syllabi will be conducted by the RPT subcommittee and the RPT Chair.

(b). Student Course Feedback Results (course evaluations--obtained through the University's official course feedback report, per Policy 6-100-III-N): Student course feedback scores in which more students agree than disagree that the course and instructor were effective are necessary to establish effectiveness in teaching. Candidates are also expected to arrive for class promptly and to communicate and hold regularly scheduled advising times for students outside of class contact hours, and evidence on these matters will be obtained through the official student course feedback

reports, and from student reporting to the department administration (provided to the RPT subcommittee for its report).

(c). Faculty Peer Observation and Evaluation: All candidates for tenure will have their teaching evaluated by a member of the RPT subcommittee or RPT Chair. Candidates for tenure will undergo at least two pre-tenure in-class evaluations. The first evaluation must be conducted prior to the Fourth year formal review. The second evaluation must be conducted no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration for promotion to associate professor, with tenure. Candidates with a probationary period shortened so that having two or more evaluations is impractical must undergo at least one such evaluation no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration for promotion and tenure.

The relevant RPT subcommittee member or RPT Chair conducting the evaluation will produce a peer observation report after each classroom visit and meet with the candidate in a timely fashion to discuss the substance of the report. Faculty peer observation reports will be submitted to the RPT Chair and included in the RPT file for each formal review.

Candidates for tenure are strongly encouraged to utilize the Center for Teaching, Learning Excellence (CTLE) for additional classroom teaching evaluations and overall teaching advice. Candidates for tenure may include in the personal statement in their RPT files a section explaining how they are utilizing faculty peer observation reports and CTLE consultations.

(d). SAC Reports: SAC Reports (developed in accord with Policy 6-303-III-C-3) will be considered in determining the level of teaching performance.

2. Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in directing student research, and advising students in general will consist of:

(a). The candidate's personal statement shall describe, and the RPT subcommittee report shall address evidence of consistent and conscientious advising of graduate and undergraduate students, including serving on comprehensive exams and MA/Ph.D. committees, advising on MPA papers, Honors theses, and other undergraduate research, and these will be considered for establishing teaching effectiveness. Contributions to thesis and dissertation committees are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality of advising committee service. Quality of advising service will be determined by considering SAC reports, the evaluations of other faculty committee members, surveys of students and/or the departmental

staff who serve them, and recognition received by student projects, as presented to the RPT subcommittee for inclusion in its report added to the RPT file.

2.2a.b. Meritorious Standard in Teaching

To be considered a meritorious teacher, a candidate must as a threshold meet the above standards for *effectiveness* in teaching with respect to (1) course preparation and delivery and (2) directing student research, and advising students in general.

Additionally, the candidate must either (or in combination) consistently meet or exceed the Department average course feedback scores for teacher and course effectiveness and other teaching measures with respect to the course preparation and delivery criterion; or satisfy the third criterion

(3) Make significant contributions to curriculum or program development. Evidence considered for evaluation of such contributions may consist of:

- a. receiving grants for new course development or interdisciplinary teaching;
- b. developing innovative teaching methods;
- c. publishing on pedagogical practices or other teaching-related topics;
- d. developing educational materials that have an impact within or beyond departmental instruction (e.g., textbooks, software, assessment measures, etc.);
- e. providing new on-line course development;
- f. creating and overseeing new student programs;
- g. offering service learning courses;
- h. serving as an Honors Thesis adviser;
- i. serving as an editor for a student-run journal;
- j. giving talks or organizing colloquia or academic conferences about teaching or that systematically serve the educational needs of undergraduate and graduate students;
- k. publishing with graduate student co-authors; or
- l. any similar activity that makes a significant contribution to teaching political science at the University.

2.2a.c. Excellence Standard in Teaching

To be considered an excellent teacher, a candidate must have, as a threshold, satisfied the standards of both (i) effectiveness, and (ii) meritoriousness in teaching (analyzed as described above), and additionally must show evidence of **significant and sustained impact** in undergraduate or graduate education by such things as:

- a. receiving a University, College, or student teaching award or similar public acknowledgment for superior teaching and/or student advising;

- b. showing a record of sustained success in receiving teaching grants or other similar forms of financial support for teaching activities; or
- c. showing other evidence of distinguished contributions to teaching and student mentoring.

2.3. Service

Rationale: Service is a fundamental part of being a member of the faculty of the Department of Political Science. The management and collegiality of the department depend on members of the faculty participating in the work of the department. Likewise, certain aspects of the work of the College and the University depend on members of the faculty participating in certain activities.

It is important to note that it is the policy of the Political Science Department to minimize service assignments of untenured faculty members. The standards for excellent or meritorious service for untenured faculty members who are being reviewed for retention or considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure reflect this policy decision of the department.

2.3a. Service Performance Standards, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For retention, and for promotion to associate professor and granting of tenure, a candidate must be at least effective in service.

2.3a.a Effectiveness Standard in Service

Effective service means that the candidate has:

- a. regularly attended faculty meetings,
- b. regularly attended faculty recruitment candidate presentations, and
- c. has been conscientious in fulfillment of any departmental, College or University service assignments.

2.3a.b Meritorious Standard in Service

Meritorious service means that the candidate, as a threshold, has fulfilled the above requirements for effective service, and additionally has engaged in any of the following activities in *either* of the following two categories:

Public and Professional Service: Public and professional service can include contributions to the nation, state, community, and profession. These activities may include:

1. Consultant services to bureaus, commissions, agencies, legislative bodies, etc., within limits established by University Policy 5-204.
2. Participation in special community projects and studies.

3. Professionally related community positions, e.g., school board memberships, participation in educational groups, professional advising to various groups, public service agencies, etc.
4. General community educational contributions, lectures, workshops, community clinic work, etc.
5. Service as editor of a journal or book series for a press.
6. Service on editorial boards.
7. Conference participation as a section chair or program committee member.
8. Conference participation as a panel chair or discussant.
9. Service on grant review boards, such as the National Science Foundation.
10. Offices in professional associations.
11. Program participation in professional associations.
12. Invited addresses.
13. Refereeing articles for journals or book manuscripts for presses in the discipline.
14. Professional contributions to the print and electronic media.

Institutional Service: Institutional service can include contributions to the Department, the College, or the University. These activities can include:

1. Service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc., beyond the minimum typical assignments of regular faculty.
2. Committee chairmanships.
3. Service on hiring committees.
4. Elected positions, such as senate, college council, etc.
5. Service as a University representative to other Universities, organizations, etc.
6. Administrative service to the department, college, or University.

2.3a.c Excellence Standard in Service

For retention and for promotion to associate professor and granting of tenure, excellent service means that the candidate, as a threshold, has fulfilled the requirements for both effective and meritorious service (analyzed as described above), and additionally, has conscientiously fulfilled additional institutional and professional service as an assistant professor.

3. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

This section provides details of the standards and criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor. In general, as described in Part 1.5b (overview), for promotion to Professor, a candidate must demonstrate continued quality and growth in research, teaching, and service. A candidate's record since tenure and promotion to associate professor must, as a threshold, continue to satisfy the requirements for tenure, and additionally be (i) excellent in one (or more) areas of research, teaching, and/or service – and meritorious in the others, or (ii) consistently meritorious in research, teaching, and service.

The department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to associate professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor.

3.1. Research

As is the case for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor, in a review for promotion to Professor the department employs the *standards* of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in research, and at a minimum requires research at the standard of meritorious. The assessment of research in such a review includes the same five *criteria* of: (a) quantity, (b) independence and contribution, (c) purpose, (d) quality of the publication outlet, and (e) impact, as well as consideration of (f) research grants and fellowships (all as fully described in Part 2.1). However, in a review for promotion to Professor, the judgment is based primarily on *new* research accomplished subsequent to the review for tenure.

3.1a. Quantity

As established by Part 3.1h.a.2 below, “the minimum quantity of *new* publications establishing *effectiveness* in research, in a review for promotion to Professor, is one (single or co-authored) book and three articles or book chapters, or seven articles or chapters without a book; or the equivalent. A larger number of publications and/or higher relative ratings for purpose, quality, and impact is needed to elevate a candidate's research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent.”

3.1b. Independence and Contribution

The department will judge ratings of the research *independence and contribution* criterion in a review for promotion to Professor in the same way as in a review for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Part 2.1b).

3.1c. Purpose

The department will judge ratings of the research *purpose* criterion in a review for promotion to Professor in the same way as in a review for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Part 2.1c).

3.1d. Quality of Publication Outlet

The department will judge ratings of the research *quality of publication outlet* criterion in a review for promotion to Professor in the same way as in a review for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Part 2.1d).

3.1e. Impact

The department will judge ratings of the research *impact* criterion in a review for promotion to Professor in the same way as in a review for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Part 2.1e), with one variation. Impact will be given *greater relative weight* in a review for promotion to Professor than is true in a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Greater weight in this context is appropriate because impact is assessed after publication, and at the career stage of promotion to Professor, a candidate's research is expected to have achieved greater impact than would ordinarily be expected at the earlier stage of granting tenure and the rank of associate professor.

3.1f. Research Grants and Fellowships

The department will judge the *research-related criterion of research grants and fellowships* in a review for promotion to Professor in the same way as in a review for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Part 2.1f).

3.1g. Future Research Plans

As with a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor (Part 2.1g), a candidate reviewed for promotion to Professor should include in the personal statement in her/his RPT file (see Appendix B) a section explaining their future research agenda in political science. This statement should explain the track that the candidate expects to take over the next five years in her/his research.

3.1h. Research Performance Standards Required for Promotion to Professor

To achieve promotion to the rank of Professor a candidate's research file must be judged meritorious or excellent. A candidate who is judged to have only been effective in research will not receive such promotion. (This is the same *threshold* as applicable in a review for tenure and the rank of associate professor, see Part 2.1i. However, in the review for promotion to Professor the judgment is based primarily on *new* research accomplished subsequent to the review for tenure.)

3.1h.a. Quantity (minimum, and forthcoming works or works used as a basis for previous promotion)

1. The evaluation of research publications in a review for promotion to the rank of Professor is primarily based on new publications accomplished subsequent to the candidate's earlier review for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Particular publications which were previously counted for the quantity criterion in the earlier review for tenure and associate professor promotion will not be counted again for the quantity criterion in the subsequent review for promotion to Professor. This exclusion of previously counted publications applies for any particular works published prior to appointment at the University of Utah which were explicitly treated as part of the earlier tenure review, as well as any works which were explicitly treated as accomplished during the candidate's pre-tenure probationary period at the University (including any "forthcoming" works explicitly made part of the file for the tenure review).

2. The minimum quantity of *new* publications establishing *effectiveness* in research, in a review for promotion to Professor, is one (single or co-authored) book and three articles or book chapters, or seven articles or chapters without a book; or the equivalent. A larger number of publications and/or higher relative ratings for purpose, quality, and impact is needed to elevate a candidate's research performance from minimum effectiveness to a standard of meritorious or excellent.

3. In a promotion review, *forthcoming* new works will count for all research criteria if the author or editor has completed all work that is her/his responsibility, leaving only production remaining.

4. For a candidate reviewed for the rank of Professor who has not served a normal full probationary period at the University of Utah the same *overall career record* of quantity of publication applies as for candidates who do progress through the normal career phases at the University. However, in such unusual cases, the calculation of quantity is approached as follows. The overall career publications of the candidate must include both *one set* of publications meeting the quantity requirements applicable in a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor (described above in Part 2i.a), and a *second set* of publications meeting the quantity requirements described here in paragraph #2. All of the candidate's cumulative career publications will be considered as relevant for satisfying the combined quantity requirements—however, particular emphasis will be placed on the record of more recent publications, and there must be persuasive indications that the candidate will continue with a rate of publication suitable for the rank of Professor after receiving that rank at the University. This alternative approach to calculation of quantity is primarily applicable for a candidate reviewed for the rank of Professor at time of initial appointment at the University. It may also be employed for a candidate reviewed for the rank of Professor within fewer than five years after initial appointment at the University, if specifically approved as appropriate for that candidate by the department RPT Advisory Committee.

3.1h.b. Effectiveness Standard

As stated in Part 2.1i.b, “Effectiveness in research . . . means that a candidate has met the minimum quantity of publications; has demonstrated some independent intellectual contributions to the field; the purpose of scholarship is primarily in categories 2 and 3; quality of publication outlet ratings are exclusively in tier 2 through 5; and there is at least minimal evidence in support of some present and continuing scholarly impact.

Ineffectiveness in research means that a faculty member has not met these minimum standards for quantity or quality.” For promotion to Professor, the judgment is based primarily on *new* research accomplished subsequent to the review for tenure.

3.1h.c. Meritorious Standard in Research

As stated in Part 2.1i.c, “Meritorious research . . . means that a candidate has met or exceeded the minimum quantity of publications; has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; the purpose of scholarship is distributed among categories 1-3; quality of publication outlet ratings are distributed among tiers 1 and 2; and there is clear evidence of scholarly impact.” For promotion to Professor, the judgment is based primarily on *new* research accomplished subsequent to the review for tenure, and there is a focus on the *continuing* nature of the scholarly impact.

3.1h.d. Excellence Standard in Research

As stated in Part 2.1i.c, “Excellence in research . . . means that a candidate has met or exceeded the minimum quantity of publications; has clearly demonstrated independent intellectual contributions to the field; has made significant contributions to purpose category 1 (as well as 2 and 3); has more than one publication with an outlet quality rating from tier 1; and there is strong evidence of scholarly impact.” For promotion to Professor, the judgment is based primarily on *new* research accomplished subsequent to the review for tenure, and there is a focus on the *continuing* nature of the scholarly impact.

3.2. Teaching

As is the case for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor, in a review for promotion to Professor the department employs the *standards* of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in teaching. The assessment of teaching in such a review is based on same three main *criteria* of (i) course preparation and delivery (2) directing student research, and advising students in general, and (3) curriculum or program development; and the department will judge ratings of those three criteria in the same way as in a review for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor (all as fully described in Part 2.2 above).

3.2a. Performance Standards for Teaching

Meritoriousness in teaching is the minimum acceptable performance standard for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.2a.a. Effectiveness Standard in Teaching

As stated in Part 2.2a.a “Effectiveness in teaching will be determined based on evaluations of the sub-criteria of (1) course preparation and delivery, and (2) directing student research, and advising students in general.”

1. Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in course preparation and delivery will consist of: (a) departmental evaluation of course syllabi, (b) student course feedback results, (c) faculty peer teaching evaluations, and (d) SAC reports (all as described in Part 2.2a.a-1 above). A candidate for promotion to Professor will undergo at least one peer teaching observation since tenure and promotion to associate professor by a member of the RPT subcommittee or RPT Chair no later than the semester prior to submitting a full file for consideration of promotion.

2. Evidence for evaluations of effectiveness in directing student research and advising students in general will be as described in Part 2.2a.a-2 above.

3.2a.b. Meritorious Standard in Teaching

As described in Part 2.2a.b. above, “To be considered a meritorious teacher, a candidate must as a threshold meet the above standards for *effectiveness* in teaching with respect to (1) course preparation and delivery and (2) directing student research and advising students in general. *Additionally*, the candidate must either (or in combination) consistently meet or exceed the Department average course feedback scores for teacher and course effectiveness and other teaching measures (with respect to the course preparation and delivery criterion); or satisfy the third criterion

(3) Make significant contributions to curriculum or program development.
Evidence considered for evaluation of such contributions may consist of:

- a. receiving grants for new course development or interdisciplinary teaching;
- b. developing innovative teaching methods;
- c. publishing on pedagogical practices or other teaching-related topics;
- d. developing educational materials that have an impact within or beyond departmental instruction (e.g., textbooks, software, assessment measures, etc.);
- e. providing new on-line course development;
- f. creating and overseeing new student programs;
- g. offering service learning courses;

- h. offering a range of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including teaching required graduate courses;
- i. serving as an Honors Thesis adviser;
- j. serving as an editor for a student-run journal;
- k. giving talks or organizing colloquia or academic conferences about teaching or that systematically serve the educational needs of undergraduate and graduate students;
- l. publishing with graduate student co-authors; or
- m. any similar activity that makes a significant contribution to teaching political science at the University.

3.2a.c. Excellence Standard in Teaching

As described in Part 2.2a.c. above, “To be considered an excellent teacher, a candidate must have, as a threshold, satisfied the requirements of both (i) effectiveness, and (ii) meritoriousness in teaching (analyzed as described above), and additionally must show evidence of significant and sustained impact in undergraduate or graduate education by such things as:

- a. receiving a University, College, or student teaching award or similar public acknowledgment for superior teaching and/or student advising;
- b. showing a record of sustained success in receiving teaching grants or other similar forms of financial support for teaching activities; or
- c. showing other evidence of distinguished contributions to teaching and student mentoring.”

3.3. Service

Rationale: As stated in Part 2.3, “Service is a fundamental part of being a member of the faculty of the Department of Political Science. The management and collegiality of the department depends on members of the faculty participating in the work of the department. Likewise, certain aspects of the work of the College and the University depend on members of the faculty participating in certain activities.”

3.3a. Service Performance Standards Required for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

As is the case for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor, in a review for promotion to Professor the department employs the *standards* of effective, meritorious, and excellent for judging performance in service, and the assessment of performance in such a review is based on same criteria and evidence (all as fully described in Part 2.3 above). However, in contrast with a review for tenure and the rank of associate professor

(for which the requirement is “at least effective in service” - Part 2.3a), for promotion to Professor, a candidate must exceed the standard for effective service and be *meritorious* or *excellent* in service.

3.3a.a. Effectiveness Standard in Service

As stated in Part 2.3a.a, “Effective service means that the candidate has:

- a. regularly attended faculty meetings,
- b. regularly attended faculty recruitment candidate presentations, and
- c. has been conscientious in fulfillment of any departmental, College or University service assignments.”

3.3a.b. Meritorious Standard in Service

As stated in Part 2.3a.b, “Meritorious service means that the candidate, as a threshold has fulfilled the above requirements for effective service, and additionally has engaged in any of the following activities in *either* of the following two categories:

Public and Professional Service: Public and professional service can include contributions to the nation, state, community, and profession. These activities may include:

1. Consultant services to bureaus, commissions, agencies, legislative bodies, etc., within limits established by University Policy 5-204.
2. Participation in special community projects and studies.
3. Professionally related community positions, e.g., school board memberships, participation in educational groups, professional advising to various groups, public service agencies, etc.
4. General community educational contributions, lectures, workshops, community clinic work, etc.
5. Service as editor of a journal or book series for a press.
6. Service on editorial boards.
7. Conference participation as a section chair or program committee member.
8. Conference participation as a panel chair or discussant.
9. Service on grant review boards, such as the National Science Foundation.
10. Offices in professional associations.
11. Program participation in professional associations.
12. Invited addresses.
13. Refereeing articles for journals or book manuscripts for presses in the discipline.
14. Professional contributions to the print and electronic media.

Institutional Service: Institutional service can include contributions to the Department, the College, or the University. These activities can include:

1. Service on committees, task forces, special assignments, etc., beyond the minimum typical assignments of regular faculty.
2. Committee chairmanships.

3. Service on hiring committees.
4. Elected positions, such as senate, college council, etc.
5. Service as a University representative to other Universities, organizations, etc.
6. Administrative service to the department, college, or University.”

3.3a.c. Excellence Standard in Service

For promotion to Professor, excellent service means that the candidate as a threshold, has fulfilled the requirements for both effective and meritorious service (analyzed as described above), and additionally has conscientiously fulfilled additional institutional and professional service as an associate professor.

4. Roles and Duties in the RPT Process

4.1. Department Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Advisory Committee

4.1a. RPT Advisory Committee membership.

With the exception of the department chair, only the faculty members identified as eligible voters normally attend or participate in RPT discussions.

“Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention.

Promotion. In each department all regular faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion.

Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure.” (Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a)

4.1b. Single vote rule.

“No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any person’s case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).” (Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a-v)

4.1c. 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.” (Policy 6-303-III-A-3-b). Otherwise, all tenured faculty members are eligible to serve. By department policy RPT Chairs may succeed themselves for a second year’s term. The responsibilities of the RPT Chair are to organize, direct, and supervise the work of the RPT Subcommittees and to preside at the meeting of the RPT Advisory Committee.

4.2. RPT Review Committee & Subcommittees.

At the same time as the Department elects the RPT Chair, it also elects members to the RPT Review Committee as a pool of members to serve on RPT Subcommittees during the following academic year. The department chair will consider the number of reviews to be done in determining the number of faculty members to be elected. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote, and all tenured faculty are eligible to serve. Only persons who will be on sabbatical leave, or other types of official leave, will be exempt from serving. Committee members will serve for staggered, two year terms. After two years, each committee member and the RPT Chair will be exempt from the pool for a period of two years.

4.2a. Formation of Subcommittees.

From the pool of faculty comprising the RPT Review Committee, two will be selected by the department chair and the RPT chair as a review subcommittee assigned to each of the candidates to be reviewed. In addition, candidates who are to be reviewed shall name a third person to their review subcommittee from the eligible department faculty. However, this third person need not be designated in the case of informal review for retention (this will be left to the discretion of the candidate). Thus, in the case of formal review for retention, promotion or tenure, the RPT subcommittee for each candidate will consist of three members and for informal review for retention either two or three members.

4.2b. Duties of Subcommittee Chairs.

Within each RPT subcommittee, the department chair and the RPT chair will select one person to serve as subcommittee chair (the member designated by the candidate will not be eligible to serve as chair). The subcommittee chair will be responsible for the preparation of the subcommittee's report and for following the procedures below, both before and after the meeting of the full RPT Advisory Committee. The subcommittee chair is responsible for seeing that all the necessary items are included in the file before it closes and normally serves as secretary for that case at the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. The subcommittee chair’s responsibilities with respect to external evaluation letters are described below in section 6.4b.

4.2c. Duties of Subcommittees.

Each subcommittee will have the responsibility of conducting the review—either formal or informal—of the assigned candidate. In either case, it will be the subcommittee's task to prepare an analysis and written report of the record of the candidate, which is to be submitted to the appropriate departmental RPT Advisory Committee; and in either case, the review will be conducted in consultation and cooperation with the candidate. More specifically, the subcommittee's report will be submitted to the candidate for his/her review one week before being submitted to the departmental RPT Advisory Committee. The candidate may or may not choose to submit a written comment on matters of fact in the report. The subcommittee's report will be a factual and analytical one, rather than persuasive in tone. After the candidate has seen the report and before the RPT Advisory Committee meets, however, the subcommittee shall draft summative language for consideration at the meeting. Both the report and the summative language, as well as any written comment submitted by the candidate, will be added to the candidate's file before the meeting.

5. Notice to Involved Parties

5.1. Notice to Candidate

“Each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure shall be given at least 30 days advance notice of the department RPT advisory committee meeting and an opportunity to submit any information the candidate desires the committee to consider.” (Policy 6-303-III-C-1).

Normal notice period is much longer—from the previous spring—as indicated in Appendix A: RPT Timetable.

5.2. Notice to Department Faculty and Staff

“At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.” (Policy 6-303-III-C-2).

5.3. Notice to Student Advisory Committee

“Prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall notify the college's representative to the Student Senate and the department student advisory committee(s) (SACs) of the upcoming review and request that the department SAC(s) submit a written report evaluating teaching effectiveness and making RPT recommendations as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC evaluation and report should be based on guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson. The SAC shall be given at least three

weeks to prepare its report, but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the reports, the SAC's recommendations shall be deemed conclusively waived and their absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.” (Policy 6-303-III-C-3).

The SAC review begins when the RPT Chair contacts the department SAC for faculty evaluation reports in formal reviews. Each department SAC (Undergraduate, MPA, and PhD/MA/MS) should be asked for a report if and only if the candidate under review taught one or more classes to that group of students during the period under review. Each participating SAC should base its report only upon classes taught and advising done for students in its respective group. The department shall make available to the SAC members all the teaching-related materials in the faculty member’s RPT file, as well as the University “guiding principles” for evaluation.

5.4. Notice to Academic Program.

“When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an academic program, the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.” (Policy 6-303-III-C-4). The department will seek and consider such input from a program for both formal and informal reviews.

6. 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. Required components and their timing are identified in the table ... in Policy 6-303-III-D-12.” (Policy 6-303-III-D).

6.1. Structure of the File

“The file is envisioned as a notebook in the department office, which is growing throughout a faculty member’s probationary period at the University. However, a physical notebook is not the only method allowable - for example, an electronic file or other format may be used alone or as a supplement. The file shall be cumulative and kept current as described in the following sections.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-1).

6.2. Security of RPT Files

RPT files are kept in a locked room in the department office. Confidentially solicited external letters of evaluation are kept in the office of the department administrator. Any electronic process to be adopted shall be equally secure.

6.3. Contents of RPT File

A detailed list of file contents and the persons responsible for assembling them appears in Appendix B: RPT File Contents.

6.3a. Curriculum Vitae

“The candidate’s file is expected to provide a current and complete curriculum vitae (“CV”), which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories related to the department’s RPT criteria. The CV should be updated annually, but not during the course of a given year’s review. During a review, new accomplishments may be reported and documented as a part of any of the reports or responses in the regular process.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-2).

Departmental guidelines for CV’s appear in Appendix C.

6.3b. Evidence of Research/Creative Activity

“The candidate is expected to provide evidence of research and other creative activity, updated annually.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-3).

Requirements for documenting research appear in Appendix B and Appendix C.

6.3c. Past Reviews and Recommendations

“The department chair shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, i.e., SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present). Teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included.

The past reviews and recommendations in a file for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate’s vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-4).

6.3d. Evidence of Faculty Responsibility

“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 candidate’s file.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-5).

6.3e. Recommendation from Academic Program

“In the event that an academic program produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C.4, the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-6).

6.3f. Recommendation from the Department Student Advisory Committee

“If the department SAC produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C-3, the recommendation shall be placed in the candidate’s file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-7).

The candidate has the right to see and respond in writing to the SAC report before the RPT Advisory Committee considers the file (See Policy 6-303-III-D-10).

6.3g. Other Written Statements

“Any other written statements — from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, staff, or interested individuals--which are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate, must be placed in the file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-8).

6.4 External Evaluations

“The purpose of external evaluations is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate’s work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. Along with the actual review, the external evaluator should describe his/her qualifications and relationship to the candidate. The department chairperson should make sure that any letters of evaluation from outside the department are requested early enough for the letters to arrive and be included in the candidate’s file before the program and department RPT advisory committee meetings.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-9).

6.4a. Waiver/Non-waiver form.

“Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the faculty member being reviewed shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

I waive my right to see the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/ promotion/tenure review. Signature/date

I retain my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/ tenure review. Signature/date

That form, with the candidate's signature below the statement preferred by the candidate, shall be included in the candidate's review file. When the candidate reserves the right to read the external letters of evaluation, respondents shall be informed in writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed." (Policy 6-303-III-D-9).

6.4b. Department Rules for Selection of External Evaluators

In cases of formal review for tenure and/or promotion, the RPT Subcommittee, the Department chair, and the candidate will jointly identify possible external evaluators to write letters of evaluation of the candidate's record of research and publication, and other areas where appropriate. External evaluations during a fourth year formal review are not required, but may be requested by the candidate undergoing review. In the spring preceding a formal review for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate shall be asked to submit at least five names of potential external evaluators with national reputations in his or her field. The candidate may also identify no more than five individuals he or she would like to preclude as evaluators. Final choice of the external evaluators shall be made by the subcommittee, in consultation with the Department chair, but they shall attempt to select half of the four evaluators from the candidate's list and half from a list drawn up by the subcommittee. The composition of the external evaluations should not include past collaborators of the candidate and should be at institutions with a similar standing as the University of Utah (e.g., Research Intensive Universities)

The subcommittee is responsible for soliciting the evaluators, working with the candidate to determine the materials to be sent each evaluator, and ensuring that the evaluations are returned by the deadline set by the RPT Chair. The subcommittee shall prepare for the file a description of the qualifications of each external evaluator and indicate whether the evaluator was the choice of the subcommittee or the candidate. The department chair and the subcommittee should make every effort to ensure that evaluations requested by the Department are obtained from persons who are in a position to exercise disinterested assessment. A minimum of three letters must be in hand for the review to proceed. The chair of the subcommittee is responsible for seeing that all the necessary items regarding external evaluations are included in the file before it closes.

6.5. Candidate's Rights to See and Comment on File

"Candidates are entitled to see their review file upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written

comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.” (Policy 6-303-III-D-10).

6.6. File Closing Date & Review of File

The file is closed on the file-closing date described in Appendix A.

“The candidate’s file shall be made available to those eligible to attend the departmental RPT advisory committee meeting a reasonable time [at least one week] before the meeting....” (Policy 6-303-III-D-11).

7. Department RPT Advisory Committee Meetings

“The department chairperson shall call a meeting of the departmental RPT advisory committee to conduct reviews as described in Policy 6-303-III-B.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-1).

7.1. Committee Member Responsibilities

Each member of the RPT advisory committee has the following responsibilities in completing the review process: (a) review the candidate’s materials in light of the criteria and standards as set forth in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service; (b) determine whether the candidate meets the criteria and standards in each area; (c) share determinations and rationale as called upon by the RPT committee chair in scheduled committee meetings; (d) contribute to the reporting process as described in University regulations; (e) maintain the highest standards of professional judgment and conduct in completing each element of the review process, and (f) preserve the confidentiality of the materials and the proceedings (*See Policy 6-303-III-E-8*).

7.2. Committee Secretary

“A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-2). Normally, the chair of the RPT subcommittee that prepared the report acts as secretary at the meeting.

7.3. Quorum

“A quorum of a department advisory committee for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of its members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-3).

7.4. Absentee Voting

“Whenever practicable, the department chairperson shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting at which a vote is taken by the department advisory committee.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-4).

7.5. Limitations on Participation and Voting

“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.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-5). Normally, the RPT Advisory Committee votes to allow the department chair to attend and participate in the discussion.

7.6. Vote on Committee Report

“After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is jointly appointed with an academic program, the department advisory committee report shall reflect the department’s discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-6).

The committee shall vote by open ballot unless a majority votes to change the ballot to secret.

7.7. Approval of the Committee Report

“This summary report of the meeting, signed by the secretary and bearing the written approval of the committee chairperson, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modification as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-7).

7.8. Confidentiality

“All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-8).

8. Action by Department Chairperson.

8.1. Recommendation

“After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.” (Policy 6-303-III-F-1).

8.2. Notice to Faculty Member

“Prior to forwarding the file, the department chairperson shall send an exact copy of the chairperson's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member.” (Policy 6-303-III-F-2).

8.3. Candidate's Right to Respond

“The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department RPT advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.” (Policy 6-303-III-F-3).

8.4. Forwarding Files & Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level

“The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.” (Policy 6-303-III-F-4).

Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G,H,I (action by dean and college advisory committee, action by cognizant vice president and University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, final action by president).

9. Post-review Meeting

After all formal and informal reviews prior to the tenure review, the Department Chair and at least one member of the RPT Subcommittee shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The Associate Chair may substitute for the Department Chair only if he/she is unavailable (*See Policy 6-303-III-B-1*).

Appendix A: RPT Timetable

The department chair and RPT chair shall establish specific deadlines each year. Deadlines for informal reviews are generally the same as for formal reviews except that those pertaining to external letters and SAC reports are not applicable.

March

- Department faculty elect RPT Chair and members of RPT Review Committee.

April

- Department Chair sends out letter to candidates required to be reviewed reminding them of upcoming review and what is required, including copy of department RPT criteria and standards. The letter also invites requests for non-mandatory formal reviews (*i.e.*, candidates requesting review for promotion).
- If candidates who have not already been determined to qualify for *credit for prior service* wish to be reviewed for tenure earlier than the seventh year at the University of Utah, procedures to establish either such credit or *extraordinary progress* must be followed before external evaluators are solicited. See University Policy 6-311, Sec. 4-C-1.
- Department Chair also sends letter to other department or academic program for candidates jointly appointed.

May-July

- Department Chair and RPT Chair create RPT subcommittees for each candidate to be reviewed.
- External evaluators are identified as per Section 6.4 above.
- Subcommittees contact and send out materials to external evaluators for their evaluation in formal reviews.

August-September

- RPT Chair contacts the department SAC for candidate evaluation reports in formal reviews. The SAC shall receive three weeks minimum notice to prepare its recommendation.
- RPT Chair notifies departmental faculty and staff of their right to submit written recommendations for the file.
- The candidate reviews the file contents (except for the external letters if the candidate signs the waiver form) and offers written responses if he/she deems necessary.
- **File Closing Date: File should be closed by September 30** (except for subcommittee report & candidate's optional response to it).

October

- Subcommittees write reports and candidates have one week to review and make

written response to factual matters.

- Department RPT Advisory Committee should hold all needed RPT meetings before the end of October.

Appendix B: RPT File Contents

In order for the RPT process to operate effectively, and to ensure that all candidates receive the most accurate reviews possible, each party in the RPT process has responsibilities for placing certain materials in the file. Unless otherwise stated, each item listed is applicable for both formal and informal reviews.

Candidate's Responsibility

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

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:
 - a. All publications since you began your professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if the work was blind reviewed.
 - b. All convention papers you have presented.
 - c. Grants and fellowships you have applied for and received.
 - d. Honors you have received for your research.
 - e. All graduate committees you have chaired and on which you have served as a member in the Political Science department and other departments.
 - f. Honors theses and other individual student research you have supervised.
 - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition you have received.
 - h. Service commitments to the institution, professional discipline, and general public.
2. Personal Statement. This is the document in which to convey your personal contribution to co-authored publications, the categories of scholarly Purpose into which your publications fall, evidence documenting the quality of your publication outlets, indicators of the impact of your scholarly work, and your *future* research plans. For teaching and service, elaborate as needed beyond the CV to describe activities that constitute evidence of meritorious or excellent performance. You may also respond to faculty peer observation reports of your teaching.
3. Copies of all publications, including title page of journals and edited books.
4. One copy of the most recent version of the course syllabus for each of the courses taught (in the past year for an informal review; in the years since appointment for a review for tenure; or since the previous formal review for a formal review for promotion after tenure) and such additional samples of assignments, exams, and handouts from those courses as the candidate chooses. Candidates should place this information in the file early enough for both the SACs and the RPT Subcommittee to use this material in doing their reports.

5. Other relevant materials, such as letters obtained by the candidate from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
6. Candidate response to any file contents, if desired.

Department's Responsibility

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

1. Course Teaching Evaluations. For mid-probationary formal reviews and reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment. For formal reviews subsequent to tenure, all evaluations since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for promotions to Professor). All such evaluations but the most recent should already be in the cumulative file, so only need to be reorganized.
2. The RPT subcommittee will generate a table displaying summary information from course evaluations by course name and number by semester, indicating at least the candidate's score and the department average for the questions on overall course effectiveness and overall instructor effectiveness. The number of students enrolled and the number completing the evaluation should also be included.
3. Faculty peer observation reports.
4. SAC report (not needed for informal reviews).
5. Recommendation from the program in which the candidate holds a joint appointment, if relevant.
6. Copies of prior years' RPT reports and candidate comments to these reports (See Section 6.3c).
7. Other relevant materials, such as letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals obtained by department administration or the RPT subcommittee.
8. Evidence of lack of faculty responsibility, if relevant.
9. External Evaluator Letters (not needed for informal review)
 - a. Evidence of candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
 - b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae

- c. Which evaluators nominated by whom (candidate, Department Chair, or RPT subcommittee)
9. Report of RPT Subcommittee (including “summative language”, and any optional written response of candidate).

Appendix C: Departmental Guidelines for CV’s in the RPT Process

1. On a CV for RPT purposes (but not necessarily other ones), please label all publications as either “blind reviewed” or “peer reviewed” if they were subject to either. “Blind reviewed” means that acceptance of the piece was not guaranteed and the work was reviewed by one or more reviewers who did not know your identity (or at least were not so informed by the publication). Most political science journals use a blind review process and your department colleagues will generally know that, but especially for formal reviews it is useful for people outside the department to know. “Peer reviewed” means that acceptance of the piece was not guaranteed, but was dependent on its passing muster with some qualified reviewer(s) who did know your identity. Often chapters that are submitted for publication in an edited book are peer reviewed either by the book editor or others. Despite debates about the unique system of student-edited law reviews and whether the qualifications of those reviewers are equivalent to professorial peers, under this definition most law review publications should be identified as “peer reviewed.” While blind reviewed articles tend to carry the most weight in the RPT process, both peer reviewed works and those invited outright can be important contributions to a scholarly record.

Publishers’ practices in reviewing book manuscripts suggest a different use of terminology. It is acceptable to call a book “blind reviewed” if you are not told the identity of the reviewers, even if you do not know if the reviewers know your identity. A “peer reviewed” book would be one where the decision to publish is made by editors without your receiving feedback from anonymous reviewers.

2. Always include complete page numbers for all published articles and chapters. It is also expected that you include the total number of pages for a work in progress, as a 25-page manuscript deserves different weight than a 3-page piece.

Reprinting of a piece in a second (or subsequent) outlet is an important indicator that it is recognized as high quality work, but the reprinted piece does not constitute a separate publication. As part of the same listing of its first appearance, a reprint is best listed as “reprinted in,” for example:

Susan Olson. "Judicial Impact Statements for State Legislation: Why So Little Interest?" *Judicature* 66 (September-October 1982): 147-150; reprinted in *Los Angeles Daily Journal Report* No. 82-21, November 5, 1982, pp. 24-27.

3. Many disciplines have well-established conventions for order of authors in co- or multi-authored research (*i.e.*, which position indicates who wrote the most or who obtained the research funding). In most the first-named author is presumed to have contributed the most, especially if the names are not in alphabetical order. It is not clear that our department or discipline has a well-established convention. Some use the format "with Jane Smith" at the end of the citation, which obscures any inferences, rightly or wrongly. Until the department develops a specific policy for co-authored works, please list the names of all authors as they appear on the publication on your CV and use your personal statement to articulate your personal contribution to the projects. For example:

Greg Andranovich, Matthew J. Burbank, and Charles H. Heying. 2001. "Olympic Cities: Lessons Learned from Mega-event Politics." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23 (2): 113-131.

Matthew J. Burbank, Charles H. Heying, and Greg Andranovich. 2000. "Antigrowth Politics or Piecemeal Resistance? Citizen Opposition to Olympic-Related Economic Growth." *Urban Affairs Review* 35 (3): 334-357.

4. The use of "forthcoming" is appropriate when authors have finished all their work on a manuscript, and it is ready to go, or is in production. For RPT purposes, manuscripts in earlier stages should be listed in a section labeled "Work in Progress," with each entry including a description of its status as of the date of the CV, such as "under submission to," "resubmitted following revise and resubmit to," or "planned for submission to." For forthcoming manuscripts, please include in your RPT file a copy of the notification documenting final acceptance.

Appendix D: University RPT Standards Committee notice of final approval of Departmental RPT Statement