

**BYLAWS**  
**The Department of World Languages and Cultures**  
**University of Utah**  
**Approved by Faculty Vote on January 18, 2018**

In the Department of World Languages and Cultures policy is made chiefly by faculty consensus, through a majority vote, and is carried out by the department administration, staff, and faculty. Policy issues can be raised by individual faculty members, committees, and sections. These issues can be brought to the Chair, the Executive Committee, or the whole department committee for wider deliberation and potentially for a department-wide vote.

**Administrative Positions**

**Department Chair.** The Department is administered by a Chair who is appointed by and reports to the Dean. The term is usually three years. The Chair is responsible for the overall administration of the department, including principally: all budget matters, including dismissal of career-line or adjunct faculty for budgetary reasons, hiring of faculty, faculty evaluations for tenure-line, career-line, and adjunct appointments, the hiring, supervision and dismissal of department staff.

**The Associate Chair and Director positions are appointed by the Chair. Appointments usually run three years. These appointments come with financial compensation or a course reduction.**

**Associate Chair:** The Associate Chair functions as a sounding board between the faculty and the Chair and focuses on a variety of tasks that best complement the Chair's responsibilities. The Associate Chair serves as acting Chair in the Chair's absence. Specific duties are determined by the Chair and Associate Chair. They could include overseeing the administration of special initiatives like research colloquia, or outside speakers.

**Director of Graduate Studies:** The DGS oversees all aspects of graduate study in the Department. This oversight includes curricular and advising questions, graduate student recruitment, serving as liaison with Department Advisors, students, and the Graduate School, handling complaints or grievances from graduate students, and Confutati. The DGS oversees the Graduate Committee and the admission of graduate students to the department. The DGS attends the monthly meeting of the Directors of Graduate Studies in the Graduate School. The DGS may also serve as the section representative for CLCS.

**Director of Undergraduate Studies:** The DUS oversees advising questions and serves as a liaison with Departmental Advisors, students, and the Office of Undergraduate Studies. The DUS oversees undergraduate curricular issues, including oversight of new course proposals and university and general education requirements. The DUS oversees departmental and learning abroad scholarships. The DUS handles undergraduate student complaints and grievances.

**Language representatives:** The LR is the contact person for the section and functions as a bridge between the Department administration and the section. The LR will perform duties specific to the section like answering questions when a student is referred by the departmental advisor or DUS/DGS, answering questions about opportunities specific to the major, advising about waiving/substituting classes, evaluating transcripts from abroad and making recommendations regarding transfer of credit. The LR coordinates with Department staff and section faculty to schedule classes. Each degree-granting section and CLCS will have a language representative who will serve for one year. All tenured and tenure-track faculty in the language area will participate in the rotation of this position. In sections where there are multiple faculty, newly appointed tenure-track faculty should not serve in their first two years.

### **Department Composition**

All full-time career-line and tenure-line faculty are considered department members.

- a) Tenure-line faculty are expected to attend department meetings, perform service assignments, and participate in votes.
- b) Career-line faculty are encouraged to participate fully in department meetings and service assignments. Career-line faculty can participate in all department votes except those concerning hiring, retention and promotion of tenure-line faculty.
- c) Voting: In most cases, a simple majority (50% plus 1) is needed to pass a motion. In order to amend the Bylaws a two-thirds majority is required. The Chair will inform the department when a quorum is required. In promotion and retention cases for career-line faculty, voting is open to all faculty. In hiring, retention and promotion cases for tenure-line faculty voting is restricted to tenure-line faculty and follows the Department RPT Guidelines approved in 2016: 4.4.b.

### **Description of Standing Committees**

**Department Faculty Committee:** This committee decides general policy issues for the Department except in areas deemed confidential personnel issues. All structural or procedural initiatives or revisions of department policy must be voted on by the DFC.

#### **Meetings:**

- In general, the Department meets on Thursday at 3:30pm once every month that the University is in session, beginning in September and ending in May.
- The Department also meets at an annual one-day planning retreat on the Friday before classes start. Extraordinary meetings of the Department Committee may be called by the Chair, or a simple majority of Committee members as necessary. Minutes for meetings are kept by the Department's Associate Chair, edited by the Chair, and distributed to all Department Committee members prior to the next meeting.
- The agenda for the Department meeting is distributed at least three days prior to the meeting (together with the minutes of the prior meeting). In the absence of agenda items, the meeting may be canceled by the Chair.

**Executive Committee:** Composition: 5 members, elected by the department (In the spring when RPT chair and other college assignments are voted on): one from each rank (1 Career-line; 3 Tenure-line: Assistant, Associate, Full; 1 tenure-line at large). The Chair may invite the

Associate Chair and DGS/UGS as additional members. Term length: one year. The Executive Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Chair on matters of departmental administration. The Executive Committee does not make departmental policy but can advise the Chair regarding initiatives the Chair will take to the larger department.

**Graduate Studies Committee** (chaired by the DGS) Composition: 4 members (one from any rank of tenure-line faculty, selected by alphabetical rotation) and one from CLCS, French and Spanish Language representatives. Term length: 1 year. The GSC oversees admission of graduate students and distribution of teaching assistantships.

**Undergraduate Studies Committee** (chaired by the DUS). Composition: 3 members (any rank of tenure-line and career-line, selected by alphabetical rotation). Term length: 1 year. Duties: Oversee undergraduate programs, undergraduate curriculum (including new course proposals), and degree requirements.

**Merit Committee** The Department Merit Committee will conduct an annual merit evaluation. Composition: 4 members (1 from each rank of tenure-line faculty and 1 at large tenure-line faculty, selected by alphabetical rotation). Term length: 1 year. Duties: award merit points to be used to calculate raises. See Merit Guidelines in Appendix III.

**RPT Committee.** As stated in the department RPT guidelines (4.4b – the passage refers to PPM 6-303): The RPT committee consists of “all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank” in matters of retention. It consists of “all tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed” for votes on promotion. Each year during the Spring semester elections, one person is elected to chair the RPT committee. College guidelines suggest a preference for full professors. In a year when there is a candidate for promotion to full, a full professor is required to preside over that process. The RPT Chair may choose to select a secretary for the whole process or to assign secretary duties to individual faculty members for each retention and promotion case.

**Teaching Advisory Committee** (Chaired in rotation by the person with the most years on the committee) Term length: 3 years. Composition: 3 members, selected by alphabetical rotation (any rank of tenure-line) each Spring semester at the time of the election of the RPT Chair. Duties: oversee teaching evaluation process, write up TAC reports for Career- and Tenure-line teaching reports.

**Peer Reviewers** selected by alphabetical rotation (rotating 2 from each rank of tenure-line faculty; career-line faculty may serve as peer reviewers of other career-line faculty). Term: 1 year. Duties: Peer reviewers do classroom visits and write reports that evaluate teaching for Career and Tenure-line faculty reviews. See attached Peer Reviewer Guidelines.

**Ad hoc Committees.** *Ad hoc* Committees are formed to address special needs of the Department. These may include: external reviews, grievances, new initiatives, event planning, conferences etc.

## **Review of Adjunct faculty**

The Chair or Associate Chair will review teaching evaluations for adjunct faculty annually. If the evaluations demand further review, individual cases will be brought to the January faculty meeting for further discussion.

## **Review of Career-line faculty**

Reviews of Career-line faculty will take place annually. The minimal review (in accordance with PPM 6-310.III.2.D) will include a report summarizing the past year's teaching evaluations. This summary report will be deliberated and voted upon by the department faculty at a January faculty meeting. Longer-term career-line faculty will have more extensive reviews every five years. These will include a peer review and a TAC report.

**Review of Tenured faculty.** After tenure and promotion, all faculty are formally reviewed every five years. See the university post-tenure review policy, approved July 2017, at PPM 6-321.

## **SEARCH PROCEDURES**

**Tenure Line Faculty:** All searches and appointments of tenure line faculty will take place in accordance with University Policies 6-301 and 6-302.

1. **Search Committee Composition:** When a search for a new faculty position is approved, the Chair shall appoint a search committee composed of at least three members of the tenure-line faculty. The committee should reflect the composition of the department and include one member from outside the field of the search.
2. **Duties of the Search Committee:** Members of the search committee will have access to all applicant files. Committee members will read files, rank candidates, report their procedure for ranking candidates to the department. They will arrange and conduct preliminary interviews and determine a short list of candidates to invite to campus. Once the short list has been established, all department members will have access to candidate files. Office of Equal Opportunity certification is required for viewing files.
3. **On-Campus Interviews:** The Chair will extend invitations to the finalists and work with department staff to schedule on-campus visits that include adequate opportunities for the candidates to meet with department faculty, staff, and students.
4. **Ranking of Candidates:** Following campus interviews the search committee will rank the candidates and submit its recommendation to the department before the full department meets to discuss and rank the finalists. At that meeting, the tenure line faculty will vote by secret ballot to determine the final ranking of candidates.
5. **After receiving all necessary approvals,** the Chair shall offer the position to the first-ranked candidate. If that candidate declines the offer the Chair shall offer the position to the second-

ranked and then third ranked candidate if necessary, unless the department has deemed them unacceptable.

**Career Line Faculty:** All searches and appointments of career line faculty will be voted upon by the Department full-time faculty and take place in accordance with the Career Line Template, Appendix II.

I. **Appendix A: Notice of Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Vice Presidential Final Approval.**

**Appendix II: Career Line Template**

**COLLEGE OF [ ]  
DEPARTMENT OF [ ]**

**Retention and Review Statement for Career-Line, Adjunct,  
and Visiting Faculty and Other Instructional Personnel**

Approved by [Unit] [describe applicable] Faculty:

Approved by Dean:

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on [date] and the Senior Vice President on [date], for implementation on [date].

This document serves as the [unit]'s Statement of retention and review criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty and Other Instructional Personnel as required by University Policy. This statement along with relevant University Policies, 6-310, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-310.php>, 6-302, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-302.php>, and 6-300, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-300.php>, govern these processes.

[Mission of unit.]

## **Table of Contents**

## **1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty**

The standards and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of [date]. All Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty members[, and other instructional personnel] appointed or reappointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement with the exception that faculty members whose review for reappointment and/or promotion is within twelve months of the adoption of these standards shall have the option of selecting either (1) the prior review standards or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the [Department Chair and] Dean by signed letter before September 1 of the academic year in which the review will take place.

## **2. Faculty Categories, Ranks, Responsibilities, and Rights**

### **2.1 Faculty Categories**

In addition to Tenure-Line faculty, the [unit] appoints faculty members as (1) Career-Line Faculty, which includes [Clinical Faculty, Lecturers, and Research Faculty; (2) Adjunct faculty; and (3) Visiting faculty.

Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty are formally appointed as members of the faculty of the [unit] and of the University and serve for fixed durational terms. Appointments may be renewed for additional terms through reappointment in accordance with University and [unit] policy. Promotions to a higher rank are (but need not be) considered at the time of reappointment to a new term with the higher rank, and such promotions require a reappointment process. Career-Line faculty also are responsible, as designated in their contracts and expected by their home units, for service at the [unit], University, and community levels. [Unit] and University service includes a collective responsibility to help oversee and to participate in the administration and governance of those institutions.

In addition to formal appointment to the status of member of the faculty, Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty members are hired as an employee of the University, in a position designated as either full- or part-time, and for a designated time period which may be equal to or less than the duration of the faculty appointment term. An individual contract for employment, including the full- or part-time position, the durational period of employment, salary and benefits, and specific individual duties, is administered by [unit] and University administrative officers, with procedures separate from the faculty appointment processes described here. Career-Line faculty members are ordinarily hired as full-time employees, Adjunct faculty are ordinarily hired as part-time employees, and Visiting faculty may be hired as either part-time or full-time employees.

### **2.2 Responsibilities and Rights of Career-Line Faculty**

All Career-Line faculty members appointed at .5 FTE or above have the following rights and responsibilities. Career-Line faculty appointed by special arrangement at less than .5 FTE will have those rights and responsibilities articulated in their contract with the university.



### 2.2.1 Responsibilities and Rights of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are primarily responsible for teaching clinical, skills, and other experiential learning courses. Clinical faculty members may also engage in scholarship[, and may be eligible for support from the [Unit]].

Clinical faculty are entitled to participate fully on [unit], College, and University Committees (within limits prescribed by University regulations), in College Council, and at faculty meetings. *[Here the unit should specify voting rights for clinical faculty members—we provide some options for your convenience:*

OPTION A: Clinical Professors are entitled to vote on all matters except hiring, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty. Clinical Assistant and Associate Professors are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty and appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Career-Line Faculty above their rank.

OPTION B: Clinical Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, and Clinical Assistant Professors are entitled to vote at College Council. They are also entitled to vote on appointment, reappointment, and promotion matters of Career-Line faculty of their rank or lower but not on hiring, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty.]

### 2.2.2 Responsibilities and Rights of Lecturer Faculty

Lecturers are primarily responsible for teaching and for the development and implementation of special programs connected with their teaching and other areas of expertise. Lecturers may also engage in scholarship[, and may be eligible for support from the [Unit]].

Lecturer faculty members are entitled to participate fully on [unit], College, and University Committees (within limits prescribed by University regulations), in College Council, and at faculty meetings. *[Here, the unit should provide the voting rights of Lecturers—we provide some options for your convenience:*

OPTION A: Lecturers at the rank of Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty. Lecturers at the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty and appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Career-Line faculty above their rank.

OPTION B: Lecturers at the rank of Professor, at the rank of Associate Professor, and at the Rank of Assistant Professor are entitled to vote at College Council. They are also entitled to vote on appointment, reappointment, and promotion matters of Career-Line faculty of their rank or lower but not on hiring, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty.]

### 2.2.3 Responsibilities of Research Faculty

Research faculty are primarily responsible for research and publication, usually in conjunction with specially funded projects, typically under supervision by or in collaboration with [one or more members of the Tenure-Line faculty or appropriate [unit] administrator]. Research faculty also may be responsible for the development and implementation of special programs connected with their research and other areas of expertise. Research faculty may work onsite at the University, or at other locations depending on the nature and funding of the research projects. Research faculty ordinarily do not teach regular courses, but may be expected to give guest lectures, participate in other programs, or otherwise enhance the [unit]'s teaching mission as related to their research programs.

Research faculty may participate fully and vote in [unit] committees to which they are assigned, as related to their research activities. Research faculty may attend College Council and appropriate faculty meetings. *[Here, the unit should provide the voting rights of research faculty—we provide options for your convenience:]*

OPTION A: Research faculty at the rank of Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty. Research faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty and appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Career-Line faculty above their rank.

Research faculty at the rank of Professor, at the rank of Associate Professor, and at the Rank of Assistant Professor are entitled to vote at College Council. They are also entitled to vote on appointment, reappointment, and promotion matters of Career-Line faculty of their rank or lower but not on hiring, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty.]

### **2.3 Responsibilities and Rights of Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty are appointed primarily to teach or to co-teach one or more courses in areas of special expertise or skills, or to address temporary or permanent gaps in courses taught by Tenure-Line and Career-Line faculty.

Adjunct faculty are not expected to serve on [unit] or University committees, but may do so at the discretion of the [unit head]. Adjunct faculty typically engage in community service as part of their professional lives.

### **2.4 Responsibilities and Rights of Visiting Faculty**

Visiting faculty appointments are ordinarily for no more than three years and may be either full- or part-time. Visiting faculty typically are appointed for one or more of the following primary purposes: (1) to teach courses as needed because of sabbaticals, leaves, or vacancies in the Tenure-Line or Career-Line faculty; (2) to explore mutual interest in a permanent appointment at the [unit] in a Tenure-Line or Career-Line position; and (3) to gain experience in teaching, and to engage in productive scholarship under the mentorship of experienced members of the faculty.

Visiting faculty members are responsible for [teaching and/or scholarship] as appropriate to the ranks to which they are appointed. Visiting faculty may participate on [unit] and University committees at the discretion of the [unit head].

### **3. Initial Appointment, Term Length, and Mentors**

#### **3.1 Initial Appointments**

Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty members are appointed at one of four ranks: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Initial appointment is based on demonstrated achievement and the expectation of future contributions. Number of years in a relevant profession, length of prior teaching or research experience, and other significant achievements, service, awards, and contributions to their profession or field shall be considered when determining the initial term and faculty rank.

Presumptively, Visiting faculty who hold a faculty appointment at another institution will be appointed at the rank they hold at that institution, so long as doing so is consistent with the criteria and standards otherwise provided in this Statement.

#### **3.2 Appointment Body**

Initial appointments of Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty require a vote of the Faculty Appointments Committee. The Faculty Appointments Committee shall consist of all faculty members eligible to vote on an appointment or reappointment matter. The Faculty Appointments Committee shall only vote when a two-thirds or greater quorum exists, including any proxy votes provided in advance in writing. A majority vote by the quorum is required for a positive recommendation on the appointment from the committee. Votes by the Faculty Appointments Committee shall proceed by secret ballot.

#### **3.3 Appointment Duration**

- (a) Career-Line and Adjunct faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor ordinarily serve for a [one- or two-year term]. Career-Line and Adjunct faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor ordinarily serve up to a three-year term. Career-Line and Adjunct faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor ordinarily serve up to a five-year term.
- (b) Once appointed at the rank of Professor, Career-Line faculty members at that rank hold a five-year term with a presumption of renewal to subsequent five-year terms.
- (c) Visiting faculty members may be appointed at varying term lengths within the University's prescribed maximum of three total years, depending on funding and institutional need. Typically, Visiting Assistant Professors will be appointed for a two-

year term, consistent with the purpose of that position to help a candidate transition to a full-time Tenure-Line position.

- (d) Notwithstanding the above, the appointment of Career-Line and Adjunct faculty members may be ended in conjunction with formal reviews, under University policy, or if there is financial exigency or discontinuation of a program or department of instruction. The affected faculty member will be given notice as soon as possible consistent with their contract terms. Unless the contract specifies otherwise, notice must be provided at least three months in advance of the ending of the appointment if the faculty member has served at least three years continuously.
- (e) The appointment of Research, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty also may be ended if there is no longer a need for the faculty member's expertise or relevant teaching or research services in light of the teaching portfolios or expertise of other members of the faculty, or for lack of funding where such appointments are contingent on funding. The affected faculty member will be given notice as soon as possible.
- (f) The appointment of any Career-Line, Adjunct, or Visiting faculty member may be terminated for cause under University Policy related directly and substantially to the fitness of the faculty member in their professional capacity. Termination for cause shall not infringe on their right to exercise academic freedom or their rights as a citizen of the United States.

### **3.4 Mentors**

Until promoted to the rank of Professor, Assistant and Associate Career-Line faculty members may be assigned an appropriate mentor either in the Tenure-Line or the Career-Line.

## **4. Procedures for Review**

Once appointed, all Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty will be regularly reviewed by [unit]. This section describes the procedures for such reviews.

### **4.1 Informal Reviews**

The [unit should designate here an individual such as department chair or vice chair or academic dean or committee to review teaching or research/scholarship/creative activity for all members of the faculty and other non-faculty teaching personnel at least annually. The designated individual or committee will also ensure peer-review of the individual's teaching and will solicit input and feedback from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence where appropriate]. Any issues or problems are discussed and addressed individually, as needed. All informal reviews are included in a candidate's formal review file. If, in an informal review, a Career-Line faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress toward reappointment, an early formal review may be "triggered" by the Review Committee or the [unit head]. Such "triggered" formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Review Committee votes to proceed

with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.

## 4.2 Formal Reviews

To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about their continuation in a position or promotion to a different rank, the [unit] will conduct formal reviews of its Career-Line and Adjunct faculty as dictated by the length and terms of the contract provided to the faculty member.

## 4.3 Review Committee

The [unit] shall formulate a Career-Line, Adjunct, and Instructional Personnel Review Committee (Review Committee). The Review Committee shall be comprised of two (or more) [note: must be at least two but unit can specify more] members of the tenured faculty and one member of the Career-Line faculty who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. These appointments are made by the [unit head]. In addition, a member of the tenured faculty shall be elected as Chair of the Review Committee by majority vote of the Tenure-Line and Career-Line faculty in the [unit].

## 4.4 Report of Review Committee

The Review Committee is responsible for conducting formal reviews of Career-Line and Adjunct faculty and completing a report describing the findings of its review. Based on this report, the Review Committee shall recommend either (1) that the candidate be reappointed and, where appropriate, promoted, (2) that the candidate be denied reappointment or, where appropriate, promotion, or (3), where there are issues that require attention, that the candidate be reappointed for a one-year contract with the opportunity to be considered for reappointment in the following year. The report of the Review Committee shall: (1) summarize the evidence considered; (2) state how the evidence considered satisfies or fails to satisfy the applicable standard(s); (3) make recommendations for rating the candidate in all applicable areas of evaluation (*e.g.*, Excellent, Effective, or Not Effective in Teaching); and (4) give the reasons for its recommendations.

## 4.5 Procedures for Career-Line Reviews

The Review Committee shall conduct its review of Career-Line faculty members using the following timeline and procedures:

1. By [September 1] of the fall semester of the academic year for review, the Chair of the Review Committee shall solicit a Student Advisory Committee report on the candidate. Such report shall be submitted to the Chair by December 1.
2. By [October 1], the Chair of the Review Committee shall designate one or more members of the Career-Line faculty (of a higher rank than the candidate) and one or more members of the Tenure-Line faculty to conduct at least two peer teaching reviews of any candidate who has teaching responsibilities. The reviewing faculty members may include members of the Review Committee.

These peer teaching evaluations of the candidate shall be submitted to the candidate's file by December 1.

3. By [October 1], the Chair of the Review Committee shall request a portfolio from the candidate. The candidate shall submit that portfolio by [December 1] of that year. The portfolio shall include:
  - (a) A curriculum vitae;
  - (b) A personal statement, including the following as appropriate: (1) a list of courses taught; (2) a description of course load and administrative responsibilities, which includes types of courses taught, student enrollment, student contact hours, and the types of student assessment for the courses; (3) a statement of teaching objectives and philosophy; (4) a description of research accomplishments, including any grant submissions and funding as well as publications; and (5) clinical practice and opportunities summary;
  - (d) All publications during the review period;
  - (e) Any prior written evaluations or reports from the Review Committee;
  - (f) Any other materials the candidate deems relevant, such as course materials, simulations, presentations, evidence of pro bono or other work or activities that serve to enhance the [unit]'s local, regional, national, or international reputation.
4. By [October 1], the Chair shall assure that—all teaching evaluations and recent syllabi for the candidate are placed in the candidate's file. By [December 1], the Chair shall solicit comments about the candidate from other members of the [unit].
5. The Chair shall circulate the candidate's portfolio to other Review Committee members, who shall read the complete file.
6. The Chair shall assign a Review Committee member to prepare a draft of the Review Committee Report. The draft report shall be completed by [February 1], and the Review Committee shall confer about the report and vote on its approval by [February 10].
7. The Chair shall expeditiously transmit the report to the candidate following its approval by the Review Committee. Upon receipt of the report, the candidate shall have five business days to make a written comment on any item in her file, or to indicate the candidate is waiving such right. The candidate has the right to review all contents in her file, except for any confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the [unit].
8. By [March 1], the Review Committee Chair shall circulate a copy of the report to the Faculty Appointments Committee and make the candidate's file available for review. Thereafter, but no later than [March 15], the Faculty Appointments Committee shall meet and discuss the recommendations and by a majority secret ballot vote make a final recommendation to the [unit head] on the candidate's

reappointment and, if applicable, promotion. The Chair of the Faculty Appointments Committee will appoint a secretary at the meeting to keep minutes, which will be made a part of the candidate's file.

9. The candidate shall receive a copy of the vote and minutes at the time they are forwarded to the [unit head].
10. The [unit head] shall receive the entire file and make their independent recommendation and forward the file to the appropriate University official for approval. Before forwarding the file, the [unit head] shall give the candidate a copy of their recommendation. The candidate has the right to make a written response to the [unit head]'s letter and/or the faculty vote and minutes within five business days of receiving the [unit head]'s letter.
11. The [unit head] shall notify the candidate of the decision no later than [April 1] of the academic year for review.

#### **4.6 Procedures for Adjunct Reviews**

The Review Committee shall conduct its review of Adjunct faculty members using the following timeline and procedures:

1. By [January 15] of the academic year for review, the Chair of the Review Committee and the [unit to specify relevant person, such as chair, vice chair, or academic dean] shall confer and create a list of adjunct faculty members with expiring terms whose reappointment will be sought.
2. By [March 1], the Review Committee shall prepare, approve, and circulate a report to the Faculty Appointments Committee describing which adjunct faculty members it recommends for reappointment and, where applicable, promotion. The report shall summarize teaching evaluations of all adjunct faculty members addressed in the report, and attach current resumes of each adjunct faculty member to the report.
3. The Review Committee shall request a vote on its report from the Faculty Appointments Committee. Unless the Review Committee determines a need for a live meeting, the vote will be conducted by email. If the Review Committee determines the need for a live meeting, it shall make all reasonable efforts to schedule the meeting in conjunction with any Career-Line review meeting being held. If a live meeting is held, minutes will be kept. Whether the vote is live or by email, it shall be conducted by secret ballot.
4. The Faculty Appointments Committee Chair shall expeditiously forward the results of the vote to the [unit head] and the [unit to specify relevant person, such as chair, vice chair, or academic dean] for any necessary further action.

#### **5. Review Guidelines**

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, as those functions are

relevant to that faculty member's appointment: (1) teaching, (2) service, and (3) research/creative activity.

Summary ratings of performance in these three areas as relevant to the faculty member's appointment serve as the standards for review, reappointment, and promotion. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: excellent, effective, and not satisfactory. [As permitted by Policy, this unit will use a four-level scale for evaluating performance: excellent, very good, effective, and not satisfactory. On this scale, the standard very good is located between the standards of excellent and effective in University Policy.] The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

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

## **5.1 Review Standards and Criteria**

### **5.1.1 Evaluation of Teaching**

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. There are therefore three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, and (3) student advising and mentoring.

#### **(1) Course instruction**

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in their personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; and (d) information from student course evaluations. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) or by the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) may also be included.

#### **(2) Curriculum and program development**



Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new and novel courses and the publication of textbooks or other teaching materials.

### (3) Student advising and mentoring

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring; (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees; and (3) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.

### (4) Summary Rating Scale for Teaching

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

*Excellent:* The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. **[May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of excellent teaching.]**

**[Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.] [May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of very good teaching.]**

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant. **[May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of effective teaching.]**

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made insufficient contributions in teaching. **[May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of not satisfactory teaching.]**

## **5.1.2 Evaluation of Service**

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the strengths and interests of individual faculty members.

### (1) Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a national or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward national professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); and presenting professional workshops. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals.

## (2) University Service

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the [Department], College, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces, or serving in administrative positions, at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.

## (3) Public Service

This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and international public settings and can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines.

## (4) Summary Rating Scale for Service

Ratings on [the three-point scale/ the four-point scale] below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above.

*Excellent:* The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. [May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of excellent service.]

*[Very Good:* The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public.] [May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of very good service.]

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant. [May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of effective service.]

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service. [May add detail consistent with the unit's RPT statement's definition of not satisfactory.]

### 5.1.3 Evaluation of Research

Judgments about a candidate's research are based on both the quality and quantity of research and its relevance to the academic community and the [unit]'s needs. The characteristics of productive research, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals and the [unit]'s needs for research in a given area.

#### (1) Description of Research Activity

*In this section, a unit may describe its research/creative activity in whatever way best suits the discipline. The description should be consistent with the parallel description in its RPT statement. Units are encouraged to keep this section short.*

EXAMPLE: We expect candidates to contribute significantly and distinctly to the development and dissemination of new knowledge through research and publication of research results. The following will be considered in evaluating a candidate's research and scholarship according to accepted publishing patterns in the candidate's own research area:

- Publication of original research papers in refereed technical journals and conference proceedings. The prestige of the journals and conferences and the quality as well as number of publications will be considered.
- Publication of research monographs, book chapters, and book reviews.
- Presentations at conferences, workshops, colloquia or seminars. Keynote, plenary, and invited talks will be noted.
- Research grants and contracts obtained, and research expenditures due to candidate's research.
- Patents issued and software licensed or otherwise distributed.
- Impact of consulting related to a candidate's expertise.

#### (2) Research Funding

OPTION A (for units that require research funding):

[Unit] expects candidates to demonstrate the ability to sustain one's research program, including supporting a sufficient number of graduate students in conjunction with the research, as well as maintain research operations over a career. As a result, the ability to attract and manage funding to support research is an important indicator of a candidate's abilities in research endeavors.

OPTION B (for units that require efforts to be made to acquire research funding):

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this [unit] and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the university. A candidate must therefore demonstrate that the candidate has either acquired funding that will help sustain the candidate's research program or that the candidate has made significant efforts to obtain such funding and will continue to do so.

OPTION C (for units in which research funding is encouraged but not required):

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this [unit] and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the university. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding will be considered as appropriate to contributing positively toward one's research.

### (3) Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

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

*Excellent:* The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. [May add detail consistent with the unit's description of excellent research in its RPT statement.]

[*Very Good:* The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.] [May add detail consistent with the unit's description of very good research in its RPT statement.]

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time. [May add detail consistent with the unit's description of effective research in its RPT statement.]

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research/creative activity. [May add detail consistent with the unit's description of not satisfactory research in its RPT statement.]

## **5.2 Review Standards for Career-Line Faculty**

Two different sets of standards apply to the review of Career-Line faculty, depending on the faculty member's appointment category. One set of standards applies to Clinical faculty and Lecturers, whose primary responsibilities are teaching and service. The other set of standards applies to Research faculty, whose primary responsibilities are research and service.

### **5.2.1 Review Standards for Clinical Faculty and Lecturers**

- (a) To be reappointed, a Clinical faculty member or Lecturer must demonstrate that they are (1) at least Effective in teaching and (2) at least Effective in service.
- (b) To be promoted from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor, a Clinical faculty member or Lecturer must demonstrate that they are (1) Excellent [or Very Good] in teaching, or that they have made substantial progress toward becoming Excellent in teaching, and (2) at least Effective in service.

- (c) To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a Clinical faculty member or Lecturer must demonstrate that they are (1) they are Excellent in teaching and (2) at least Effective in service.
- (d) Clinical faculty members and Lecturers are not expected to engage in research and published scholarship. However, the [unit head] and faculty encourage and support Clinical faculty and Lecturers who wish to engage in scholarship.

### 5.2.2 Review Standards for Research Faculty

- (a) To be reappointed, a Research faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) at least Effective in research; [and] (2) if the faculty member teaches, at least Effective in teaching; and (3) at least Effective in service.
- (b) To be promoted from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor, a Research faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) Excellent [or Very Good] in research; [and] (2) if the faculty member teaches, at least Effective in teaching; and (3) at least Effective in service.
- (c) To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a Research faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) they are Excellent in research, [and] (2) if the faculty member teaches, at least Effective in teaching, and (2) at least Effective in service.

### 5.3 Review Standards for Adjunct Faculty

- (a) To be reappointed, an Adjunct faculty member must demonstrate that they are at least Effective in teaching.
- (b) To be promoted from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor, an Adjunct faculty member must demonstrate that they are [Excellent or Very Good] in teaching. In evaluating promotion of an Adjunct faculty member, the value of the faculty member and the courses they teach to the [unit] may be taken into account.
- (c) To be promoted to the rank of Professor, an Adjunct faculty member must demonstrate that they are [Excellent or Very Good] in teaching. In evaluating promotion of an Adjunct faculty member, the value of the faculty member and the courses they teach to the [unit] may be taken into account.

### 5.4 Review Standards for Visiting Faculty

- (a) As their appointments are by definition temporary, Visiting faculty typically do not undergo formal reviews. Visiting faculty who are subsequently considered for a permanent position will be reviewed in conjunction with the regular faculty appointment process.
- (b) If a Visiting faculty member is appointed for longer than a semester, the [unit to designate individual, such as chair, vice chair, or academic dean] will review their

teaching evaluations at the end of each semester and consult with the faculty member if any issues warrant attention. If, at any time, the [unit head] and [unit to designate individual, such as vice chair or academic dean] agree that a visiting faculty member is not Effective in teaching, they may terminate the appointment.

- (c) If the faculty member has served fewer than three years and is being considered for reappointment, to be reappointed, a Visiting faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) at least Effective in teaching and (2) at least Effective in service.

**6. Non-Faculty Instructional and Research Personnel** [a unit need not include this section if they do not use such personnel]

Non-faculty instructional personnel do not hold faculty appointments but teach credit-bearing courses within the [unit]. They include [unit to specify--academic staff (associate instructors, or research associates), and potentially graduate student instructors of record or postdoctoral fellows]. Non-faculty research personnel are responsible for research. Non-faculty instructional and research personnel do not have voting rights and are not expected to serve on committees.

Non-faculty instructional or research personnel shall undergo a formal review after every [1-3] academic years of service at the University. To be reappointed, a non-faculty instructional and research personnel undergoing formal review must demonstrate that they are at least Effective in teaching and/or at least Effective in research, whichever is applicable, using the same standards that define Effective teaching and Effective research for Career-Line faculty within the [unit].

The Review Committee shall conduct its review of non-faculty instructional personnel using the following timeline and procedures:

1. By [January 15] of the academic year for review, the Chair of the Review Committee and the [unit to specify relevant person, such as chair, vice chair, or academic dean] shall confer and create a list of non-faculty instructional and research personnel for whom a formal review is required.
2. By [March 1], the Review Committee shall prepare, approve, and circulate a report to the [unit head] describing its findings on all reviewed non-faculty instructional and research personnel. The report shall explain how the committee gathered information for the review, including steps taken to collect information from the personnel being reviewed. The report shall also summarize all teaching or other evaluations of all personnel reviewed, and attach current resumes/CVs of each such individual to the report.
3. The [unit head] shall consider and take into account the Review Committee's report when determining whether to appoint the instructional personnel to teach courses or conduct research in the subsequent academic year.

The appointment of non-faculty instructional and research personnel also may be ended if there is no longer a need for the personnel's expertise or relevant teaching or research services in light of the teaching portfolios or expertise of other members of the faculty, or for lack of funding where such appointments are contingent on funding. The affected person will be given notice as soon as possible.

The appointment of any non-faculty instructional or research personnel may be terminated for cause under University Policy related directly and substantially to the fitness of the person in their professional capacity. Termination for cause shall not infringe on their right to exercise academic freedom or their rights as a citizen of the United States.

## Criteria for Merit Evaluation

- Weighting of the three categories is as follows:
  - 50% scholarship
  - 30% teaching
  - 20% service

	Scholarship	Teaching	Service
<b>High – 3 points</b>	For faculty who during the past three years have published either a book* or 3 articles in edited books or refereed scholarly journals and delivered at least 2 invited lectures or papers at international or national conferences.	For those who receive 7+ points in the teaching assessment attached.	Meets all criteria in basic category <b>AND a greater</b> number of the criteria for “Medium.” “High” service either establishes national prominence OR shows an unusually heavy time commitment.
<b>Medium – 2 points</b>	For faculty who during the past three years have published 2 scholarly articles in an edited book or a refereed scholarly journal, have presented at least two invited lectures or papers at national or regional conferences.	For those who receive 5-6 points in the teaching assessment attached.	Meets all criteria in basic category <b>AND who perform some additional service – examples include but are not limited to:</b> Serves on additional committees either locally* or nationally; Holds national office in a professional organization; Receives a program development grant; Serves as chair or discussant on conference panel; Serves on graduate committees; Serves as external reviewer of institutional programs; Does uncompensated community service related to academic field
<b>Basic – 1 point</b>	For faculty who in the last three years have published 1 article in an edited book or refereed journal, or some combination of encyclopedia entries or book reviews, and have delivered at least one invited lecture or paper at a conference.	For those who receive 3-4 points in the teaching assessment attached.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attends monthly departmental meetings</li> <li>Attends annual departmental retreat</li> <li>Serves on two departmental, college or university committees per year– [serving as language representative for a section is equal to service on one committee]</li> </ul>
	*Publication of a book will keep a faculty member in the high merit category for four years providing other criteria in the category are met. **Creative work, translations or work not named above will be evaluated on an ad hoc basis	*See attached for description of teaching assessment.	* the department will maintain a list of committees grouped according to workload: heavy, medium, light



--	--	--	--

**Special Merit**

A designated dollar amount (added to the base salary) is awarded in addition to any other salary increase to faculty in the year that they achieve one or more of the following:

- 1) A single authored book -- \$1000;
- 2) A co-authored book -- \$750;
- 3) Receipt of national or international grant in support of scholarship will be evaluated on an ad hoc basis.

**TEACHING ASSESSMENT DESCRIPTION**

Merit is assigned based on three areas: class size, curricular contribution, student evaluations. Each area can receive between 0 and 3 points as explained below:

**Class size:** 3 points for faculty who have taught more than one highly-enrolled course per year; 2 points for one highly-enrolled course per year; 1 point for 1-2 highly enrolled classes in the previous 3 years; 0 points if no large courses taught. 'Highly enrolled' = undergraduate class with more than 28 students; graduate course with more than 10 students.

**Curricular Contribution:** curricular contribution includes teaching the core/required courses in either one's section or for CLCS, developing new courses, securing teaching grants, teaching for honors, capstones, directed readings, etc. The committee will look at overall curricular contribution and award 1, 2 or 3 points depending on the extent of the faculty member's contribution.

**Student evaluations:** 3 points for faculty with consistently higher evaluations than departmental averages; 2 points if evaluations are usually average with some higher than average; 1 point for average evaluations with one or two below average classes; 0 points if evaluations are often below average.

**High merit**    7+ points

**Medium**        5-6

**Basic**            3-4

## Department of Languages and Literature

### Guidelines for Class Observation and Peer Review

Updated 2018

Peer reviewers are rotated on an alphabetical basis. Check with Chair and Executive Administrative Assistant for current list of reviewers.

#### Guidelines

1. Class syllabus should be provided to the reviewer a few days prior to the day of observation.
2. Where possible, reviews should be done when the term is in full swing – not too early when teachers and students have not yet established a rapport and not in the last couple of sessions of the term when many instructors spend time reviewing the course materials.
3. The reviewer should remain a quiet unobtrusive observer rather than become a participant in the discussion in order not to interfere with the dynamic of the class.
4. The reviewer should be given a copy of the day's materials in order to be able to follow along and make necessary notes.
5. The reviewer should stay about an hour or so to get a sense of the class topic, discussion, and the class dynamic between students and the instructor and among students (remaining longer should be optional).
6. The peer review should include the specifics of the course (time, day, course name and number, number of students, place).
7. 1-2 pages should be the standard length of the review.
8. The review should briefly state the topic of the discussion during the observation period.
9. The review should focus on the following:
  - the instructor's pedagogic style
  - her/his interactions with students; the class dynamic
  - the class dynamic among students
  - student participation

10. Reviews should be submitted to the ad hoc committee chair, the TAC chair, and the department RPT chair within two weeks of the class visit.

### When your spouse is your colleague:

Spouse/partner means one of two people involved in a committed relationship and sharing an abode.

Spouses will not attend meetings as proxies for each other.

Spouses will not serve as proxy votes for each other.

Spouses must leave the room when their partner is discussed. All subsequent discussions are confidential to both members of the couple.

Spouses are expected to act as independent members of the department at all times.

If the Department Chair has a spouse within the Department, that individual's salary consideration will be adjudicated by the College of Humanities Dean's Office.

If the Department Chair has a spouse within the Department, and the spouse has research funds that the Chair would normally approve, that approval will be adjudicated by the Associate Dean.

If the Department Chair has a spouse within the Department, the Associate Dean for the College of Humanities will write any necessary letters of recommendation for the spouse, duly noting the circumstances.

If the Department Chair has a spouse within the Department of a different rank, the Chair will recuse him/herself from the RPT process (leaving the room when necessary). The spouse's external reviewers and evaluative letter (normally written by the Chair) will be overseen and written by the Associate chair, duly noting the circumstances.

If the Department Chair has a spouse within the Department, the spouse will be ineligible to hold the office of Director of Graduate Studies, Associate Chair, or be elected to the Executive Committee.

If one spouse is at a different rank than the other, the spouse will leave the room during RPT discussions. The higher-ranked spouse will not review the RPT minutes of any meeting where their partner was discussed.

If a couple within the same academic department divorce or otherwise separate, they will follow the above guidelines for a period of three academic years.

Guideline for Implementing New Tenured Faculty Review Policies  
November 20, 2017

Approved by the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee: November 15, 2017

Last year the Academic Senate passed a new tenured faculty review policy. It can be found at: <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-321.php>. The new policy provides that departments and colleges (also referred to as academic “units”) should revise their TFR Statements to reflect the procedures and criteria of the new policy, and such Statements will be finally approved by the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and the cognizant senior vice president. Because it will take time for units to adopt new Statements, this guideline is intended to guide units in conducting reviews of their tenured faculty until they have an approved revised Statement.

In particular, this Guideline provides more detail for the new *process* in Policy 6-321. When considering the *substantive* standards to be applied when evaluating a faculty member’s performance, the new Policy provides that one should meet the expectations for a tenured faculty member in their unit. These expectations have historically been articulated in the unit’s existing TFR Statements or in other similar policies of a unit.

As a result, to the extent that there is an inconsistency between a unit’s current TFR Statement and this Guideline, because this Guideline is procedural in nature, it should be followed. If you have questions, please contact the Office for Faculty at 801-581-8763 or [officeforfaculty@utah.edu](mailto:officeforfaculty@utah.edu).

\* \* \*

Tenured Faculty Review Procedures

- I. Notice to participants. To ensure that all review participants are adequately informed of the review scheduling, the department chairperson (dean in single-department colleges) is responsible to provide the following reminders:
  - a) Notice should be given before January 1 to the departmental TFR Committee (see below) and the faculty members to be reviewed, identifying the faculty members due for review each year.
  - b) Notice should be given to the faculty member undergoing a review thirty (30) days before the file closing date (see below) of (1) the file closing date, (2) a list of the information and materials the faculty member will be required to submit for the TFR File, and (3) an invitation to submit any additional information the faculty member desires the departmental TFR Committee to consider.

- c) Notice to the department's tenure-line and career-line faculty members of the scheduled reviews for the year and the opportunity to submit any pertinent comments and information by signed writing to be included in the TFR file by the specified file closing date.
- d) If the reviewed faculty member has a shared-appointment agreement with an interdisciplinary program or with a unit that was an interdisciplinary program (see Policy [6-303-III-C](#), and [Policy 6-001-III-A](#)), notice must be provided to the program administrator at least 30 days in advance of the file closing date requesting that the program submit a report regarding the faculty member's contributions to the TFR Committee at least five business days before the Committee meets.

## II. TFR File.

- a) Information from faculty member engaged in review. A faculty member undergoing a TFR Review shall submit the following items:
  - 1. Curriculum vitae. The faculty member shall submit a current, complete curriculum vitae (CV), organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories. If the unit has a standard template, it should be organized using that template.
  - 2. Written report. The faculty member shall provide a written report describing relevant activities and accomplishments for the period of time since the faculty member's most recent formal RPT or TFR Review. The report should describe the faculty member's professional development over time and future professional plans.
  - 3. Other evidence. The faculty member shall provide any other evidence as indicated by the unit's TFR Statement and may provide any other evidence permitted by the unit's TFR Statement.
- b) Information from department chairperson.
  - 1. The department chairperson shall compile and place in the file course evaluation results for the relevant period (developed using the University's approved "Course Feedback Instrument and Report" pursuant to [Policy 6-100-III-N](#)), and those other multiple indicators of

quality of teaching which the unit has adopted as specified within its TFR Statement, consistent with the University's commitment to "assess its courses and instruction in multiple ways" ([Policy 6-100-III-N](#)). Units may elect to include for all TFR Reviews assessments from peer observations and analyses of teaching and teaching materials conducted by peer observers qualified by experience and familiarity with the methods of teaching and subjects appropriate for the discipline.

2. The department chairperson shall add to the file all prior TFR reports, any signed, written information submitted for purposes of the review by any tenure-line or career-line member of the department faculty; any written report submitted by the head of the unit with whom a faculty member's appointment is shared; and other information as specified in the unit's TFR Statement.
  3. The department chairperson is strongly encouraged to provide in writing a summary of the candidate's service contributions as well as any other appropriate information relevant to the faculty member's teaching, research, or clinical contributions that the chairperson is privy to as the administrator of the unit.
- c) Faculty member's rights regarding TFR file. The faculty member is entitled to see all contents of the TFR file upon request at any time during the review process except any external evaluator letters protected by confidentiality. The faculty member may respond to any item in the file by written comment submitted within seven (7) business days after the specified file closing date.
  - d) File closing. The file shall be closed on the date specified in the notices given the faculty member and others by the department chairperson (see above), which shall be at least seven (7) business days before the TFR Committee meets and prepares its report. The file shall be made available to the Committee as of the file closing date.

### III. Department TFR Committee's report.

- a) Committee membership. The departmental TFR Committee membership and leadership are described in the unit's approved TFR Statement. The Committee's members must all be tenured and have the same or higher rank as the reviewed faculty member. It must have at least two members (for small departments, a special exception for membership may be approved in advance

by the cognizant senior vice president). It may consist of as many as all of the unit's tenured and rank-qualified members (except the reviewed faculty member). The department chairperson and all ranks of deans and vice presidents and the President are not eligible to serve on the Committee.

- b) TFR Committee report. After reviewing the file, the TFR Committee or, for those units that so choose, a smaller subcommittee of the TFR Committee shall prepare a report that reflects the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, service, and as appropriate, clinical work; the report should not be based on any single area. For a shared-appointment, the TFR Committee report shall reflect discussion and consideration of any report submitted by the interdisciplinary academic program.

The Committee's report shall include a faculty member's accomplishments and opportunities for further improvement. It must include the committee's overall *findings and recommendations* and, include a specific statement of whether the faculty member has made meaningful and sustained contributions in their role such that they are meeting the standards for a tenured faculty member in the unit (typically described in the unit's current TFR Statement). When appropriate, the report should include commendations and/or strategies, timelines (including those for follow-up reviews), and recommendations for improvement of a faculty member's performance.

Unless otherwise specifically provided in the unit's TFR Statement, the Committee may choose to consult with the faculty member while preparing a final version of the report to ensure accuracy of included information or discuss any contemplated recommendations.

- c) Confidentiality. All TFR Committee deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.
- d) Distribution to TFR Committee members. The Committee report must be shared with all TFR Committee members, and then, if needed, revised based on their review and feedback. The report, with any such revisions made, will become the Committee's final report when approved by vote of a majority of the Committee members. The department chairperson and all ranks of deans and vice presidents and the President are not eligible to participate in this review and vote for the report.
- e) Candidate receipt and opportunity to respond. The Committee's report then shall be sent to the reviewed faculty member as well as the department chair,



dean, and cognizant senior vice president. The reviewed faculty member has the opportunity to respond to the Committee's report within seven (7) calendar days of receiving it, by submitting a written response to the designated leadership of the Committee. The Committee's report, and any written response of the reviewed faculty member, will be included in the TFR file .

IV. Finalizing a TFR Report.

- a) The departmental TFR Committee's report will serve as the Final TFR Report if no party seeks review of the report.
- b) As provided in Policy 6-321, the reviewed faculty member, the department chairperson, or the dean, who disagrees with the TFR Committee's report, may seek review by the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee ("UPTAC") following the procedures outlined in Policy 6-304. A party who chooses to seek review must notify UPTAC of that intention within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the distribution of the departmental Committee's report.
- c) After reviewing the entire file, UPTAC will either (1) uphold the departmental Committee's report without change, or (2) describe particular errors in the report's findings or recommendations which the departmental Committee will then correct accordingly. Once found satisfactory by UPTAC, the departmental Committee report will constitute the Final TFR report for the TFR process under Policy 6-321.

V. Action After a Final TFR Report.

- a) If the faculty member is found to be meeting the standards for a tenured faculty member in the unit, the cognizant senior vice president will formally acknowledge the evaluation and will consult with the dean and department chairperson to designate an appropriate recognition for the achievement.
- b) If the faculty member is found not to be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured faculty member in the unit, the dean and department chairperson, together with designated members of the review committee and other faculty members as needed, shall work with the reviewed faculty member to implement the recommendations of the Final TFR Report.

VI. Relationship to Other Processes.

In the course of any review of a tenured faculty member, if an issue arises under the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities ([Policy 6-316](#)), such as an issue that is appropriate for consideration by the University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action ([Policy 1-012](#)), the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights ([Policy 6-010](#)), or the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee ([Policy 6-011](#)), that issue should proceed as is appropriate under the relevant Policy. If a case is referred to or a complaint filed with one of these bodies, those entities may request that the tenured faculty review process be suspended until the matter is resolved.