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Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP)

• The reappointment, tenure and promotion policy is one of the most delicate matters in a university community.

• The correct conduct of RTP procedures provides the assurance that every RTP candidate will be fairly evaluated and that the integrity of the evaluation process is maintained to the highest degree.

• The RTP process is guided by the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) articles 10 to 15, University Policies #1328 and #1329, and Department RTP criteria documents.

• Policy #1328, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy and Procedures, was reviewed and modified in the AY 2019-20 with implementation of changes to begin in the AY 2021-22 RTP cycle.
Where to find resources for RTP

Office of Faculty Affairs
Office of Faculty Affairs

Tenure-Line Faculty Evaluation

Reappointment, Tenure & Promotion (RTP)

RTP packets must be submitted via Interfolio.

By the start of the Fall semester, a case will have been created in Interfolio for faculty eligible to submit a RTP packet via Interfolio. Once you log in to Interfolio, you will be able to access instructions for submitting your packet along with links to upload the required documents and forms. Please begin drafting your candidate’s report and self-narrative using the form below. This will become part of your RTP submission.

RTP Calendar
- RTP Calendar 2022-2023 (pdf)

RTP Policies
- Policy No. 1329 - RTP Policy and Procedure (pdf)
- Policy No. 1329 - Student Evaluation of Teaching (pdf)
- CBA Article 15 Evaluation (doc)
- Senate Resolution on Faculty Evaluations - Spring 2020
- Senate Resolution on Faculty Evaluations - AY 2020-2021
- Letter to PAF - COVID-19 Context in AY 2020/21 (doc)
- Letter to PAF - COVID-19 Context in AY 2020/21 (pdf)

RTP Forms
- Faculty Performance Review Form 2022-23 (doc) - for full performance reviews
- Periodic Review Form 2022-23 (doc) - for faculty periodic reviews
- DRTPC Evaluation Form 2022-03 (doc) Signature page (pdf)
- Department Chair Evaluation Form 2022-03 (doc) Signature page (pdf)
- Dean Evaluation Form 2022-23 (doc) Signature page (pdf)

RTP Online Resources

- RTP calendar
- Policies
- Academic Resolutions
- Faculty Performance Review Form
- Evaluator’s Forms
- Interfolio Resource link
Overview of RTP
General Principles

• The faculty member requesting RTP action is primarily responsible for demonstrating criteria is met

• Evaluation and recommendation is based on materials included in the RTP packet and Personnel Action File (PAF)

• RTP packet is also referred to as the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)
Who are the evaluators?

1. **Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)** and Department Chair, if not part of the DRTPC and explicitly stated in department RTP criteria. If separate, it must be done independently from DRTPC review.

2. **Dean**

3. **University RTP Committee (URTPC)**

4. **Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs**, as President’s designee, makes final decisions on RTP matters.
Who are the evaluators?

- The College RTP Committee, **CRTPC**, is part of the process only if there is an appeal of the DRTPC's recommendation. If triggered, their participation is strictly limited to the appeal, they don’t conduct a full evaluation.

- Appeal can only be for violation of department RTP procedures and/or upon misapplication of department RTP criteria.
Evaluator Responsibilities: confidentiality of review

- Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion are confidential

- Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, evaluators, and appropriate administrators, and the CRTPC only if there’s an appeal to the DRTPC recommendation.
Evaluator recommendations

- RTP committee’s evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a **simple majority**

- Before recommendations are reviewed by next review level, the candidate must be given the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation.

- The candidate shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation.
Other evaluator responsibilities

• The candidate may request an opportunity to discuss recommendation with the recommending group or individual, who shall honor such a request. Such requests shall not require that RTP timelines, as specified in the current University Calendar for RTP Actions, be extended.

• Under rare circumstances beyond the control of individual(s) at a given review level, a request may be submitted to the URTPC for extending a deadline. After consulting with AVP for Faculty Affairs, URTPC Chair responds to the request.
DRTPC duties during the RTP cycle

• Evaluate using only applicable department RTP criteria

• Produce DRTPC evaluation by deadlines

• Maintain security and confidentiality
DRTPC duties during the RTP cycle

• The DRTPC must also include a discussion of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle. This applies to probationary faculty and tenured faculty who are applying for promotion (full PAF review would likely be the only way to find out what was recommended in prior years).
DRTPC duties during the Academic Year

- Responsible for making sure class peer observations are conducted

- Mentor probationary faculty about departmental expectations

- **Initiate review of DRTP criteria document** as needed or if expired (current deadline for submission to the DRTPC and the Dean is April 1st each year). CRTPC, Dean, and AVPFA are also reviewers.
DRTPC member: supplementary report

• Also known as “minority report”

• Any member of the DRTPC may file a supplementary report. Supplementary reports, if submitted, must accompany the recommendation in question and must be made available to all members of the DRTPC and to the candidate.
Appeals of DRTPC recommendation

• The candidate has ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the DRTPC’s recommendation to appeal the DRTPC action to the CRTPC

• In cases of appeal, the Office of Faculty Affairs will create a special separate calendar to track these cases
## Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Calendar
**Academic Year 2022-2023**

**Fall Semester: August 22 – December 23**  
**Spring Semester: January 20 – May 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>RTP Package Due Date</th>
<th>Review Begins</th>
<th>Recommendation Deadline</th>
<th>Rebuttal Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERIODIC:</strong> Faculty in 3rd/4th probationary year</td>
<td>DRTPC</td>
<td>9/12/22</td>
<td>9/12/22</td>
<td>9/26/22</td>
<td>10/6/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>9/12/22</td>
<td>9/26/22</td>
<td>10/6/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>10/7/22</td>
<td>10/24/22</td>
<td>11/3/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERIODIC:</strong> Faculty in 5th/6th probationary year</td>
<td>DRTPC</td>
<td>9/26/22</td>
<td>9/26/22</td>
<td>10/21/22</td>
<td>10/31/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>9/26/22</td>
<td>10/21/22</td>
<td>10/31/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>11/1/22</td>
<td>12/6/22</td>
<td>12/16/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **FULL PERFORMANCE:** For faculty requesting 2nd/3rd/4th/5th/6th reappt. Tenure/Promotion¹  
Promotion to Full Professor² | DRTPC | 10/10/22 | 10/10/22 | 11/18/22 | 11/28/22 |
| | Department Chair | 10/10/22 | 11/18/22 | 11/28/22 |
| | Dean | 11/29/22 | 1/31/23 | 2/10/23 |
| | URTPC | 2/11/23 | 4/14/23 | 4/24/23 |
| | Provost | 4/25/23 | 6/1/23  
6/15/23 (promo to full only) |
| **Pre-RTP** | DRTPC | 2/6/23 | 2/6/23 | 2/21/23 | 3/3/23 |
| | Department Chair | 2/6/23 | 2/21/23 | 3/3/23 |
| | Dean | 3/4/23 | 3/24/23 meeting with faculty member³  
Dean | 4/7/23  
4/17/23 |

¹ Probationary faculty (assistant or associate professor) requesting tenure and/or promotion.  
² Tenured associate professors requesting promotion to full professor.  
³ Dean shall meet with the probationary faculty member to review the department evaluation by March 24, 2023.  
⁴ The Dean’s separate evaluation must be provided to the probationary faculty member within seven days of the meeting (by April 7, 2023).
Criteria for RTP evaluations

• Criteria document provided to candidates no later than **14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term** (CBA requirement)

• **Department Chair** responsible for delivering document (campus policy)

• Candidates for **reappointment** must use department RTP criteria in effect during the first year of appointment

• Candidates requesting **tenure and/or promotion** may use either the criteria in effect during the first year of appointment in rank or the criteria in effect during the year of RTP action request
Areas of Evaluation

• Teaching

• Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

• Service

  • Advising: in some departments it is under teaching, in others service
  • Graduate advising vs. undergrad advising could be recognized differently in some departments
Teaching, Research & Scholarly Activities

Student evaluation of teaching

• All classes evaluated with a few exceptions
• Conducted anonymously via survey questionnaires, comments not allowed

Out of class evaluation comments

• At any time a student may submit input on teaching performance of a faculty member. Letter/petition must be signed and include the Bronco Identification Number of student(s) who signed and addressed to department chair or DRTPC chair.
• Solicitation of student comments

• Only via public announcement posting/publication or by some other means designed to reach students collectively, not individually

• Any solicitation by a faculty member on his/her own behalf, or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is considered unprofessional and is prohibited

• The comments must be due at least 10 days before RTP packet deadline to allow candidate required minimum 10 days to write response and so that DRTPC can consider both student input and candidate’s response in deliberations
Evaluation of Teaching

• **Peer observation of teaching**
  • Minimum of two peer observations per academic year, some departments require more during early probationary years
  • Responsibility of DRTPC is to ensure required minimum number observations is met and that the report is submitted to the faculty member and placed in faculty member’s PAF within two weeks of the classroom visit
  • Scheduling of peer observation – done with faculty member
Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

• Based on department RTP criteria

• Expectations vary by department

• Criteria expectations must be clear, not subject to interpretation

• Short-term and long-term plans are essential
Overall evaluation of Teaching

• Describe your teaching philosophy and pedagogical approaches in detail
• Thoroughly address RTP criteria, reference each specific criterium
• Expectations in terms of minimum scores, teaching philosophy statement, activities to support teaching, etc. vary by department
Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

- Describe your research/scholarly/creative activities focus/philosophy
- Describe the significance of activities
- Keep in mind that some in the URTPC, as well as others, will not be familiar with your disciplinary expertise as you write your narrative
- Thoroughly address RTP criteria, reference each specific criterium
Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

• Describe the impact on teaching and professional community
• Describe and include completed work and work in progress
• Expectations vary by department
• Short-term and long-term plans are essential
Release time for new probationary faculty

- 3 WTU per semester (a total of 12 WTUs during the initial two year appointment)

- “To assist new probationary faculty employees with establishing their programs of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities, and carrying out other activities that would support them in meeting the requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion.” (CBA 20.36)
Evaluation of Service

• Based on department RTP criteria, expectations vary by department

• Thoroughly address RTP criteria, reference each specific criterium

• Ask for department guidance on service strategies

• Describe nature of contribution, intensity of commitment

• Organize by service at different levels – department, college, university, and system

• Discuss service to the profession and to the community referencing the criteria in the service area
How long is probationary period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service Credit</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Evaluation Period for Tenure and Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common questions about probationary period

Q. Can work produced prior to beginning probationary period be evaluated for consideration for tenure for those with service credit?

A. No, pursuant to campus Policy #1328, Section 7.3: “tenure evaluations are based on the period since original appointment to the probationary position”
Avoiding past mistakes

• Not addressing recommendations given the previous cycle

• Not listing the appropriate probationary year in the form

• Not addressing all RTP criteria requirements in each of the three evaluation areas

• Not analyzing teaching scores as required

• Third probationary year candidates with little or no progress or plans in terms of scholarly and creative activities, despite release time for first two years

• Do not comment on informal feedback from students. Not a part of official policy.
Final recommendations

• Have a short term and long term plans, even if not required by your department.

• Understand and follow all applicable policies and criteria document procedures and understand your role and responsibilities

• Double-check your RTP packet before final submission

• Ask for clarification/guidance/help when needed
Overview of Changes to RTP Process

Introduction of Periodic Evaluation (PE) for probationary faculty (vs. Performance review)
Pre-RTP – No changes

Probationary faculty will receive an initial appointment of two years.

In Year One they will undergo a unique form of periodic evaluation known as “Pre-RTP.”

As a periodic evaluation, Pre-RTP is not actionable and will be reviewed only by the DRTPC and Dean.
Performance reviews

• **Performance review**: actionable evaluation process by the DRTPC, Department Chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), Dean/or Director by each level of review that results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure and/or promotion

• Probationary faculty will undergo a *minimum of three full performance reviews* before being granted tenure (except early tenure cases).

• Performance Review (PR) is required for reappointment.
Periodic Evaluations

A periodic evaluation is an intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the DRTPC, Department Chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and Dean.

Periodic evaluation does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions. Reports from the DRTPC and Dean are issued to the probationary faculty member with feedback and guidance.
### Scenario 1: Six-Year Probationary Period (no service credit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary Year</th>
<th>Types of Review</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-RTP</td>
<td>This is the first year of employment; Pre-RTP; Stops at dean’s level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Performance review (PR)</strong> for reappointment to 3(^{rd}) and 4(^{th}) probationary years</td>
<td>Two years, or one-year reappointment if candidate is found to be in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Periodic evaluation (PE)</td>
<td>Stops at dean’s level; no personnel action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Performance review (PR)</strong> for reappointment to 5(^{th}) and 6(^{th}) probationary years</td>
<td>Two years, or one-year reappointment if candidate is found to be in need of improvement, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Periodic evaluation (PE)</td>
<td>Stops at dean’s level; no personnel action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Performance review (PR)</strong> for Tenure and Promotion consideration</td>
<td>T&amp;P recommended, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 2: Five-Year Probationary Period (one year of service credit, are only eligible to be considered for a 2-year appointment in their 3rd probationary year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary Year</th>
<th>Types of review and outcomes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pre-RTP</td>
<td>This is the first year of employment; Pre-RTP; Stops at dean’s level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance Review (PR) for reappointment to 4th and 5th probationary years</td>
<td>Two years, or one-year reappointment if candidate is found to be in need of improvement, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Periodic Evaluation (PE)</td>
<td>Stops at dean’s level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Performance Review (PR) for reappointment to 6th probationary year</td>
<td>Appointed to one-year reappointment, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Performance Review (PR) for Tenure and Promotion consideration</td>
<td>T&amp;P recommended, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 3: Four-Year Probationary Period (two years of service credit, cannot receive 2-year appointments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary Year</th>
<th>Types of review and outcomes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pre-RTP</td>
<td>This is the first year of employment; Pre-RTP; Stops at dean’s level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Performance Review (PR)</strong></td>
<td>Appointed to one-year reappointment, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for reappointment to 5(^{th}) probationary year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Performance Review (PR)</strong></td>
<td>Appointed to one-year reappointment, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for reappointment to 6(^{th}) probationary year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Performance Review (PR)</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;P recommended, or terminal year granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Tenure and Promotion consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation of a one year or two year appointment

• During a **Performance Review (PR)**, based on the review of the RTP package and evaluation of progress towards tenure and promotion, evaluators at any level of review may recommend that a probationary faculty member undergo another performance review (one year appointment) rather than a periodic evaluation in the following Academic Year.

• This recommendation is **not subject to appeal** although the probationary faculty member can submit a rebuttal.
Components of Performance Review: RTP package
As stated in Policy #1328

1. An updated curriculum vitae; -new-

2. The Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form); and

3. A self-assessment narrative (no page limit) discussing the DRTP criteria regarding strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities and service from the current review period. In your narrative, highlight, as applicable, how your accomplishments support CPP’s core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.
Components of Performance Review, RTP package
As stated in Policy #1328

4. All peer evaluations since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all peer evaluations since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);

5. Statistical summaries of student survey scores since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all student survey scores since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion); and

6. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)
Candidate responsibilities, Policy #1328, 7.5 C

• Candidates for reappointment must discuss their progress toward meeting department requirements for tenure

• All candidates must discuss progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle. This includes not only probationary faculty but tenured faculty who are applying for promotion. This includes recommendations given through the Periodic Evaluations, not just the Performance Reviews
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

Evaluators for RTP packages – no changes

1. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) and Department Chair, if not part of the DRTPC and explicitly stated in department RTP criteria. If separate, it must be done independently from DRTPC review.

2. CRTPC, only if there is an appeal.

3. Dean

4. University RTP Committee (URTPC)

5. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as President’s designee, makes final decisions on RTP matters.
1. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) and Department Chair, if not part of the DRTPC. If separate, it must be done independently from DRTPC review

2. Dean (evaluation stops here, this is similar to Pre-RTP)

The DRTPC, the department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and the dean shall produce a report with constructive feedback and clear guidance for improvement in preparation of the next year’s performance review.
Periodic Evaluation (PE)

• Probationary faculty issued a two-year appointment will undergo a periodic evaluation (PE) in the fall semester of year 1 of the two-year appointment.

• Like Pre-RTP evaluation, Periodic Evaluation does not lead to reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.

• Reports from the DRTPC and Dean are issued to the probationary faculty member with feedback and guidance. A copy of the report shall be placed in the faculty member’s PAF.
1. An updated curriculum vitae;

2. A self-assessment narrative, **not to exceed four pages**, discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities and service and other professional activities as applicable from the current review period. In your narrative, highlight, as applicable, how your accomplishments support CPP's core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;
Periodic Evaluation (PE)
Components of Periodic Evaluation, Periodic Evaluation Report

3. Two peer evaluations from the period of review (or more if required by the department);
4. Statistical summaries of student survey scores and reviews from the current review period; and
5. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.
Supplementary materials

• Supplementary materials will continue to be uploaded via Interfolio and they can be added for performance reviews and periodic evaluations

• Supplementary materials are not required by University policy but could be required by the department’s RTP criteria document

• If included, an index of all supplementary materials must be provided
Period covered by performance reviews and periodic evaluations

• For subsequent reappointment applications/performance reviews and for periodic evaluations the period of review shall be the period since the last performance review.

• The period of review for application for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure shall be the period since the original appointment.

• The period of review for application for promotion to Full Professor shall be the period since the previous application for promotion to Associate, or, if the candidate was hired at the Associate rank, the period since the original appointment.
Candidates do not request one or two year appointment or performance review versus periodic evaluation. Candidates apply for the action(s) they are eligible for.

Only evaluators can recommend a one or two year reappointment.
CFA