The University RPT Standards Committee, with assistance from Associate Academic Vice President Susan Olson and her representative Professor Robert Flores, met once monthly from Sept 2009 to May 2010 and completed the following tasks:

1. The committee answered questions and provided guidance to departments and colleges for bringing RPT statements into compliance with changes in University Policy 6-303 regarding an “excellence” standard for tenure and an explicit statement about the role of external funding in the tenure decision. These changes took effect July 1, 2010.

2. The committee discussed recent changes to University Policy 6-310 that, among other purposes, clarifies reappointment procedures for auxiliary faculty members. A subcommittee of this committee, chaired by Robert Flores and augmented by three representatives of the auxiliary faculty, was involved in developing some of these changes. Now that these policy changes have taken effect, the University can proceed with the formidable task of reviewing and approving recently formulated college policy statements that treat the evaluation and reappointment of auxiliary faculty. Our augmented subcommittee is ready to advise the Academic Vice President in this process. In addition, the revised 6-310 newly authorizes certain interdisciplinary teaching programs to appoint Lecturer auxiliary faculty, and requires those programs to prepare statements of rules for appointment and reappointment of their Lecturers. It is agreed that our augmented subcommittee will also share its expertise by advising the Academic Vice President in the review of those statements. Since the crafting of regular faculty RPT statements involves many of the same issues of clarity and due process as the auxiliary faculty statements, it seems appropriate that this committee have some involvement in the review. The augmented advisory subcommittee structure also seems to be appropriate, since it provides the needed overlap with the full committee, yet it does not detract from the main business of the full committee, namely reviewing regular faculty RPT statements.

3. University Policies 6-303 and 6-311 govern the RPT process in the University’s regular academic units. The libraries intend that their evaluation and promotion procedures follow 6-303 and 6-311, but with some adaptations because of the special status of librarians. The committee discussed a procedural method for temporarily codifying these adaptations in lieu of a revision to University Policy 6-306.
4. This year the committee reviewed RPT statements from the following departments and colleges with the status indicated

a. Nursing (returned with comments to the college)
b. Libraries (returned with comments to the libraries)
c. Educational Leadership and Policy (first, approved an expedited discrete change in policy and, second, returned to the department with detailed comments for further improvement)
d. English (returned with comments to the department)
e. Pharmacology/Toxicology (after revisions, approved)
f. Art and Art History (expedited approval of new formal review schedule)
g. History (returned with preliminary comments to the department)
h. Communication Sciences and Disorders (expedited approval of new formal review schedule)
i. Social Work (returned with preliminary comments to the department)
j. Modern Dance (returned with preliminary comments to the department)
k. Educational Psychology (after revisions, approved)
l. Psychology (returned with comments to the department)
m. Music (returned with comments to the school).
n. Sociology (returned with preliminary comments to the department)

5. Procedural matters:

The committee continued developing tools for assisting departments and colleges in the revision of their RPT statements so that they are clear and complete and they are fully consistent with University policy. We are considering a web-based tool that would list the desired document components, provide links to relevant University Policy in each case, and provide explanations and examples.