

UCCD Resolution on RTP Policies and Procedures

At its meeting on February 12, 2020, the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD) passed the following resolution unanimously (19-0-0), to be forwarded to the Provost and the Academic Senate Chair.

Context. University policies regarding Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) were updated via Policies [S15-7](#) (Criteria and Standards) and [S15-8](#) (Procedures). These new policies were designed to provide better and updated explanations of expectations and standards for faculty review, and RTP processes and decisions. In general, the new policies have been useful to faculty undergoing review and review committees.

However, based on a variety of direct experiences and those shared by faculty, department chairs and directors, and those serving on RTP committees at different levels (department, college, and university), concerns have arisen about: (1) the consistency of how RTP standards are interpreted and applied for review, (2) the application of department RTP guidelines that were approved by the university in the review process, and (3) assumed or inequitable emphasis placed on specific components of the three areas of review (Academic Assignment/Teaching Effectiveness, RSCA, and Service) contrary to university policies. Specifically, with the increased resources and opportunities for RSCA, is the RSCA area of RTP evaluation weighted greater in actuality than the other two areas? Similarly, what weight should service as one of the three components of RTP have, especially given contexts in which some faculty are asked or driven to dedicate more time in service/service to students when they are members of a cultural group for which students have an affinity?

Thus, concerns have risen to the level where confusion, anxiety, fear, and frustration are affecting: (1) faculty members' ability to strategize effectively their career paths, priorities, and achievements in the three areas of review, (2) chairs' and directors' ability to mentor and support successfully their colleagues through the RTP process, and (3) RTP committee members' ability to evaluate faculty competently and consistently according to the RTP policies.

As a result of these concerns, UCCD presents the following resolution.

Whereas, Faculty and faculty success are key to the primary functioning of the university, and mechanisms and supports for faculty success, especially RTP, are a priority; and

Whereas, There are concerns about inconsistency in the interpretation and implementation of the RTP policy; and

Whereas, Inconsistencies reduce the validity of RTP decisions, and thus affect the careers of faculty colleagues and the overall functioning of the University; and

Whereas, Service to the profession is important to many departments and professions; and

Whereas, There is no clarity as to how or whether department guidelines are (or are not) being used in the RTP evaluation process; therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the University Council of Chairs and Directors urge the University and its administration to hold to the following principles regarding RTP guidelines and procedures:

1. Improvements in the scope of training and refreshers to address effective and holistic evaluation of RTP candidates' performance (not just policies and procedures) should be required for all levels of RTP review, including the Provost and President levels;
2. All levels should review and apply department specific RTP guidelines, as well as the information provided at the department level, given that departments know best their respective disciplines and expectations. RTP committee representatives at each level should become familiar with RTP guidelines or expectations of departments they represent;
3. Data about RTP decisions (aggregate de-identified) should be reported annually to the campus, including analysis by rank and key demographic characteristics and proportion of mismatches of recommendations across all the levels of RTP committee review;

4. There should be increased clarity and transparency regarding the RTP standards and their application if the weighting in the three categories in actuality differs from the description according to policies;
5. RTP committees and additional administrative levels of review should consider the appropriate role of service to the profession for faculty in programs for which such service is important;
6. Information and messaging about RTP and RTP standards should be consistent for the benefit of all.