

Issue raised about	URTPC recommendation	FAC recommendation/action	status
1. Mentoring student research	Provide guidelines for categorizing and rewarding mentorship of student research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section I, point 10: language added Programs to specify in their PPS. 	completed
2. Evaluation of service: reassigned time service vs. service performed with no reassigned time	<p>“Service roles need to be assessed differently if compensated...”</p> <p>“Address this issue specifically”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section I, point 9: language added Programs to specify in their PPS. 	completed
3. Evaluation of research in newer publication formats	“give clear guidance...that specifically defines parameters of ‘peer review and ‘research journal’.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programs to specify in their PPS. Section I, point 8: language added 	completed
4. Accounting of 15 WTUs	“faculty members include accounting of the 15 WTUs for each semester”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section K Faculty shall include a list in their Portfolio Language added to section K (point 7 d) and to appendix (checklist) 	completed
5. Criteria for early tenure or promotion	“clarify what constitutes ‘widespread recognition’ for early promotion and/or tenure”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections O and P, point 4 Language added: “markedly exceeded PPS in all areas” in order to qualify for early tenure; can only apply one year early 	completed
6. Extended University teaching	“include a line in RTP policy reflecting the fact that non-stateside teaching is outside the scope of RTP”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section I, point 6 a: language added FAC does not agree with recommendation; Extended Univ. teaching is crucial to CI mission and varies per program 	completed
7. Evaluation system for tenure and promotion	“change policy to eliminate numerical standards”: “meets standards” or “does not”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section C, “General Standards for RTP” Language added to points 2, 3 **Also added to sections N, O, P 	completed

Issue raised about	URTPC recommendation	FAC recommendation/observations/notes	status
<p>8. "Ensure all faculty and all levels of review take university policy as well as Program Personnel Standards into account."</p> <p>"Probationary faculty benefit from having a clear understanding of RTP policies while several reviews at various levels did not apply the relevant university policy."</p>	<p>"The URTPC recommends...that FAC consider an addition to policy requiring that all PPS documents include explicit reference to the existence of university policy on RTP together with the expectation that candidates and reviewers at all levels of review should incorporate both the PPS and the relevant university policy in their work."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language added to section I, point 2: • "All PPS shall include explicit expectations that candidates and reviewers at all levels of review shall incorporate both the PPS and the relevant university RTP policy in their deliberations." 	<p>completed</p> <p>Consulted via email with AY 20-21 URTPC.</p>

Issue raised about	URTPC recommendation	FAC recommendation	status
9. Portfolio standardization: “Provide guidance and assistance in assembling portfolios”	“work with Faculty Affairs [office] to standardize the format for everyone”; provide a template or templates, of well-organized, hyperlinked portfolios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section K. This appears to be a procedural question rather than a policy question? FAC will defer until after AY 21-22 RTP cycle given transition to a new system (Interfolio). 	No action.
10. Chair needing to check portfolio before candidate hands in	“responsible for verifying” portfolio completeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section R, point 3 We disagree with URTPC. After polling chairs last year, we removed language requiring chair to verify portfolio; we clarified that onus is on applicants, where it should be. 	completed
11. Anti-bias training	Require anti-bias training for RTP reviewers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language added to section M, point 1 	completed

Issue raised about	URTPC recommendation	FAC recommendation	status
12. URTPC committee (Excessive workload)	“include an upper limit on the number of times any individual may serve”?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section D, point 3 g: We added language as follows: “A faculty member who has served four years on the URTPC may choose to exempt themselves from the next four annual election cycles.” 	completed