RPT Committee Letters --- Guidance to COE School Committees

The *purpose* of the letter is to report the committee’s evaluation of the case. It includes the vote count and a complete explanation of the committee’s comprehensive examination of the case.

The School RPT Committee’s letter is **addressed to the School Chair** and **written on school letterhead**. In addition to the School Chair, the letter will be read and interpreted by the
- COE RPT Committee composed of faculty from every engineering school
- Dean of Engineering
- School Chairs from every engineering school
- Institute RPT Committee, composed of the Deans of each college, faculty from each college, and the Vice Provost
- Provost
- President

In addition, in recent years many of the candidates have been requesting and receiving a copy of his/her RPT packets at the end of process, so the candidate is likely to eventually read the committee letter.

The School RPT Committee’s letter is **from everyone** on the committee. Every member should sign the letter to confirm his/her participation in the case evaluation and careful review of the committee letter. If obtaining signatures of all the committee members is too difficult, the letter should be signed by the committee chair and should contain an explicit statement that all committee members participated in the case discussion and review of the letter, and that each committee member endorses the letter contents.

Letters should
- Clearly report the committee’s vote and those present/absent for the case deliberations.
- Cover all aspects of the case, explaining strengths and concerns, making it clear that every potential dimension was considered and evaluated by the committee. A distinct paragraph must explicitly discuss measurement of the candidate’s scholarly impact. Committees should be careful not to be sidetracked by a single issue that dominates the discussion, overall vote, and/or letter from the committee.
- Reflect the committee discussion and evaluation. The tone of the letter should be consistent with the vote; e.g., a very positive letter should be the outcome of a very positive vote. An explanation should be provided for split votes and alternative thinking by a subset of the committee.
- Never predict the eventual outcome of this review or future reviews.
- Provide perspective on the candidate’s research area, relative quality of journals where published, funding potential for area, relative challenge of teaching schedule, relative contribution significance of service, awards, special conventions in the school, etc. There will be future readers of the committee letter who are not in engineering and will appreciate the perspective provided.
- Never refer to external references by name or institution. Instead, number the references *a priori* and then refer to them by number.
- Be kept confidential at all times. For security reasons, most committees try to avoid the use of email for transfer of drafts and material.
- Explicitly disclose all real or potential perception of conflicts of interests that committee members have with the candidates (e.g., committee member X served as a Co-PI on grant XXX with the candidate in 20XX; committee member Y co-authored YY papers with the candidate, none of which are part of the intellectual products under review) and state that the committee member with the potential conflict has made an honest effort not to be influenced by it in his/her evaluation. If the committee member deems they cannot serve impartially due to a conflict of interest, the member should not participate in discussion of the candidate and should vote “Abstain-required.” In cases where a committee member does not want to vote on a case for reasons other than a conflict of interest, than the committee should vote “Abstain-other.” Both cases of abstentions should be used rarely and in exceptional circumstances only.