

## **RPT Internal Area Committee Letters - Guidance to CoE Area Committees**

The *purpose* of the area review letter is to report the committee's evaluation of the intellectual products submitted by the candidate and to provide measures of **scholarly impact**. This committee does *not* vote or provide advice on the merits on the case. The area committee is typically composed of three tenured faculty members with domain expertise in the candidate's field of research; area committee members can be from the candidate's unit or can be interdisciplinary in composition. The letter should include a detailed explanation of the committee's examination of the submitted intellectual products, including placing the candidate's contributions in context and commenting on the importance and measurement of scholarly impact of the work.

### **The letter does not evaluate the candidate's teaching or service contributions.**

The letter does **NOT** discuss

- Grants or funding
- Quantity/productivity of research publications and/or presentations
- A recommendation on the final outcome of the case

The Area/Internal/Research Committee's letter is **addressed to the School Chair and written on the committee chair's school letterhead**. In addition to the School Chair, the letter will be read and interpreted by the

- School RPT Committee
- COE RPT Committee - composed of faculty from every engineering school
- Dean of Engineering
- School Chairs from every engineering school
- Provost Advisory Committee aka Institute RPT Committee, composed of the Deans of each college, faculty from each college, and the Vice Provosts
- Provost, and
- President.

All tenure-track faculty receive a copy of their reappointment package after completion of critical review. 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 Area/Internal/Research 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. Committee members need to include their rank and title on the signature page.**

Letters should

- Cover all aspects of the committee's evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, explaining strengths and concerns, placing the candidate's contributions in context and commenting on the importance and the measurement of scholarly impact of the work, relative quality of journals where published, etc. There will be future readers of the committee letter who are not in engineering and will appreciate the perspective provided.
- Reflect the committee discussion and evaluation. Be careful not to be sidetracked by a single issue that dominates the evaluation and/or the letter contents. The tone of the letter should be consistent with the evaluation; e.g., a very positive letter should be the outcome of a very positive evaluation but not the opposite.
- ***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.
- Be kept confidential at all times.

**Template letter for area committee is on the next page.**

June 2019

TO: School Chair

FROM: Area Committee for Dr. XXX XXX: George P. Burdell (Professor – AE), Mickey Mouse (Associate Professor – BME), Georgia P. Burdell (Professor – CEE), and Buzz Tech (Associate Professor – ME)

DATE: Date of Meeting 20XX

The area committee for Dr. XXX XXX, Professor in the School of ZZZZ Engineering met to provide a detailed assessment of the quality, and impact on the field, of the most significant scholarly accomplishments of Dr. XXX XXX's five intellectual products submitted for review. In the following summary we provide a detailed summary of our assessment.

**In the next few paragraphs provide an assessment of the intellectual products submitted.**

Conflict of Interest Disclosure: Be sure to indicate if the any of the committee members have collaborated with the promotion candidate and that this collaboration did not prevent an objective evaluation of the intellectual products.

All the Area Committee members listed below have participated in the discussion of these intellectual products, contributed to the preparation of this letter, reviewed this letter, and endorsed the contents of this letter.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Committee Member Name, Title, School)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Committee Member Name, Title, School)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Committee Member Name, Title, School)