**Philosophy and Humanities Department RTP Criteria**

Approvals required by UVU policies 637 (§ 5.1.1-5.1.3), 632 (§ 5.10.1.3), and 638 (§ 5.1.1).

Provide signature and date of approval.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Tenure | Rank Advancement | Post-tenure Review |
| Department Faculty |  | NA | NA |
| Department Chair | NA | Leslie Simon | NA |
| College RTP Committee | NA | Scott Abbott, Geoff Cockerham, Phil Gordon, Nathan Gorelick, Doug Jensen, Bart Poulson, Chris Weigel, 4/7/2020 | NA |
| Dean | Steven Clark, 4/7/2020 | Steven Clark, 4/7/2020 | NA |
| SVPAA |  |  |  |
| President |  | NA | NA |
| Faculty Senate Committee | NA | Feedback received 5/12/2020 | NA |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Minimum Qualifications for Initial Appointment (UVU Policy 632) | | |
| Tenure-Track Ranks | Policy | Department RTP Criteria |
| Instructor | “An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department retention, tenure, promotion (RTP) committee. The appointment to instructor is reserved for a faculty member who lacks a terminal degree” (5.3.1). | Earned Master’s degree and pursuit of terminal degree in appropriate field (typically PhD, EdD, MFA) |
| Assistant Professor | “An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee” (5.3.2). | Terminal degree (including a Master’s degree if that is the terminal degree) in appropriate field (ABD [all but dissertation] status is acceptable if the candidate has a scheduled defense date or the candidate’s committee indicates that one will be scheduled within one year of the time of hire) |
| Associate Professor | “An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee and either (1) successful attainment of tenure at a regionally accredited college or university or (2) tenure granted at the time of hire to UVU” (5.3.3). | Terminal degree in appropriate field  AND  Successful attainment of tenure at regionally accredited college or university,  OR  Tenure granted at time of hire to UVU |
| Professor | “An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee, a minimum of five years of teaching, service and scholarship as a tenured associate professor, and successful fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to professor. The rank of professor is reserved for individuals who are judged to be exemplary. Such individuals shall have achieved distinction clearly above that of associate professor” (5.3.4). | Terminal degree in appropriate field  AND  Minimum of five years of teaching, scholarship, and service at a regionally-accredited college or university as a tenured Associate Professor |
| Non-Tenure-Track Ranks |  |  |
| Lecturer | “An earned degree in an appropriate discipline or professional field as determined by the department RTP committee” (5.6.1). | Earned Master’s degree in appropriate field |
| Appointment in Residence | “Regional, national, or international reputation and substantial body of work in an appropriate discipline with strong department, school/college, dean and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) endorsement” (5.6.2) | Appropriate applied/creative/work experience |
| Visiting Faculty/Scholar | “Rank consistent with the academic rank the individual held in a previous faculty position or rank appropriate to the visiting faculty/scholar position as negotiated and decided among the department chair, dean and VPAA. This appointment may be given to an individual under temporary appointment to the University” (5.6.3) | Terminal degree in appropriate field |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Minimum Qualifications for Rank Advancement (UVU Policy 632) | | |
| Tenure-Track Ranks | Policy | Department RTP Criteria |
| Assistant Professor | “An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee, successful fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to assistant professor, and two years of teaching, service, and scholarship at UVU.” (5.4.1). | See RTP criteria listed below. |
| Associate Professor | “Successful attainment of tenure at UVU.” (5.4.2). | See RTP criteria listed below. |
| Professor | “An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee, a minimum of five years of teaching, service and scholarship at a regionally accredited college or university as a tenured associate professor, and successful fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to professor. The rank of professor is reserved for individuals who are judged to be exemplary. Such individuals shall have achieved distinction clearly above that of associate professor” (5.4.3). | See RTP criteria listed below. |
| Non-Tenure-Track Ranks |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer | “Fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to senior lecturer status and seven years of university service” (5.7.1). | See RTP criteria listed below. |
| Senior Appointment in Residence | “Fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to senior appointment in residence status and seven years of university service.” (5.7.2) | See RTP criteria listed below. |
| Senior Visiting Faculty/Scholar | “Fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to senior visiting faculty/scholar status and seven years of university service” (5.7.3). | See RTP criteria listed below. |

**RTP Criteria**

The following RTP criteria reflect expectations for faculty with a workload of 12 instructional credit hour equivalents (ICHE), 3 academic credit hour equivalents (ACHE), and 0 governance credit hour equivalents (GCHE) per semester (UVU Policy 641). The expectations established by the criteria below need to be adjusted for faculty who have different workloads (UVU Policy 641 § 4.1.6). Lecturers do not have ACHE or GCHE, and thus there are no expectations for scholarly / creative work and no expectations for governance / service. Faculty serving in administrative roles may have up to 12 GCHE, as few as 3 ICHE, and may have no ACHE. Regardless of the assigned workload, the primacy of teaching in midterm, tenure, and rank advancement decisions remains, insofar as high quality teaching and professional development in teaching are expected of all faculty.

Policy 632 establishes that advancement to the rank of professor requires “a consistently high level of professional work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service over and above competency,” and that “[t]he rank of professor is reserved for individuals who are judged to be exemplary. Such individuals shall have achieved distinction clearly above that of associate professor.”

| **Portfolio Tabs** | **Contents and *Advice (italicized)*** | **Qualitative RTP Criteria** | **Quantitative RTP Criteria** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table of Contents** | * A detailed, organized table of contents listing every entry in the portfolio.   *Advice: The Table of Contents, Informational Statement, and CV are not categories by which the RTP Committee grants or denies tenure or promotion. Rather, they exist to help facilitate review of your portfolio materials. As such, there are no criteria by which we will be evaluating these three tabs. In order to facilitate review of your portfolio, each of these three documents should strive for clarity and organization, as indicated in the suggestions below.*  *A Table of Contents should provide:*   * *Clarity.* * *Thoroughness*   *A Table of Contents should include:*   * *Appropriate materials from evaluation period.* * *Tabs for all required sections along with appropriate documentation.* |  |  |
| **Informational Statement** | * A cover letter (2-3 pages) about overall performance during the probationary period. * The cover letter should: * Provide documentation related to changes to the tenure or rank-advancement clock (extensions, years toward tenure, early application, etc.). * Refer to any subsequent documents mentioned in the portfolio, by tab number (e.g. tabs 1-50). * Highlight accomplishments of note. * Describe contributions to the profession and university. * Describe the extent to which departmental expectations (criteria) have been met. * Describe any circumstances that helped or hindered progress. * Describe any other information that shall be beneficial to the reviewers in evaluating the material in the portfolio.   *Advice: Within your portfolio, this is the first document people will read. Keep in mind that some of your readers may never have met you. Although a dry, factual cover letter is perfectly fine, it is better to give a sense of who you are as a teacher-scholar and a colleague. Don’t be afraid to give a sense of your outstanding contributions to the profession and university, and to show how future UVU students would especially benefit from your presence as a teacher-scholar.* |  |  |
| **Curriculum Vitae** | * A curriculum vitae.   + Is clear about which work has been done during the probationary period, in the context of earlier academic training and work.   + Matches materials provided in the portfolio.   *Advice: The best CVs make it easy for readers to find dates and categories. CVs should be current, complete, clear, and well-organized.* |  |  |
| **Teaching** | * A brief overview (2-3 pages) of one’s teaching during the probationary period.   + Because the department views scholarship and teaching as two facets of the same activity, explain how your scholarship informs your teaching. | * Introduces, contextualizes, and summarizes materials included in the Teaching tab. * Provides evidence of an intentional, reflective pedagogical practice focused on student learning. * Provides evidence of teaching that maintains appropriate standards of academic rigor and content. |  |
| **Self-Assessment** | * A self-assessment of one’s teaching – and professional development related to teaching – for each year of the probationary period.   + Include not only the self-assessment you write at the time of submitting your file, but also yearly self-assessments (which you develop for your evaluation meeting with the chair each year). See “Departmental Mentorship Plan” (hereafter DMP) for further explanation. | * Demonstrates a pattern of self‐reflection, pedagogical development, and incorporation of supervisor, peer, and student feedback from year to year. * Provides evidence that, within your “intentional, reflective pedagogical practice,” you have learned and grown pedagogically, based on student/peer/chair feedback and through self-reflection. * Provides evidence that your approach to courses has changed and evolved with the broader discipline and other developments related to the field and program, with attention to course and program learning outcomes. * Highlights your strengths as a teacher and unique aspects of your pedagogy. |  |
| **Supervisor Assessment** | * A supervisor assessment of one’s teaching for each year of the probationary period, based on direct classroom observation and a review of course materials.   *Advice: Make arrangements each year for the department chair to observe you teaching. In your meeting with the chair afterwards, bring your own yearly teaching self-assessment to help facilitate a full discussion of your teaching practice.*  *The RTP Committee will be especially interested in how you work, year by year, with your Chair to meet Departmental needs and to improve your work as a teacher (as well as scholar, and contributor in various service capacities). The fact that you may have served under two or even three chairs during your candidacy for tenure can complicate this a bit, but these assessments (which also include your own annual assessments) are useful as we evaluate the quality of your contributions.* | Supervisor assessments should reflect to what degree the faculty member demonstrates:   * Subject matter mastery. * Organizational ability. * Clarity of presentation. * Sound/appropriate pedagogy. * Respect for and rapport with students. * Flexibility in accepting teaching assignments (courses and schedules) to meet department needs.   Taken together, supervisor assessments should trace a reflective practice that encourages growth and development. | * **Tenure:** At least one departmental supervisor assessment, per year, during the probationary period. * **Rank Advancement to Professor:** At least three departmental supervisor assessments during a five‐year period before application for rank advancement. * **Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer (etc**.): At least three departmental supervisor assessments during a six‐year period before application for rank advancement. |
| **Peer/Mentor Assessment** | * A peer assessment of one’s teaching for each year of the probationary period, based on direct classroom observation and a review of course materials. * Peer assessments should reflect:   + a variety of courses you teach (upper/lower division, large/small classes, e.g.), and   + a variety of perspectives (e.g., people who work in areas close to yours and people who don’t, people newer in their careers and people more established). * If you have deviated from the minimum requirement of one peer review per year, explain why. * A quantitative mentor assessment for each year of the probationary period, wherein the mentor fills out an SRI as though they were your student. This will provide context for your actual SRIs. (See DMP for more details.) * Include also your yearly qualitative mentor assessments, wherein the mentor evaluates your teaching. (See DMP for more details.) * This is not required for those applying for full professor or senior lecturer.   *Advice: The RTP Committee will evaluate these carefully, looking for patterns of praise and of critique and then looking for your responses, especially, to the critiques in your self-assessment.* | Peer assessments should reflect to what degree the faculty member demonstrates:   * Subject matter mastery. * Organizational ability. * Clarity of presentation. * Sound/appropriate pedagogy. * Respect for and rapport with students.   Taken together, peer assessments should trace a reflective practice that encourages growth and development.  Mentor assessments should reflect to what degree the faculty member demonstrates:   * Subject matter mastery. * Organizational ability. * Clarity of presentation. * Sound/appropriate pedagogy. * Respect for and rapport with students.   Taken together, mentor assessments should trace a reflective practice that encourages growth and development. | Peer assessments:   * **Tenure:** At least one departmental peer assessment, per year, during the probationary period. * **Rank Advancement to Professor:** At least three departmental peer assessments during a five‐year period before application for rank advancement. * **Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer (etc**.): At least three departmental peer assessments during a six‐year period before application for rank advancement.   Mentor assessments:   * **Tenure:** At least one departmental mentor assessment, per year, during the probationary period. * **Rank Advancement to Professor:** Not required. * **Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer (etc**.): Not required. |
| **SRIs** | * Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) from all courses taught during the period being reviewed, with each appearing under a separate numbered tab. * A summary sheet with overall scores for all courses taught during the period being reviewed. * In order to help the committee evaluate your SRIs, provide a table at the beginning that lists all of your numbers in the “Instructor Evaluation” portion of the SRIs for each course and each year. (Note which ones do and do not have at least a 50% participation rate, and please use the actual participation rate for crosslisted courses, which may be separated out by section. For example, an introduction to philosophy class with 20 students, 15 of whom are enrolled in PHIL 1000 and 5 of whom are enrolled in PHIL 100H requires 10 combined students to reach the 50% mark) Provide yearly averages and overall averages for courses with at least a 50% participation rate. | * Demonstrate an overall pattern of student comments that is positive about the faculty member’s teaching and the courses taught. * Provides a record in which negative comments are infrequent and unsubstantiated or are addressed by the faculty member in their annual self-assessments.   A note on SRI review and criteria: We are well aware that the information presented by SRIs varies widely in quality and accuracy. Some of these issues operate at an institutional level, as the university does not require students to fill out SRIs; thus, some of your courses may be evaluated by only a few students, calling into question any numbers reported. Moreover, SRI scores have been shown in studies to be biased by race, gender, sexual orientation, age, nationality, and other demographic factors. And SRI scores can be lower for classes where difficult topics are discussed (e.g., abortion) and for classes with unconventional pedagogies (e.g., service learning, online learning). Because the “[d]epartment values and promotes teaching that models, maintains and upholds the highest possible standards of academic rigor and expectations and that challenges students with course content relevant to the course objectives, including material that may be difficult, controversial, and uncomfortable,” the RTP Committee will take into account that “such teaching may not always correlate with high SRI scores.” Having said that, relatively low scores or extraordinarily high scores will lead the Committee to look carefully elsewhere for corroborating evidence and/or evidence that calls the scores into question. | * A ballpark picture of numerical data is here given in the spirit of giving a broad sense of expectations. The following examples are merely examples of ways you might meet the criteria. In no way do they indicate required thresholds. They are neither requirements nor guarantees. The RTP committee can and must use disciplinary knowledge and judgment to see if your actual portfolio is similar enough to the example indicated. Examples of considerations the RTP committee will consider for people who deviate from these numbers include, but are not limited to, in the case of SRIs, whether there may be biases on the part of students based on the candidate’s race, gender, age, accent, etc., whether they teach early in the mornings or late in the afternoon, and other factors that, according to research, can affect SRIs. We also look at how students evaluate themselves in the “student experiences” section in relationship to how they evaluate the faculty member.   With all of the relevant qualifications, competence in teaching could have the following quantitative evidence: SRIs for the “Instructor Evaluation” section average at or above the University average for all courses (currently 4.5-4.6), for courses with at least a 50% participation rate. Exemplary teaching (for the purposes of tenure), or teaching that merits promotion to full professor, is above that for the same courses. Your yearly self-assessments and the overview you provide in this section of the file will help the committee contextualize your numbers. Mentors, too, will provide quantitative data (see DMP). |
| **Other Evidence** | * **Required evidence of teaching and professional development related to teaching.** * Syllabi of courses taught. (Exception: do not include redundant syllabi for different sections of the same course in the same semester.) Assignments, assessments, rubrics, and other course materials may also be included with syllabi. * Participation in activities sponsored by UVU’s Office of Teaching and Learning, including Advance HE (previously the Higher Education Academy). * Participation in training for online or hybrid course development and delivery. * **Optional evidence of teaching and professional development related to teaching.** (Below is a list of additional evidence, in no particular order, that may be included. This list is not inclusive and there is no expectation that all or even most of these materials will be included in the portfolio. This is an opportunity for faculty to supplement the documents included in the other Teaching tabs.) * Honors/awards for teaching. * Course preparations of greater intensity than is typical. * Especially good papers students have written for your courses. * Copies of the best senior theses you have directed. * Engaged learning, service learning, experiential learning, etc. * Domestic multicultural experiences or study abroad. * Developing or teaching online or hybrid courses. * Supervising independent study, directed readings, or internships. * Mentoring students. * Team teaching and interdisciplinary teaching. * Attending or organizing conferences on pedagogy. * Presenting teaching‐related workshops or facilitating teaching-related discussions. * Supplemental student evaluations of teaching other than the institutional SRIs. * Sponsoring and/or judging writing contests. * Unsolicited letters from students and former students. * Using campus resources (Unicheck, writing lab, library trainings, etc.) to support student learning and rigor. * Statement of teaching philosophy and practice. * Training related to instructional design/delivery. * Serving on student thesis committees. * Observations from Student Collaborators on Teaching (SCOT). * Applications for grants and receipt of grants related to teaching. * Development or implementation of innovative teaching practices. * Publication or sharing of teaching materials with other faculty at UVU or within one’s discipline. | * **Required evidence of teaching and professional development related to teaching.** * Syllabi are thoughtful and rigorous in ways thatillustrate commitment to the development of student knowledge and skills, and that support departmental aims. * Syllabi change based on experience and professional development. * Courses change and evolve with the broader discipline and other developments related to courses and the discipline. * Tests, assignments, rubrics, practice, and projects accurately and productively assess student learning and provide both formative and summative feedback to students in a timely way. * Ongoing participation with activities and trainings sponsored by UVU’s Office of Teaching and Learning. * Completion of training for online or hybrid course development and delivery. * **Supplemental evidence of teaching and professional development related to teaching.** * The criteria will depend on the documents that are submitted. Overall, they need to demonstrate educational rigor, a focus on student learning, pedagogical development, and continual improvement as a teacher. |  |
| **Scholarship** | * A brief overview (2-3 pages) of one’s scholarship during the probationary period, and an explanation of the documents in the Scholarship tab. * **Required documents include:**   + A compilation of the brief statements (self-assessments) written each year, in consultation with your mentor, in which you explain your progress as a scholar and set goals for yourself for the following year.     - These statements, written each year of the probationary period, should look back on and critique the previous year, taking into account information from peer assessments, conference feedback, reviewer comments, and also reflecting on your own experience writing and attending conferences (mutatis mutandis for disciplinary differences, e.g., performances). They should also look forward to the next year, articulating publishing/writing/performance/etc. goals.     - Self-assessments are not required for promotion to full professor or to senior lecturer.   + Yearly qualitative mentor assessments, wherein the mentor evaluates your scholarship. (See DMP for more details.)     - Mentor assessments are not required for promotion to full professor or to senior lecturer.   + One external review of your scholarship.     - In the September before you submit your file (one full year before the file is due), you should give the RTP chair a list of five potential external reviewers of your scholarship. This list should include some people you do not know personally. The RTP chair will select a reviewer and solicit a review, taking your list into consideration.     - You should have the scholarship portion of your portfolio completed by the May before your portfolio is due, thus giving the external reviewer several months (the summer) to review your materials and to return comments to the RTP chair. The RTP chair will give reviewers the option to remain anonymous.     - You are not responsible for putting this review into your file, but should provide a space for it.       * An external review is not required for the third-year review, but is required for tenure and promotion. * Documents related to scholarship. Possible inclusions (these are suggestions, not requirements, and they are listed in no particular order): * Scholarly or creative monographs (books and other major works) appropriate to the faculty member’s field(s) of expertise, after peer or similarly competitive review. * Essay in edited academic volume or anthology. * Other short scholarly or creative works (essays, poems, short stories, etc.) appropriate to the faculty member’s field(s) of expertise, after peer or similarly competitive review. * Peer-reviewed, national-edition textbooks. * Review articles in peer-reviewed periodicals. * Edited collection of essays published by a scholarly peer-reviewed press or a special edition of a refereed academic journal. * Edited volume and/or translation of a substantial primary source, in a scholarly book or journal. * Published proceedings of external refereed professional conference or symposium. * Conference presentations. * Scholarship under review at an academic press (these materials are understood to carry less weight than materials already in, or headed to, print). * Peer-reviewed collaborative works with peers and/or students (include a description of your specific contributions). * Other evidence of scholarly and or creative work. Documents may include: * Award(s) for scholarly or creative work, such as the Dean’s Scholarship Award, Presidential Scholar, etc. * Grants in support of research and scholarship. * Research presentations at refereed regional, national, or international conferences. * Participation in the organization of scholarly conferences, colloquia, workshops, etc., at university, national, and international levels. * Invited scholarly presentations. * Readings of your creative works (poems, e.g.). * Editing and/or production of scholarly, professional‐quality documentary or film/video. * Performances. * Curation of an accredited museum exhibit. * Preparation of significant reports for historical or government organizations. * Construction of an academic digital humanities project. * Winning, or being named a finalist in, creative writing contests. * Other measures of scholarship, as proposed by the faculty member. * Public philosophy   *Advice: The RTP Committee will get a good sense for the quality of your work if you carefully document it and paint a picture of the trajectory of your scholarship so that the materials do not seem merely like a collection of papers. The RTP Committee will be especially interested in whether your scholarship is active and ongoing. The department sees teaching and scholarship as two facets of a broader endeavor; hence, the committee wants to see whether your scholarship is substantial enough to promote the highest quality teaching.*  *Give context for a reader who may not be familiar with your specialty or your discipline. The RTP Committee and Department Chair will have a relatively good sense for this already, since they are your disciplinary peers, but the Dean and the Vice President will be making their evaluations from some distance, and any way you can make the quality of your work clear to a broader audience will be helpful. Use your yearly self-assessments to give a broader perspective on your trajectory as well.*  *Note that, when reviewing your file, the RTP Committee will take into account research demonstrating that philosophy as a discipline has failed to create an equitable space where women, people of color, and faculty members at non-elite institutions publish at the rates of white men and faculty members at elite institutions.* | Overview:   * Accurately describes one’s scholarly works, the nature of the publications/venues in which they appeared, and the types of review they underwent. Provide context so that reviewers from outside your field will understand the quality of your scholarly and creative contributions to your discipline.   Self-assessments:   * Demonstrate a pattern of self‐reflection on creating a research program that is active and ongoing, and that incorporates supervisor, mentor, and peer feedback from year to year.   Mentor assessments   * Reflect degree to which the faculty member demonstrates a pattern of self‐reflection on creating a research program that is active and ongoing, and that incorporates supervisor, mentor, and peer feedback from year to year.   External review:   * Reflects degree to which the faculty member demonstrates an active and ongoing research program. * May also comment on contributions to the discipline and quality of the academic and/or creative work.   Scholarship portfolio as a whole:   * Provides complete copies of all materials listed in your Scholarship overview. If certain materials do not fit in the binder, and the institution has not yet moved to electronic portfolios, you should include only the first ten pages in the binder and put full copies on a thumb drive. If these are not comprised of written materials, provide other documentation. * Reflects a competent research program that is *active* and *ongoing*. Quality of the scholarship and/or creative activity is paramount for the RTP Committee. Although unusual extenuating circumstances may lead to a case that is an outlier, publication (or performance or exhibition) is expected and will be evaluated in terms of the quality of the venue/journal as established by acceptance rates, disciplinary reputation, and so on. An exemplary research program at the time of tenure yields *contributions to the broader discipline*. These contributions need not shape the field nor set the bounds for the discussion, but they do contribute to the discipline via high-quality publications, performances, or exhibitions (judgments based on the quality of the venue/journal as established by acceptance rates, disciplinary reputation, and so on). For promotion to full professor, the research program also yields (since the time of tenure) ongoing similar contributions to the broader discipline. Related considerations: * As long as standards of quality, academic rigor, scholarly venue, and peer review are met, electronic publications count as much as printed scholarship. * Scholarship that has been accepted for publication or presentation will count as if it had already been published or presented as long as there is documentation of its acceptance. * Publications in predatory or vanity outlets will not carry any weight in the RTP process. Reprints or other evidence must be included. * Creative or proprietary professional work (such as published books, news reporting across media, or professional publications) will be assessed based on the quality of the work, the value to the client, and the contribution to national or regional interests. * Adherence to ethical and professional standards for scholarship, research, and/or creative works, as defined by the discipline and institutional policies and practices, must be maintained. * Makes note of unusual extenuating circumstances that have interfered with publication rates should be provided.   + For example, Family Medical leave, or bias within publishing (e.g., just as SRIs are affected by a faculty member’s ethnicity/race, gender, etc., so too are publishing rates). | External Review:   * **Tenure**: One external review required. * **Rank Advancement to Professor**: One external review required. * **Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer (etc.)**: Not required.   Scholarship portfolio as a whole:   * A ballpark picture of numerical data is here given in the spirit of giving a broad sense of expectations. The following example is merely an example of one way you might meet the criteria. In no way does this example indicate required thresholds. It establishes neither requirements nor guarantees. The RTP committee can and must use disciplinary knowledge and judgment to see if your actual portfolio is similar enough to the example indicated. Examples of considerations the RTP committee will consider are average review time for journals that you publish in, how much responsibility for the publication is yours for collaborative works, how much release time you have been granted, differences in different areas of philosophy or humanities (e.g., analytic vs. continental, historical vs. contemporary, applied vs. non-applied, interdisciplinary vs. not interdisciplinary, differences that arise in areas that come from traditions in different parts of the world) and in different areas of the department (e.g., philosophy vs. humanities, scholarship that involves publication vs. scholarship that involves performance or other artistic expression). If your portfolio looks significantly different from the example below, explain why. (E.g., perhaps you were trying to shift the boundaries of the field by publishing in a mainstream journal something that is not considered mainstream by gatekeepers of the discipline.)   With all of the relevant qualifications, competence in scholarship could have the following quantitative evidence: One publication every 2-3 years, with at least one being major (peer-reviewed journal article, invited keynote presentation, e.g.), every 5 years. |
| **Service** | * A brief overview (2‐3 pages) of one’s discipline-related service to the department, college/school, University, profession, and/or community, during the probationary period, and an explanation of the documents in the Service tab. * **Required documents include:** * Self-assessment of service, drawn from conversations with your mentor each year during the probationary period. See DMP for further information. * Mentor assessment of service, for each year of the probationary period. See DMP for further information. * Documentation of any service grants, honors, and/or awards. * **Additional documents might indicate the following types of service work, provided here in no particular order:** * Department chair, assistant chair, program coordinator, adjunct coordinator, etc. * Instructional Assistant (IA) coordinator / supervisor. * Advisor for student publications sponsored by the department, college, university, or other academic entity. * Thesis director or advisor, e.g., for Honors, Integrated Studies, or other student organizations. * Organizer or leader for a workshop or other student learning experience. * Referee for students’ applications to internships, post-baccalaureate studies, and similar endeavors. * Faculty senate officer, faculty senator, faculty senate committee chair or member. * Hiring committees. * Assessment work. * Review and coordination of existing curriculum, and/or creation of new course or program curriculum. * Development of seminars and workshops pertaining to department disciplines. * Attendance at university, college, department, and program meetings. * Promotion of interdisciplinary and engaged learning across the university. * Establishment of ad hoc committees at department, college, and university levels. * Policy development. * Organization of conferences, lectures, and lecture series. * Community outreach and service related to the discipline. * Officer or contributing member of national, regional, state, or local committee connected to the faculty member’s area of expertise. * Manuscript / articles reviews. * Editor or editorial board member for a scholarly or creative outlet. * Participating as a panelist at national, regional, or local disciplinary conference (unless documented as a research presentation in the scholarship section). * Active participation in academic or professional organizations.   *Advice: Note that “[a] candidate who exhibits competence in service demonstrates an active role in the shared governance critical to a healthy university,” and it is the quality of the active role that will be the primary concern of the RTP Committee as it makes its evaluation.*  *Note also that the introductory statement should accurately describe one’s service and contribution to the entities served. The statement should provide context for work done, indicating time commitments (frequency and length of meetings, preparation time, work time outside committee meetings, etc.), the nature of the work, and whether you have passively attended vs. actively shaped the direction of a committee. Context will be particularly necessary where work falls outside the university and will be potentially less familiar to reviewers.* | * The committee is looking for evidence that the faculty member:   + Plays an active and ongoing role in shared governance via service.   + Has provided substantive service at two or more levels during the period being reviewed (i.e. [1] program, [2] department, [3] college, [4] university, [5] community, and [6] disciplinary or professional organization).   + Demonstrates a consistent pattern of service across the period being reviewed.   + Has maintained ethical and professional standards for service. * Documentation of service includes letters from colleagues, supervisors, committee chairs, etc., that detail the service obligations (frequency of meetings, number of meetings, preparation time, work time outside committee meetings, etc.) and contribution of the faculty member (attendance, preparedness, level of productive engagement, etc.). * The number of committees and positions will carry less weight than the quality, intensity, and consistency of work required by service positions and the contributions made in those roles. * Faculty with reassigned time for governance (GCHE) must document the fulfilment of those service obligations and how they were met. | * Service will be evaluated holistically. But as a numerical guideline, think about competence in service as amounting to an average of three hours per week (excluding summers), knowing that this will be divided wildly over the course of the academic year. Again, this is not a threshold that guarantees competence in service, but rather a representative case to give a sense of the level of expectation. * Faculty with reassigned time for governance (GCHE) fulfill their service obligation for which they have reassigned time and also contribute substantive service at another level as well. * **Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer (etc.):** Not applicable. |
| **RTP Criteria** | * A copy of the tenure criteria against which the faculty member shall be evaluated. People go up for tenure and rank advancement with the criteria in place at the time of hire. * Documentation if the tenure-track faculty member elected to be reviewed under criteria that were approved after their hire in the tenure-track position. |  |  |
| **Annual Reviews** | * Annual reviews conducted by the supervisor(s) during the probationary period. | * Annual reviews are positive and free from problematic behaviors (e.g. substantiated student complaints, missing classes or being late to classes, not turning in grades, missing department or committee meetings, not adhering to university policies, procedures, and practices). If there are problematic behaviors, subsequent annual reviews document that any issues that were previously identified have been resolved. | * **Tenure:** Meets or exceeds expectations for teaching in all years before tenure. * **Rank Advancement to Professor:** Meets or exceeds expectations for teaching in all of the most recent five years before application for rank advancement. (Exceptions for extenuating circumstances like a death in the family will be considered.) * **Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer (etc.):** Meets or exceeds expectations for teaching in all of the most recent six years before application for rank advancement. |
| **Solicited Peer Evaluations** | * Copies of all solicited peer evaluations. |  |  |
| **Policy** | * A copy of the relevant policy (Tenure 637, Rank Advancement 632). |  |  |

**Annual Review and Post-tenure Review Criteria**

**Annual Reviews:**

The criteria for annual reviews is that faculty performance be consistent with the principles set forth in the above RTP criteria, with the recognition that tenure and rank advancement are based on the cumulative work of faculty over multiple years while annual reviews reflect what might reasonably be accomplished in a single year.

**Post-Tenure Review – Annual**:

Same as the annual review criteria.

**Post-Tenure Review – 5th Year**:

The criteria for post-tenure review in the 5th year is that faculty have met or exceeded expectations for their annual reviews for all five of the years under consideration.

**Departmental Mentorship Plan**

(If you are applying for full professor, you can follow this plan with or without a mentor.)

At the beginning of your first year, meet with your mentor and write up your goals for teaching, scholarship, and service. Have the mentor sign off on this. At the end of that year, meet and assess your performance in all 3 areas and set goals for the next year. Write up a self-assessment of the previous year. Your mentor will write up a separate assessment too. Write up a new goals statement, and have your mentor sign off on it.

**TEACHING**

**Annual meetings**

Your goals statement should look forward to the next year (e.g., what you want to accomplish in terms of teaching and/or how your pedagogy and/or syllabi will change in light of what you have learned). Your self-assessment should look back on the previous year (including information from peer and supervisor assessments and SRIs, but also from your own experience teaching and interacting with students). Critique the previous year as fodder for your new goals. Highlight growth and development (e.g., “My Ethics and Values syllabus has changed over the years to reflect what I have learned about teaching writing, and I also teach different applied topics because of changing student interests and needs.”) Turn in this plan each year to the chair and to your mentor. You will be including these statements in your file, so think about how they can help you make the case here for your “intentional, reflective pedagogical practice.” How have you “learned and grown based on student/peer/chair feedback and from self-reflection”? How have your “courses changed and evolved with the broader discipline and other developments related to the course”? What are your strengths as a teacher? What do you bring to your classes that is unique? Etc. Use your yearly self-assessments to give a broader perspective on your trajectory.

**Mentor assessments**

Have your mentor visit your class occasionally. Rather than writing a typical peer assessment, your mentor will collect data in some combination of the following ways:

* 1. The mentor might fill out an SRI as though they were a student based on their observation of you in the classroom.
  2. The mentor might ask students to fill out a paper survey that they devise and run.
  3. The mentor might have discussions with students during class when you aren’t there to get feedback.
  4. The mentor will give a qualitative analysis of your class, paying careful attention to how and whether you are successful in achieving your goals and objectives. The mentor will highlight strengths and weaknesses both in your teaching and in the composition of the class that may shed additional light on SRIs. The mentor may also suggest different objectives and goals if necessary. This will be similar to a peer evaluation, but much more robust.
  5. At your request, the mentor will rate your class on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely well), on the following questions:
     1. Adapted from “Colleges are Getting Smarter About Student Evaluations: Here’s How” by Kristin Doerer, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1/13/2019:
        1. How well does the course meet the instructor’s objectives
        2. How well do the assignments teach students the content?
        3. How well do the assignments teach students the skills?
        4. How well do class meetings teach students the content?
        5. How well do class meetings teach students the skills?
     2. Adapted from “Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness at Utah Valley University: Past Present and Future,” by Denise Richards and Lisa Lambert, 2018:
        1. How well does the instructor influence, motivate and inspire students to learn?
        2. How well does the course reflect that the instructor has a command of the field?
        3. How well does the instructor approach assessment and feedback that foster independent learning?
        4. How well does the instructor respect and support the development of students as individuals?
        5. How well does the instructor’s scholarly pursuits influence and enhance teaching and learning?
        6. How well does the instructor manage the course with respect to organization, preparation, clarity, timely feedback, and so on?
        7. How well do students learn? (Support this answer with examples of A, C and F work)

**SCHOLARSHIP ANNUAL MEETINGS**

In your annual meeting with your mentor, also set goals and reflect on the past year. Write these reflections up as well to include in your file. The mentor should do the same. You might want to bring the RTP document to talk more specifically about where you are on the track.

**SERVICE ANNUAL MEETINGS**

In your annual meeting with your mentor, also set goals and reflect on the past year. Write these reflections up as well to include in your file. The mentor should do the same. You might want to bring the RTP document to talk more specifically about where you are on the track.