

### Communication 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).

Date of Approval:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement	Post-tenure Review
Department Faculty	David Scott, RTP Chair, 4/15/2019	NA	NA
Department Chair	NA	David Morin, 4/15/2019	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 Rank Advancement (UVU Policy 632)		
Tenure-Track Ranks	Policy	Department RTP Criteria
<b>Instructor</b>	"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).	ABD at time of hire (pursuant to approval by hiring and RTP committee) leading to no more than a one-year probationary period on RTP track to complete requirements for a Ph.D. in a Communication-specific discipline.
<b>Assistant Professor</b>	"An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee" (5.3.2).	Terminal Degree (Ph.D.) in a Communication-specific discipline from a regionally accredited college/university.
<b>Associate Professor</b>	"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 (Ph.D.) in a Communication specific-discipline from a regionally accredited college/university.
<b>Professor</b>	"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 (Ph.D.) in a Communication specific-discipline from a regionally accredited college/university.
Non-Tenure-Track Ranks		
<b>Lecturer</b>	"An earned degree in an appropriate discipline or professional field as determined by the department RTP committee" (5.6.1).	Minimum of master's degree in an appropriate field from a regionally accredited college/university. Experience when necessary.
<b>Appointment in Residence</b>	"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)	Minimum of master's degree in an appropriate field from a regionally accredited college/university.  - AND -  Appropriate applied/work experience.
<b>Visiting Faculty/Scholar</b>	"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)	Minimum of master's degree in an appropriate field from a regionally accredited college/university.

Minimum Qualifications for Rank Advancement (UVU Policy 632)		
Tenure-Track Ranks	Policy	Department RTP Criteria
<b>Assistant Professor</b>	"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.
<b>Associate Professor</b>	"Successful attainment of tenure at UVU." (5.4.2).	See RTP criteria listed below.

<b>Professor</b>	“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.
<b>Non-Tenure-Track Ranks</b>		
<b>Senior Lecturer</b>	“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.
<b>Senior Appointment in Residence</b>	“Fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to senior appointment in residence status and seven years of university service.” (5.7.2)	Same as senior lecturer
<b>Senior Visiting Faculty/Scholar</b>	“Fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to senior visiting faculty/scholar status and seven years of university service” (5.7.3).	Same as senior lecturer

#### 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 – high quality teaching and professional development in teaching are expected of all faculty.

Faculty employed in tenure-track positions prior to the approval of these criteria may opt to apply for tenure under these criteria if approved by the department chair, dean, and senior vice president for academic affairs. Faculty who are tenured and lecturers who are employed prior to the approval of these criteria may opt to apply for rank advancement under these criteria or remain under existing approved criteria. Opting to move to these criteria requires the approval of the department chair, dean, and provost.

Decisions to promote faculty members and to award tenure are the most important made by the Department, for they determine the quality of the faculty for decades to come. Because tenure has consequences of long life and great magnitude, **it should be awarded only when the best interest of the Department is clearly served by doing so.** This is the overriding criterion.

Questions to address in determining the best interest of the Department in regard to a particular candidate’s application for tenure include:

- *Will the candidate improve the overall quality of the Department’s faculty and program?*
- *Will the Department be better able to improve itself by granting tenure, or by hiring anew?*
- *Is the candidate likely to maintain or improve his or her contributions to the Department over the long period of time typically involved in a tenured appointment?*

The Department should not accept a lifetime obligation if there is serious doubt on any of these points.

Faculty seeking advancement to full professor will be evaluated by the RTP Committee to determine if their contribution is exemplary and exceeds expectations for tenure.

In general, when a file is marginal, quantity or level of evidence is lacking, or the file lacks the required supporting documentation, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case as to why these shortcomings are somehow

offset by his/her contribution to the department.

**Tenure Dates and Process:**

*Please note: if a deadline specified in Policy 637 does not fall on a business day,  
the deadline is extended to the next business day.*

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than September 15, the candidate submits their binder to their RTP committee.

\_\_\_\_\_ The RTP committee chair creates the initial tenure review portfolio by combining the following with the faculty portfolio: (1) Copies of the faculty member's annual reviews from the evaluation period, (2) the tenure criteria against which the faculty member shall be evaluated, and (3) all solicited (external) peer evaluations, if required or voluntarily given.

\_\_\_\_\_ The RTP committee may request any additional information from the faculty member and/or peers that it deems appropriate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than October 7, the RTP committee gives to the department chair the faculty member's portfolio and a detailed report for or against tenure of the faculty member, including the committee's vote tally. The report shall comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member relative to university policy and department tenure criteria. In cases of midterm review, if the decision is to retain the probationary faculty member, the report must also provide comments and recommendations concerning the faculty member's progress toward tenure.

\_\_\_\_\_ AND the RTP committee report is placed in the portfolio.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than October 21, the department chair gives to the dean the faculty member's portfolio and a detailed letter in favor of or against tenure/retention. The letter shall comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member relative to university policy and department tenure criteria.

\_\_\_\_\_ AND, the letter is placed in the portfolio.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than November 7, the dean composes a detailed letter in favor of or against tenure/retention. The report shall comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member relative to university policy and department tenure criteria.

\_\_\_\_\_ AND, the dean provides a copy of the solicited (external) peer evaluations (with the identifying information of the peer reviewer redacted) and the recommendations of the RTP committee, department chair, and dean to the candidate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than November 14, the faculty member may deliver a written response to all recommendations up to that point to the dean for inclusion in the tenure review portfolio.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than December 1, the dean forwards the tenure review portfolio, including all written recommendations and faculty response, if any, to the Provost.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than December 1, the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) will have assigned to its members the faculty members up for tenure review, with at least 3 reviewers per candidate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than January 10, the Advisory Committee shall forward its findings on all portfolios to the Provost.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than March 1, in cases of midterm review, the Provost shall review the tenure review portfolio and render a written decision to the faculty member, dean, department chair, and chair of the RTP committee.

\_\_\_\_\_ No later than March 1, in cases of tenure review, the Provost reviews the tenure review portfolio and forwards their written recommendation to the President of the University.

\_\_\_\_\_ The President of the University forwards their recommendation to the Board of Trustees for consideration at its next meeting (typically, late March).

\_\_\_\_\_ The Board of Trustees decides whether to award or deny tenure. Within 14 days, the Provost conveys the decision of the Board of Trustees to the faculty member by letter.

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
<b>Table of Contents</b>		Must be clear and accurate	
<b>Informational Statement</b>	A brief statement at the beginning of the portfolio describing: 1) the nature of the candidate’s contribution to the department, the discipline, and the University; 2) the extent to which department expectations were met and any circumstances that helped or hindered; and, 3) any other information that shall be beneficial to the reviewers in evaluating the material as it relates the department RTP requirements.		
<b>Curriculum Vitae</b>	A current curriculum vita with contributions in reverse chronological order.		
<b>Teaching</b>	A 1-3 page reflective summary by the candidate discussing his or her contribution to teaching and the supporting documentation.	Overview: The department prides itself on the quality of its teaching and places a high priority on it. Following university-wide policy, every candidate must have every class evaluated through SRIs (student ratings of instructors) every semester. Candidates should	

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
		<p>demonstrate, not only positive evaluations, but an earnest process of self-reflection and development over time which incorporates learning from the self-evaluation process.</p> <p>Minimum for Advancement to Professor: Candidate's teaching is consistently <b>exemplary</b> as demonstrated by annual reviews, classroom observations, qualitative SRI comments, SRI scores and commitment improving pedagogy. Exemplary teaching is evident when the <b>preponderance of evidence</b> in the file demonstrates the candidate is current in the field, engaged with student success, and has made an ongoing effort to address valid issues and to improve or enhance the learning experience for the students. File demonstrates evidence of <b>continuous contributions</b> to pedagogy and learning <b>above and beyond standard classroom interactions within the department.</b></p> <p>Minimum for Tenure: Candidate's teaching is deemed <b>excellent</b> in terms of annual reviews, classroom observations, qualitative SRI comments, SRI scores and commitment improving pedagogy. The <b>preponderance of evidence</b> in the file demonstrates the candidate is current in the field, engaged with student success, and has made an ongoing effort to address valid issues and to improve or enhance the learning experience for the students. File demonstrates evidence of <b>ongoing contributions to pedagogy and learning at the classroom and department level.</b></p> <p>Minimum for advancement to Senior Lecturer: Candidate's teaching is generally ranked <b>good</b> in terms of annual reviews, classroom observations, qualitative SRI comments, SRI scores and commitment improving pedagogy.</p>	
<b>Self-Assessment</b>	A reflective summary by the candidate discussing his or her contribution to teaching.	This should demonstrate a reflective approach in ascertaining success in teaching and adjustments made to improve pedagogy in the classroom setting.	
<b>Supervisor Assessment</b>	All classroom evaluations by department chair or dean must be included in file.	Subject matter mastery. Organizational ability. Clarity of presentation. Sound/appropriate pedagogy. Respect for and rapport with students.	One evaluation per academic year from department chair.
<b>Peer Assessment</b>	All peer evaluations must be included in the file.	Subject matter mastery. Organizational ability. Clarity of presentation.	Encourage one peer assessment once per academic year from other comm faculty member or member of teaching committee.

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
		<p>Sound/appropriate pedagogy.</p> <p>Respect for and rapport with students.</p>	
<b>SRIs</b>	<p>Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) from all courses taught during the period being reviewed.</p> <p>A summary sheet with overall scores for all courses taught during the period being reviewed.</p>	<p>An overall pattern of student comments that is positive about the faculty member and the courses taught.</p> <p>Negative comments are infrequent and unsubstantiated or are addressed by the faculty member in their annual self-assessments.</p>	
<b>Curriculum &amp; Course Development</b>	<p>Documentation of curriculum development.</p>	<p>Continually involved in enhancing and improving the curriculum of courses taught.</p> <p>Continually involved in the assessment of student learning outcomes and curricular improvements to enhance students' acquisition of learning outcomes.</p> <p>Participation in the review and coordination of existing curriculum.</p> <p>If new courses (including hybrid and online courses) and programs are developed, demonstrate their quality and how they address student and department needs.</p>	
<b>Other Evidence</b>	<p>Required Evidence for Teaching (noted above):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Syllabi of courses taught (one per subject, not per class) at minimum</li> <li>• A 1-3 page reflective summary by the candidate discussing his or her contribution to teaching and the supporting documentation</li> <li>• One classroom evaluation per semester/year (depending on rank) from a SCOT visit.</li> </ul> <p>Other Supporting material may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course-wide learning outcomes assessment</li> <li>• Samples of student projects resulting from classroom instruction or faculty mentoring</li> <li>• Receipt of teaching awards.</li> <li>• Receipt or applications for faculty development grants to support innovations in teaching.</li> <li>• Publication of teaching materials (including textbooks or book chapters)</li> <li>• Development and management of seminars and workshops for colleagues who want to enhance or improve their teaching skills.</li> <li>• Appointment/election to leadership roles in teaching- related activities of professional associations.</li> </ul>	<p>An overall pattern of efforts to improve upon the pedagogical skill set.</p>	

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development/enrichment of new courses or programs.</li> <li>• Being asked to serve as a visiting teacher at another institution.</li> <li>• Attending seminars/conferences aimed at improving pedagogy</li> <li>• Unsolicited letters from former students</li> <li>• Attending UVU courses/conferences on pedagogy</li> </ul>		
Scholarship	<p>Required Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reflective statement (under the Scholarship/Creative tab) by the candidate summarizing his or her creative/scholarly contributions, the caliber of Journals/Conferences where work is published/presented, and a clear summary of the attending documentation.</li> <li>• Evidence of creative/scholarly output: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reprints and copies of work published or in press</li> <li>• Copies of papers presented at academic or professional meetings/conferences</li> <li>• Copies of programs or letters of acceptance for presentations at academic conferences or professional meetings</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Peer assessment of creative works/scholarship from faculty members at three sister universities (required only if the majority of scholarly/creative publications are not peer-reviewed).</li> </ul> <p>Other evidence of research/creative work <b>includes, but is not limited to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copies of proprietary research reports completed in the faculty member's role as a consultant</li> <li>• Awards and honors for research/creative works</li> <li>• Grant proposals or awards</li> <li>▪ Creative projects or publications that demonstrate innovative ideas or techniques and contribute to professional growth in the field</li> </ul>	<p>It is expected that these publications/presentations demonstrate a clear and focused pursuit of knowledge within the expertise of the candidate as it relates to the discipline/profession. Multiple-authored publications/presentations should include a detailed account of the candidate's contribution to that work.</p> <p>The following general criteria influence the assessment of published scholarship:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The scholarship of teaching is welcome and will be weighed equally with other discipline-related scholarship.</li> <li>• The quality of the venue/journal as established by acceptance rates, disciplinary reputation, and so on. Publications in predatory or vanity outlets will not carry any weight in the RTP process.</li> <li>• 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, and outside peer assessment.</li> <li>• Adherence to ethical and professional standards for scholarship, research, and or creative works as defined by the discipline and institutional policies and practices.</li> <li>• All scholarship presented and/or published must have gone through the peer review/competitively selected process in order for the material to count towards rank, tenure, and promotion, <b>unless the RTP Committee agrees to external peer assessment, and coordinates that assessment as described below.</b></li> </ul> <p>Minimum Requirement for advancement to full professor:</p> <p>The scholarship is focused and consistent.</p> <p>Minimum for Tenure:</p>	<p>Minimum Requirement for advancement to full professor: 9 points based on output below) during previous six years.</p> <p>Minimum for Tenure (6 points based on output below) during probationary period.</p> <p>Minimum for advancement to Senior Lecturer: N/A</p> <p>Output rating system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Author of a peer-reviewed, nationally recognized, academic press book (or textbook if not included in teaching section) (5 pts)</li> <li>• Editor of a book/volume of work tied to discipline and published by academic press (4 pts);</li> <li>• Author of a refereed scholarly monograph. (3 pts)</li> <li>• Author of a peer reviewed publication in an academic journal, refereed anthology, or scholarly book chapter (2.5 pts.)</li> <li>• <b>Creator/submitter of a refereed conference panel (1 pt.)</b></li> </ul>



Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
		<p>The scholarship is focused and consistent, demonstrating an excellent contribution to the discipline.</p> <p>Minimum for advancement to Senior Lecturer: N/A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Author of a refereed conference presentation (1 pt.)</li> <li>• Author of a refereed conference presentation published in conference proceedings after undergoing further revision and peer review (1 point).</li> <li>• Awardee of grant won to support research (1 pt.)</li> <li>• Author of a refereed book review published in a scholarly journal (.5 pt.)</li> <li>• Non-refereed, published book reviews are evidence of Service, and do not count toward scholarship.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE:</p> <p>These requirements may be offset by unusual workload requirements in Teaching or Service. It is the responsibility of the candidate to clarify when such exceptions are warranted and to negotiate these requirements with the RTP Chair and/or supervisor when necessary PRIOR to seeking rank advancement/tenure.</p>
<p><b>Service</b></p>	<p>Required Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 1-3 page reflective statement by the candidate discussing his or her contribution to service with a clear summary of the attending documentation. REQUIRED</li> <li>• Any valid correspondence/letter/evidence of participation in a service activity when feasible</li> </ul> <p>Other documentation/evidence of service may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serving on an editorial board or as an editor of a scholarly journal or academic book</li> </ul>	<p>Minimum for Advancement to Full Professor:</p> <p>Evidence of ongoing service not only at the department and or college/university level, but also of service at the regional, national, and/or international level. Candidate also contributes significantly to local and department needs. Service is ongoing and consistent in relation to the discipline. File demonstrates the reputation and caliber of the program and/or discipline is greatly enhanced as a result of his/her service commitment.</p> <p>Minimum requirements for tenure:</p>	

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewing manuscripts considered for publication (journals, conference papers, or books) for academic or professional conferences</li> <li>• Participating as a panelist at national, regional, or local conference in Communication discipline (unless documented as a research presentation in the scholarship section)</li> <li>• Development of seminars and workshops pertaining to department disciplines</li> <li>• Active participation in the appropriate academic or professional organizations</li> <li>• Receipt of service grants, honors and awards</li> <li>• Service to the department, college, and university in the form of committee membership or leadership positions</li> <li>• <b>Mentorship to junior faculty colleagues, including but not limited to matters relating to retention, tenure, and promotion.</b></li> <li>• Advising or assisting student organizations</li> <li>• Community service/outreach tied to the discipline</li> <li>• Professional contributions through services as an officer, committee chair or other administrative responsibility in appropriate scholarly and/or professional organizations</li> <li>• Professional achievement in professional fields represented by department.</li> <li>• Work in professional positions in the communications industry during summers or leave time or, with the approval of the dean, part-time during a regular term</li> <li>• Textbooks or textbook chapters (unless used as evidence of teaching)</li> <li>• Reviewing/judging student competitions/work</li> <li>• Promoting the university/program at conferences or within the community</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence of commitment to service at the university or discipline level. Service is ongoing and consistent in relation to the university and/or discipline.</p> <p>Minimum requirements for advancement to senior lecturer: N/A</p> <p>NOTE: These requirements may be offset by unusual workload requirements in Teaching or Scholarship. It is the responsibility of the candidate to clarify when such exceptions are warranted and to negotiate these requirements with the RTP Chair and/or supervisor when necessary PRIOR to seeking rank advancement/tenure.</p>	
<p><b>RTP Criteria</b></p>	<p>A copy of the RTP criteria by which the faculty member will be evaluated.</p>		
<p><b>Annual Reviews</b></p>	<p>Annual reviews conducted by the supervisor for the period under review.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p><b>If faculty received any official commendations or reprimands from department or University administration (these are somewhat rare), these must be included here or in</b></p>	

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
		the relevant section of the portfolio (teaching, scholarship, or service), along with any rebuttals, if appropriate.	
<b>Solicited Peer Evaluations</b>	Scholarship: Applicants with non-peer-reviewed publications should work with the RTP Committee to find qualified individuals at no fewer than three other universities to assess the caliber of their research or creative works relative to what is expected at teaching institutions ( <del>see Peer Evaluations tab below</del> ) and their expertise in the subject matter of the candidate's work. The RTP Chair may solicit up to three letters from a list of 5 references offered by the candidate; and may, if appropriate, also solicit letters from up to 3 other outside reviewers. All solicited reviews (whether or not feedback is positive) must be included in the file as evidence of the quality of candidate's work.		
<b>Policy</b>	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.

In addition, faculty need to follow UVU policies and procedures, complete required trainings, etc.

#### Post-Tenure Review – Annual:

Same as the annual review criteria.

#### Post-Tenure Review – 5<sup>th</sup> Year:

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