



**UVU** *School of*  
**EDUCATION**

UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

*Guidelines and Criteria for  
Retention, Tenure, and Promotion*



## Table of Contents

### Documentation of Approvals

#### Introduction

*Mission of the School of Education*

*Faculty Overview*

*Workload Expectations*

*Additional Expectations*

*Accreditation Standards and Expectations*

*About this Document*

*RTP and Equity*

#### Minimum Qualifications for Appointment and Rank Advancement

*Minimum Qualifications for Initial Appointment in the School of Education*

*Minimum Qualifications for Rank Advancement in the School of Education*

#### Tenure and Rank Advancement

*Tenure explanation*

*Rank advancement/promotion explanation*

*Recommendations and decisions*

*Appeals*

*Criteria*

*Rubrics*

#### Timelines for Annual Reviews, Tenure, and Rank Advancement

#### School of Education Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee

#### School of Education RTP Guidelines and Procedures

*Tenure/Rank Advancement Plan*

*Annual Performance Reviews*

*Mentoring*

*Peer Assessments of Teaching*

*Supervisor Assessments of Teaching*

*Portfolio*

#### Guidelines and Criteria for Teaching

*Portfolio Components*

*Teaching Section Checklist*

*Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching*

#### Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarship

*Non-tenure Track Faculty*

*Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty*

*Creative Works*

*Levels of Scholarship*

*Portfolio Components*

*Scholarship Section Checklist*

*Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship*

#### Guidelines and Criteria for Service

*Non-tenure Track Faculty*

*Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty*

*Faculty with Administrative Appointments*

*Portfolio Components*

*Service Section Checklist*

*Criteria for Evaluation of Service*





**Appendix A: School of Education RTP Rubrics**

**Appendix B: School of Education Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement Form**

**Appendix C: School of Education Faculty Mentoring Form**

**Appendix D: School of Education Peer Assessment of Teaching Form**

**Appendix E: School of Education Supervisor Assessment of Teaching Form**

**Appendix F: Tenure Portfolio Checklist from Policy 637**

**Appendix G: Portfolio Contents Required by the School of Education**

**Appendix H: Advancement of Teaching Committee's Teaching Excellence Model**

**Appendix I: Examples of Inclusion, Engagement, and Achievement**

**Appendix J: School of Education Summary of SRIs Form**





**UVU School of Education  
Retention, Tenure, and Promotion  
Guidelines and Criteria**

**Documentation of Approvals**

<i>Documentation of Approvals</i>			
<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Ratified by School of Education Faculty</b> Vote held 4/2 – 4/5/2021 via Qualtrics Results: 23 for, 0 against, 7 did not vote	RTP Committee Chair: Suzy Cox, PhD		
<b>Approved by Elementary Education Department Chair</b>	Elaine Tuft, PhD		
<b>Approved by Secondary Education Department Chair</b>	Bryan Waite, PhD		
<b>Approved by Dean of the School of Education</b>	Vessela Ilieva, PhD		
<b>Approved by Provost</b>	Wayne Vaught, PhD		





## Introduction

### *Mission of the School of Education*

The School of Education at Utah Valley University prepares educators and clinicians to have a positive impact on children, families, and communities through meaningful innovation, engaged pedagogy, rigorous preparation, inclusion & diversity, and transformative collaborations.

### *Faculty Overview*

The School of Education, as an academic unit of Utah Valley University (UVU), seeks to appoint excellent faculty, recognize their achievement, and encourage them to become active participants in the institution. Tenure and promotion are granted in recognition of distinctive achievement. A faculty member's responsibility at UVU is to engage in high quality teaching, supported by scholarship and active service that reflect their individual role in the institution and make a positive contribution to the university mission. UVU and the School of Education have "a firm expectation of ever-developing excellence in a faculty member's role as a teacher-scholar, and one's contributions to the mission of UVU" and the School of Education (see Policy 632: *Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank*).

### *Workload Expectations*

UVU is a regionally accredited teaching institution with a Carnegie Elective Community Engagement designation. As such, the primary responsibility of faculty in the School of Education is excellent teaching. To the extent possible, teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service at UVU should "support dynamic and noteworthy community engagement" (<https://www.uvu.edu/engagedlearning/carnegie.html>). Workload expectations for faculty are outlined in Policy 641.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty in the School of Education are expected to maintain a teaching load of an average of 12 credits per semester, with an additional three credits per semester designated for scholarly activities, which should be accounted for each year. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, service is a condition of employment and should be likewise documented, but is not generally awarded credit hour equivalents, except in rare cases.

The workload of full-time non-tenure track faculty in the School of Education is focused exclusively on teaching. These faculty teach an average of 15 credits per semester, and there are no requirements for scholarship or service.

### *Additional Expectations*

Faculty in the School of Education are expected to comply with all University policies and local, state, and national laws and to comport themselves with professionalism and civility (see Policy 635 §4.4.4). Faculty are likewise expected to complete mandatory trainings; follow reasonable instructions from the department chair, dean, Provost, and UVU President; attend and contribute to department meetings; collaboratively support the goals of their peers, their department, and the School of Education; and assist with accreditation activities. These and





other faculty expectations are outlined in detail in Policy 635: *Faculty Rights and Responsibilities*. Faculty are also expected to not discriminate, as defined in Policy 165: *Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action*.

#### *Accreditation Standards and Expectations*

The Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education programs, as well as the graduate certificate in Secondary Education and the graduate certificate and Master's degree programs in K-12 Educational Leadership and School Counseling, are accredited through the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). Faculty in these programs as well as in new programs required to obtain AAQEP accreditation are expected to familiarize themselves with the AAQEP standards (<https://aaqep.org/standards>) to fully understand the responsibilities of these programs with regard to Candidate/Completer Performance, Completer Professional Competence and Growth, Quality Program Practices, and Program Engagement in System Improvement. These standards should inform each faculty member's course curriculum, scholarship, and service. Faculty are also expected to contribute to accreditation reports, as requested by School of Education leadership.

Faculty and programs in Autism Studies and the Master's degree in Applied Behavior Analysis must meet specific requirements from the Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) with regard to professional qualifications and course content. Faculty in these areas are expected to familiarize themselves with and meet these requirements. Special consideration of these requirements is included in this document.

#### *About this Document*

This document clarifies guidelines and criteria that are specific to the School of Education for faculty annual reviews, tenure, and rank advancement. It is intended to supplement important University policies, which each faculty member should read and review each year. Faculty Senators will keep faculty apprised of general changes to policies. Additionally, the RTP committee will update the faculty on changes to policy related to RTP at least yearly. Specifically, all faculty should be very familiar with the following policies, as they delineate the primary roles and responsibilities of faculty at UVU:

[Policy 635: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities](#)

[Policy 601: Classroom Instruction and Management](#)

[Policy 632: Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank](#)

[Policy 633: Annual Faculty Reviews](#)

[Policy 641: Faculty Workload](#)

Further, tenure-track faculty should thoroughly review [Policy 637: Faculty Tenure](#)

Tenured faculty should also be aware of [Policy 638: Post-Tenure Review](#)

#### *RTP and Equity*

We acknowledge systemic and structural inequities that are embedded within academia, particularly in the hiring and tenure processes. We are committed to reviewing our job descriptions and RTP criteria frequently and with a lens of equity, diversity, and inclusion to minimize and remove barriers that disadvantage historically marginalized groups.





We acknowledge that our faculty are whole people with lives that exist beyond the walls of the institution. Just as work experiences can impact personal life, personal experiences can impact work life. We hope to embrace and develop each faculty member as a whole person, providing a supportive environment in which to make space to be human and grow. If we don't make room for a department member's personal needs, it is unfair to ask them to make space in their personal lives for work.

We acknowledge that parenthood—motherhood in particular—and caregiving can impact the professional goals and trajectories of our faculty. Paths to tenure and rank advancement can be customized and adjusted to meet the needs of parents and caregivers. We are committed to regularly reviewing and revising our RTP criteria to ensure that parents and caregivers are not disproportionately disadvantaged by any criteria.

We acknowledge that the majority of faculty, and particularly those who are the first in their families to work in academe, may not be familiar with RTP processes and the demands of a faculty position. We are committed to providing help and support for all of our faculty and encourage faculty to ask questions and provide feedback to improve these processes.

We have therefore worked to ensure that the guidelines and criteria in this document are specific, promote personalized approaches, and allow for occasional variations in performance due to life circumstances. In all cases, faculty should work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to establish professional goals that are consistent with these criteria as well as the realities of their lives.





### Minimum Qualifications for Appointment and Rank Advancement

Rank is awarded at initial appointment to a full-time faculty position and advanced in recognition of exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service as outlined in this document.

#### *Minimum Qualifications for Initial Appointment in the School of Education*

Initial appointment to a given rank for full-time faculty in the School of Education is determined using the following minimum qualifications and with the approval of the dean and Provost.

<i>Minimum Qualifications for Initial Appointment (UVU Policy 632)</i>		
<b>Tenure-Track Ranks</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>School of Education Criteria</b>
Assistant Professor	“An earned appropriate degree as determined by the department RTP committee” (§5.3.2).	<p>An earned, terminal degree (PhD, EdD) in an appropriate field</p> <p>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 <b>prior to the candidate’s official start date</b></p> <p>“A candidate for hire into a tenure-track position may be awarded up to four years toward tenure for equivalent tenure-track experience at other institutions if approved by the dean and [Provost]. A determination of the necessity and timing of a midterm review of candidates for hire who are granted three or four years toward tenure at the time of hire is recommended by the department and approved by the dean and [Provost]. Years awarded toward tenure shall not exceed the number of years actually served at previous institutions in tenure-track” (Policy 637 § 5.4.2).</p>





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).	<p>An earned, terminal degree (PhD, EdD) in an appropriate field AND Successful attainment of tenure at a regionally accredited college or university, OR Tenure granted at time of hire to UVU</p> <p>“If a newly hired faculty member or administrator has been awarded tenure previously at another regionally accredited institution or equivalent, he or she may be awarded tenure at hire, or after a specified period of full-time employment after hire as agreed upon at the time of hire, if approved by the Board of Trustees which shall consider recommendation by the appropriate RTP committee.”</p> <p>The recommendation by the RTP committee will be determined by a majority vote of the committee members. The committee may ask for evidence that the candidate has met the criteria for tenure in the School of Education, as needed.</p>
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).	<p>An earned, terminal degree (PhD, EdD) in an appropriate field AND A minimum of five years of teaching, scholarship, and service at a regionally accredited college or university as a tenured Associate Professor, consistent with the School of Education criteria for rank advancement</p>
<b>Non-Tenure Track Ranks</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>School of Education Criteria</b>
Lecturer	“An earned degree in an appropriate discipline or professional field as determined by the department RTP committee” (5.6.1).	<p>An earned Master’s degree in an appropriate field AND Relevant experience related to the position</p>



Appointment in Residence	“Regional, national, or international reputation and substantial body of work in an appropriate discipline with strong department, school/college, dean and [Provost] endorsement” (5.6.2)	Appropriate applied/creative/work experience (e.g., Teacher or Administrator of the Year, member of the Utah State Board of Education, developer of renowned curriculum, etc.)
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 [Provost]. This appointment may be given to an individual under temporary appointment to the University” (5.6.3)	An earned, terminal degree (PhD, EdD) in an appropriate field AND Relevant experience related to the position





### *Minimum Qualifications for Rank Advancement in the School of Education*

Rank advancement in the School of Education of full-time, tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure track faculty is awarded through successfully meeting the RTP criteria outlined later in this document. These criteria comply with minimum qualifications outlined in UVU Policy 632, as follows:

Minimum Qualifications for Rank Advancement (UVU Policy 632)	
Tenure-Track Ranks	Policy
Associate Professor	“Successful attainment of tenure at UVU” (5.4.2).
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).
Non-Tenure Track Ranks	Policy
Senior Lecturer	“Fulfillment of department RTP committee criteria for promotion to senior lecturer status and seven years of university service” (5.7.1).
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)





## Tenure and Rank Advancement

### *Tenure explanation*

Tenure is “A condition of continuing employment, awarded to qualified faculty members, that promotes academic freedom, attracts professionals of ability, and enhances the quality of the University’s academic programs” (Policy 637 § 3.8). It is intended to ensure that the faculty in the School of Education are highly qualified and worthy of ongoing student, University, and state support. Tenure is contingent on meeting the criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service outlined in University policy and this document. The award of tenure is accompanied with rank advancement from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

All tenure-track faculty **must** complete a midterm review in the fall of their third year to evaluate progress toward tenure and inform the decision of retention. All tenure-track faculty **must** apply for tenure in the fall of their sixth year as a tenure-track faculty member (except in cases when years were awarded toward tenure at the time of hire or the faculty member applied for and was granted a tenure clock stoppage or extension). If tenure is not awarded, faculty are “offered a one-year, terminal appointment for the next academic year, except in cases of termination for cause, due to a bona fide program or unit discontinuance, or financial exigency” (Policy 637 § 5.7.13).

### *Rank advancement/promotion explanation*

For tenured and non-tenure track faculty, rank advancement/promotion is not a condition of continuing employment, nor is it automatically awarded based on number of years of employment. Rather, it is a recognition of exemplary performance. “Each promotion is evaluated on its own merit, recognizing not merely what has been accomplished, but also the promise for future achievement” (Policy 632 § 4.1). Faculty are not required to apply for rank advancement.

Currently, rank advancement from Associate Professor to Professor includes a guaranteed increase in compensation. This guaranteed increase is not currently in place for non-tenure track faculty, as of Spring 2021. In all cases, faculty are encouraged to apply in order to receive recognition for their work, but must also weigh the effort required to complete the portfolio.

Should they choose to do so, associate professors may apply for rank advancement in the fall of the sixth year after they were awarded tenure or later, at their discretion and in consultation with their mentor, the department chair, and the RTP committee, and must demonstrate exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service, as outlined in this document. Non-tenure track faculty may apply for rank advancement in the fall of their eighth year of university service or later, at their discretion and in consultation with their mentor, the department chair, and the RTP committee, and must demonstrate exemplary teaching, as outlined in this document. If rank advancement is not awarded, faculty may re-apply in any subsequent year, and as many times as they desire, in consultation with their mentor, the department chair, and the RTP committee.





### *Recommendations and decisions*

Reviews of the RTP portfolio at each level results in a recommendation or final decision, as follows:

<i>Recommendations and decisions at each level of review</i>	
<b>Level of review</b>	<b>Recommendation or decision</b>
Department RTP committee	Recommendation
Department chair	Recommendation
Dean	Recommendation
Provost	Recommendation (tenure and rank advancement to professor) Decision (midterm review and rank advancement for non-tenure track faculty)
President	Recommendation (tenure and rank advancement to professor)
Board of Trustees	Decision (tenure and rank advancement to professor)

### *Appeals*

Faculty who receive a negative decision for midterm retention, tenure, or rank advancement and believe that the decision was made contrary to policy or on the basis of something other than their portfolio may appeal the decision. Review Policy 646 for appeal requirements and processes.

### *Criteria*

Tenure-track and tenured faculty seeking tenure/rank advancement must compile a portfolio as outlined in this document and meet the criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service appropriate for the rank they are seeking to earn tenure and rank advancement. Non-tenure track faculty must compile a portfolio and meet the criteria for rank advancement for teaching only.

The term *current evaluation period*, as used throughout these criteria, refers to the years in the position under consideration. For tenure-track faculty, the evaluation period for midterm review is the first two years in the tenure-track position and the evaluation period for tenure review is the first five years in the tenure-track position, unless years toward tenure were awarded upon hire. This is also called the *probationary period* for tenure-track faculty. For tenured associate professors, the evaluation period is the five years or more after tenure was awarded. For non-tenure track faculty, the evaluation period is the seven years or more in that position.

**\*Please note:** Only materials from the current evaluation period may be included for consideration in the portfolio. Additionally, only artifacts representing the faculty member's work while employed at UVU may be included in the portfolio. In the case of years toward tenure having been awarded upon hire, the letter of appointment serves as evidence of adequate progress for those years.

### *Rubrics*

The evaluation rubrics for teaching, scholarship, and service can be found throughout this document and in [Appendix A](#).





### Timelines for Annual Reviews, Tenure, and Rank Advancement

The School of Education follows the timelines outlined in University policy for annual faculty performance reviews (Policy 633), midterm and tenure reviews (Policy 637), rank advancement (Policy 632), and post-tenure reviews (Policy 638). Faculty are responsible for knowing and meeting these timelines.


Tenure-track faculty **must** apply for midterm review in the fall of their third year (e.g., a faculty member hired in Fall 2019 would apply for midterm review in Fall of 2021, which is the beginning of their third year) except when years toward tenure are awarded on hire or in the very rare case that a request for extension is submitted and accepted by the RTP committee, department chair, dean, and Provost, which is only allowed if the candidate was awarded years toward tenure on hire.

Tenure-track faculty **must** apply for tenure in the fall of their sixth year (e.g., a faculty member hired in Fall 2019 would apply for tenure in Fall of 2024, which is the beginning of their sixth year) except when years toward tenure are awarded on hire or in the very rare case that a request for extension is submitted and accepted by the RTP committee, department chair, dean, and Provost (see Policy 637 § 5.10). In exceptionally rare cases, tenure-track faculty may apply for a tenure clock stoppage for a period when they are unable to fulfill their duties (see Policy 637 § 5.9.2) or a reduction of the probationary period in cases of extraordinary achievement (see Policy 637 § 5.11).

Tenured associate professors **may** apply for rank advancement to full professor during or after their sixth year **after tenure was officially awarded** (e.g., if tenure was awarded Spring 2014 (effective July 1), the faculty would first potentially be eligible to apply for rank advancement in Fall 2019), barring any circumstances which may have interfered with their teaching responsibilities, such as a sabbatical or full-time reassignment for governance. Faculty should work with their department chair and the RTP committee chair to determine when they are eligible. If rank advancement is denied, tenured faculty may re-apply for rank advancement each year at their discretion and in consultation with the RTP committee.

Non-tenure track faculty **may** apply for rank advancement to a senior rank during or after their eighth year of service. If rank advancement is denied, non-tenure track faculty may re-apply for rank advancement each year at their discretion and in consultation with the RTP committee.





<i>Overall Faculty Timeline</i>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
Within one month of hire	Faculty member is provided with a copy of the appropriate University tenure or rank advancement policy and this document	Department chair
Within the first semester of hire/post-tenure	Faculty member meets with department chair and RTP committee chair to be oriented to UVU/SOE RTP processes and draft the initial tenure or rank advancement plan	Department chair, RTP committee chair
Each fall	Faculty meet with mentors to set annual goals in alignment with the tenure or rank advancement plan	Mentor, RTP committee
September 15 (beginning Year 2)	Tenure-track faculty submit portfolios for annual evaluation by RTP committee	Faculty member, RTP committee chair
December 15	Lecturers and associate professors are encouraged to submit portfolios for annual evaluation by RTP committee	Faculty member, RTP committee chair
Determined by policy (currently by Feb. 7)	Faculty member submits annual review	Faculty member
Each spring	Tenure-track faculty meet with mentors to evaluate progress and plan work on portfolio	Mentor, RTP committee
Each academic year	Faculty members participate in a peer observation/evaluation of their teaching	Faculty member, RTP committee
Each academic year	Department chairs and/or deans complete a supervisor observation/evaluation of faculty members' teaching	Faculty member, department chair/deans
September 15 of 3 <sup>rd</sup> year	Tenure-track faculty submit portfolios for midterm review	Faculty member, RTP committee chair
Spring of 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, after a positive recommendation for midterm retention	Tenure-track faculty member meets with the Deputy Provost, dean (or dean's representative), department chair, and RTP committee chair to revise the tenure plan	Faculty member, department chair, RTP committee chair
Spring of 3 <sup>rd</sup> year post-tenure	Faculty member meets with department chair and RTP committee chair to revise rank advancement plan	Faculty member
September 15 of 6 <sup>th</sup> year	Tenure-track faculty submit portfolios for tenure evaluation	Faculty member, RTP committee chair
December 15 of 8 <sup>th</sup> year (or later)	Non-tenure track faculty may submit their portfolios for rank advancement evaluation	Faculty member, RTP committee chair
December 15 of 6 <sup>th</sup> year post-tenure (or later)	Associate professors may submit their portfolios for rank advancement evaluation *If the faculty member has taken a sabbatical, they will likely need to delay the application for rank advancement to ensure they can demonstrate 5 full years of exemplary teaching at UVU post-tenure.	Faculty member, RTP committee chair





### **School of Education Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee**

The School of Education has a schoolwide RTP committee rather than one committee per department, due to the size of the School. The RTP committee in the School of Education is composed of five tenured faculty members, elected from among the faculty by all full-time, benefits eligible faculty members. Both the Elementary Education and Secondary and Special Education departments must be represented on the committee. When possible, at least one member of the committee should be a full professor to help ensure the rigor of the criteria and evaluation for rank advancement for tenured faculty, having successfully attained the rank themselves.

The election is to be held under the direction of the dean, but the dean, other full-time non-faculty administrators, and staff may not vote in the election. Current department chairs may not serve on the RTP committee but may vote in the election of committee members. Committee members serve a three-year term, and terms should be staggered to ensure greater continuity. Committee members may be re-elected for two consecutive terms and should then rotate off for at least one term unless there are no other eligible tenured faculty.

The RTP committee elects a chair from among the committee members each year. The chair is responsible for ensuring the implementation of procedures outlined in this document, with support from the committee members.







*Guidelines and Procedures*



## School of Education RTP Guidelines and Procedures

### *Tenure/Rank Advancement Plan*

“Within the first semester of hire in a tenure-track position, a new faculty member shall meet jointly with the department chair and the chair of the RTP committee to develop the expectations of the faculty member’s performance during the probationary period, consistent with established department tenure criteria. The expectations agreed upon constitute the candidate’s initial tenure plan. Such expectations shall be clear and reasonable, yet not overly prescriptive, allowing for a broad range of faculty achievement. The tenure plan shall be written; signed by the faculty member, department chair and RTP committee chair; and a copy shall be placed in the faculty member’s official personnel file” (Policy 637 § 5.5.2). In the School of Education, this plan is composed and approved using the *School of Education Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement Form* found in [Appendix B](#).

This process will also be followed for non-tenure track faculty upon hire and for tenured faculty the fall after being awarded tenure to develop a plan for rank advancement. During this meeting, the RTP committee chair will also provide the digital portfolio folder structure (for those hired or awarded tenure in 2021 or later).

The initial tenure/rank advancement plan created during this meeting should be fairly broad, creating a general picture of how the faculty member will meet the RTP criteria given the position into which they were hired, their current research agenda (tenure-track and tenured faculty only), and their professional interests and qualifications. The department chair and RTP committee chair will help guide the faculty member in setting goals that are reasonable given workload and any other requirements.

*Midterm revision.* Tenure-track faculty members who receive a positive recommendation for retention from the Provost after their midterm review will meet with the Deputy Provost and their dean (or dean’s representative), department chair, and RTP committee chair in the Spring of their third year to discuss their portfolio and possible adjustments to their tenure plan. After this meeting, the faculty member should compose a revised tenure plan.

Non-tenure track and tenured faculty members will meet with their department chair and the RTP committee chair in the Spring of their third year of employment/post-tenure to revise their rank advancement plan.

In both cases, the revised document should be more specific and more clearly outline the faculty member’s plan for tenure/rank advancement in light of their increased understanding of their position and the opportunities available to them. Again, the plan should be written using the *School of Education Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement Form* and signed by the faculty member, department chair, and RTP committee chair.

*Inclusion in the tenure/rank advancement portfolio.* The initial tenure/rank advancement plan and the third year revision should both be placed in the “Annual Reviews” tab or folder of the portfolio, as described in the Portfolio section of this document. Each year as part of the annual





review process, each faculty member will work with their mentor and department chair to set yearly goals toward the achievement of their tenure/rank advancement plan and make minor revisions to their plan, as needed.

*Changes to the tenure/rank advancement plan.* Significant changes—such as a dramatic shift in research agenda or change in courses taught—to a tenure/rank advancement plan beyond those in the third year revision should be made only in consultation with the department chair and RTP committee chair. In this case, a new form should be completed and signed and added to the portfolio to document the change.





### *Annual Performance Reviews*

Annual performance reviews are holistic evaluations that address both compliance with university policies and progress toward RTP criteria for teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service (depending on academic rank, see Policy 633). Faculty should be familiar with baseline expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service outlined in Policies 601: *Classroom Management*, Policy 635: *Faculty Rights and Responsibilities*, and Policy 641: *Faculty Workload*, as these baseline expectations will be evaluated during the annual review.

Beyond the baseline expectations, annual performance reviews are an opportunity for faculty to reflect on and plan for their progress toward tenure and rank advancement. Annual goals should be aligned to the faculty member's tenure/rank advancement plan and the criteria outlined in this document and set in consultation with their mentor and department chair. The annual self-evaluation should reflect on the accomplishment of those goals as well as feedback received from supervisor and peer assessments and Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs).

*Inclusion in the tenure/rank advancement portfolio.* The full annual performance reviews (including the department chair evaluations and improvement plans, if any) should be included in the Annual Reviews section of the portfolio.

Faculty members' annual self-assessments in teaching, scholarship, and service (depending on rank) should also be included in the relevant sections of their portfolios, as outlined later in this document.

Documentation provided as evidence in annual reviews should be saved for inclusion in the tenure/rank advancement portfolio. Participation in the annual review process should make the completion of the tenure/rank advancement portfolio easier, as it empowers faculty members to set goals, self-assess, and collect documentation each year.

**[Further information about and criteria for annual reviews is forthcoming, as the policy is currently in Stage 2 of the revision process]**





### *Mentoring*

Mentorship is a responsibility of all senior faculty members (Policy 635 § 4.7.4). Additionally, the UVU Inclusion Plan 2.0 encourages departments to “expand faculty peer-mentorship programs, particularly first-generation faculty, to include topics such as publishing, innovative teaching, inclusive scholarship, difficult conversations, conference presentations, negotiating in academia, and navigating UVU culture and climate” (§3.2.4). Therefore, all senior lecturers and associate and full professors are expected to serve as mentors.

### **The mentoring process described below is valid as of Fall 2021 and applies to RTP mentoring only.**

Each full-time tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty member in the School of Education will be assigned a mentor upon hire. The mentor must be a tenured faculty member or Senior Lecturer, as appropriate. Each tenured associate professor in the School of Education will be assigned a mentor upon the award of tenure or upon hire, when applicable. The mentor must be a tenured full professor. In many cases, a single mentor will work with more than one faculty member. Generally, mentoring will take place in structured meetings, as described below, to reduce the burden on mentors and facilitate group mentoring.

<i>Faculty Mentoring Eligibility</i>	
<b>Faculty Rank</b>	<b>Eligible Mentor Rank</b>
Non-tenure track faculty prior to rank advancement	Senior non-tenure track faculty, Associate or Full Professor
Assistant Professor	Associate or Full Professor
Associate Professor	Full Professor

Mentors will be assigned as a joint decision between the RTP committee and department chair within the first semester of hire or the first semester after the award of tenure. Mentors will be, to the extent possible, based on alignments of subject matter expertise, research agenda, course modality, and/or position description as well as the mentor’s workload. Some faculty, particularly full professors, may be asked to mentor more than one mentee. Mentors may be reassigned as needed due to faculty workload, retirement, leaving the University, at the discretion of the RTP committee, or upon request by the faculty member. Faculty members who wish to request a change of mentor should email this request to the RTP chair and department chair, with a brief explanation of the rationale for the change.

The RTP committee will create and maintain mentor training and will orient mentors each fall, either in a meeting or via email, regarding mentoring expectations and any relevant changes to guidelines or policies. Mentoring in the School of Education is intended to be formative and supportive. Mentors are intended to serve as an extra “set of eyes” in addition to the RTP committee and department chair, helping to guide their mentees within their perspectives and ranges of experience as fellow faculty members. Mentors are expected to understand SOE criteria and do their best to guide faculty to set appropriate goals and complete thoughtful self-evaluations, but each faculty member is ultimately responsible for successful attainment of tenure or rank advancement. Therefore, faculty are not required to comply with the advice of their mentors, but should carefully consider the feedback they receive and discuss it with the RTP committee chair and department chair to help them determine the best course of action. Faculty will be invited to evaluate the mentoring they received each year during the Spring semester. This





will help to improve the program overall and identify areas in which mentors may need additional training or support. Mentors who are concerned about the progress of their mentees should also contact the RTP committee chair and department chair as soon as concerns arise to ensure that each faculty member receives the appropriate level of support.

*Mentors of tenure-track and early career non-tenure track faculty* are responsible for helping their mentees understand the requirements of their faculty positions and the missions of UVU and the School of Education, as well as how to navigate the RTP process.

*Mentors of tenure-track faculty*, specifically, should also help their mentees select service opportunities that are appropriate for their workload, expertise, and interests and engage in scholarship appropriate for a teaching institution. Mentors are also encouraged to invite their mentees to participate in their scholarship and service activities, where appropriate. This collaboration will both improve the mentor's scholarship and service through the inclusion of new voices and help the tenure-track faculty member learn to navigate systems and expectations in the academy.

*Mentors of tenured associate professors* are responsible for helping their mentees understand the requirements for senior faculty; selecting service opportunities that are appropriate for their workload, expertise, interests, and position as senior faculty; engaging in more impactful scholarship; and navigating the process for rank advancement.

The RTP committee will host mentoring meetings each semester to ensure more consistent mentoring for all faculty and that committee members and department leadership are available to answer questions and offer support. These meetings will be scheduled on the School of Education calendar. Additional and frequent mentoring is strongly encouraged to promote faculty success and quality teaching. Questions that arise during meetings with mentees should be directed to the RTP committee chair.

- In the fall meeting (to be held prior to the submission of annual goals to the department chair), the mentor should help the faculty member set goals for the annual performance review in accordance with the RTP criteria and University policies, and in line with the faculty member's tenure/rank advancement plan and overall career goals. Faculty have the opportunity to respond to/rebut feedback from their mentors and are encouraged to discuss the feedback with their department chair during their annual review.
- In the spring meeting (to be held between March 1<sup>st</sup> and April 15<sup>th</sup>), the mentor and the faculty member should conduct a preliminary evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward tenure or rank advancement, including discussion about what to include in the tenure or rank advancement portfolio (described below) and how to address any issues that may have occurred during that academic year. Meeting in the Spring gives the faculty member time to work on their portfolio through the summer. Faculty have the opportunity to respond to/rebut feedback from their mentors and are encouraged to discuss the feedback with their department chair and/or the RTP committee chair, as needed.





*Documentation of mentoring.* Mentors will submit a report using the *School of Education Faculty Mentoring Form* found in [Appendix C](#) to the RTP committee chair within two weeks of the Spring meeting documenting the date of the meeting and the overall discussion and outcomes. This form will be reviewed and signed by the RTP committee chair and returned to the mentor for inclusion in the mentor's rank advancement portfolio, with the mentee's name redacted. Mentees should use this document to inform their work, but do not need to include it in their tenure/rank advancement portfolios. Department chairs will also ask each faculty member about mentoring during annual reviews.







### *Peer Assessments of Teaching*

Each full-time faculty member seeking tenure or rank advancement is required to have peer assessments of their teaching. The School of Education asks that faculty secure a peer assessment of their teaching *each year*. In addition to meeting tenure and rank advancement requirements, this practice helps faculty members set goals for the improvement of teaching for annual reviews and to benefit students. These peer assessments should be formative and supportive, helping to improve the quality of teaching across the School of Education.

Each fall, the RTP committee will send out a suggested peer review list for all lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors. Faculty members are welcome to reach out to other colleagues—both within the School of Education and across campus—to obtain a peer assessment in the place of or in addition to the suggested peer review. Faculty may consult with their mentors to make decisions about peer assessments. Full-time non-tenure track faculty and tenured associate professors seeking rank advancement should be mindful that they are required to obtain multiple perspectives of their teaching, as described in the Guidelines and Criteria for Teaching section of this document. **Please note** that it is the faculty member’s responsibility to arrange for the peer review. It is not the responsibility of the reviewer.

Those not currently seeking tenure or rank advancement are also encouraged to obtain these reviews as a best practice and as evidence for annual and post-tenure reviews (see Policies 633 and 638). Professors and Senior Lecturers may solicit their own peer reviews from among the School of Education faculty or from faculty outside the School of Education.

Peer assessments are conducted regardless of the method of delivery (i.e., face-to-face, hybrid, or online) using the *School of Education Peer Assessment of Teaching Form* found in [Appendix D](#). **[This document is forthcoming. It is based on the UVU Advancement of Teaching Committee’s Peer Assessment instrument, which is currently undergoing revision.]** These observations are intended to help faculty improve their teaching and as such, should not simply be “friendly letters,” but should focus on providing constructive feedback

In general, the following process should be followed for peer assessments (hereafter referred to as *reviews*) of teaching:

1. The faculty member identifies specific aspects of their teaching about which they would like peer feedback.
2. The faculty member schedules a meeting with their reviewer prior to the review to discuss the faculty member’s goals, provide context for the review, and identify how the review will take place (e.g., at a scheduled time in a face-to-face class, at a scheduled time in an online synchronous session, by watching a pre-recorded session, via access to a Canvas course or module, through a face-to-face or online “guided tour” of a Canvas course or module, etc.).
3. Conduct the review as agreed. The reviewer should complete the Peer Assessment of Teaching Form and look for and note examples of best practices, including ideas they might transfer and use in their own practice, as well as areas for improvement, particularly with regard to the faculty member’s stated goals. *Noting areas for improvement will not jeopardize tenure or rank advancement in an otherwise positive review and is critical to continuous improvement.*
4. Debrief the review in a face-to-face or online meeting. This will allow the reviewer to ask questions and make clarifications prior to composing the official report.







5. The reviewer will then compose the report *within two weeks of the debrief* by completing the final portion of the form, providing a holistic summary of the review including specific teaching strategies, characteristics, approaches, and/or design elements that were particularly beneficial and noting specific areas for improvement. Faculty members who do not receive the report in this timeframe should contact their reviewer and, if necessary, the department chair.
6. Faculty who disagree with their peer assessment may compose a rebuttal to include in their portfolio and/or seek another peer assessment, in which case both assessment should be included.

*Inclusion in the tenure/rank advancement portfolio.* These reviews should be added to the Peer Assessments tab/folder in the Teaching section of the portfolio (see the Portfolio section below), not the Solicited Peer Evaluations section, which is not used in the School of Education. Reviewers should also redact the faculty member's name and other identifying information (e.g., course name) and include the reviews in their own portfolios as evidence of Service. Department chairs will also ask each faculty member about peer assessments during annual reviews.





### *Supervisor Assessments of Teaching*

Each full-time faculty member seeking tenure or rank advancement is required to have supervisor assessments of their teaching. These assessments are performed by the department chair, but faculty may also request assessments from the assistant dean, associate dean, and/or dean. The School of Education asks that lecturers and assistant professors secure a supervisor assessment of their teaching *each year*. Senior lecturers and associate and full professors should secure a supervisor assessment of their teaching *at least every other year* (see minimum portfolio requirements below).

**Please note** that these assessments are different from annual reviews, though the supervisor assessment may be incorporated into the annual reviews, as appropriate.

The department chair is responsible for ensuring that the supervisor assessments are completed. The dean will also confirm that supervisors are completing these assessments during annual reviews.

Supervisor assessments are conducted regardless of the method of delivery (i.e., face-to-face, hybrid, or online) using the *School of Education Supervisor Assessment of Teaching Form* found in [Appendix E](#). **[This document is forthcoming. It is based on the UVU Advancement of Teaching Committee's Peer Assessment instrument, which is currently undergoing revision.]** This form is similar to the Peer-assessment of Teaching form, but includes additional items related to policy compliance and other department concerns related to teaching.

In general, supervisor assessments should follow the same process described for peer-assessments, including a meeting prior to the review to establish goals and logistics; the observation/review of class sessions and/or course materials; and a debrief of the review, including discussion of compliance with policies and other department concerns related to teaching found on the form. The supervisor will then compose the report *within two weeks of the debrief* by completing the final portion of the form, providing a holistic summary of the review including specific teaching strategies, characteristics, approaches, and/or design elements that were particularly beneficial and noting specific areas for improvement.

*Inclusion in the tenure/rank advancement portfolio.* These reviews should be placed in the Supervisor Assessment tab/folder of the portfolio and in the faculty member's personnel file. The supervisor may also redact the faculty member's name and other identifying information (e.g., course name) and include the reviews in their own portfolios as evidence of fulfillment of their position (GCHE) under Service, as needed.





### *Portfolio*

In order to be considered for midterm retention, for tenure, and for rank advancement, full-time faculty must produce a portfolio demonstrating that they have met University policies and department criteria, as outlined in this document and the policies cited previously. The required and optional contents of this portfolio are outlined in the criteria documents below. The RTP committee chair will orient each faculty member to the portfolio structure during the meeting in which the tenure plan is established.

*Annual portfolio reviews.* Tenure-track faculty in the School of Education are required to submit their portfolios to the SOE RTP committee chair by September 15<sup>th</sup> each year. Three members of the RTP committee will evaluate each candidate's progress toward tenure and produce a report for inclusion in the portfolio that details the committee's evaluation and recommendations.

Full-time, non-tenure track faculty are encouraged to submit their portfolios to the SOE RTP committee by December 15<sup>th</sup> each year and, particularly, in their third year of University service, for evaluation of the candidate's progress toward rank advancement. Three members of the RTP committee will evaluate each candidate's progress toward rank advancement and produce a report for inclusion in the portfolio that details the committee's evaluation and recommendations. Additional procedures for rank advancement for non-tenure track faculty (for which faculty are eligible in the eighth year of service or later) are outlined in UVU Policy 632: *Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank*.

Tenured associate professors pursuing rank advancement are encouraged to submit their portfolios to the SOE RTP committee by December 15<sup>th</sup> each year and, particularly, in the third year post-tenure, for evaluation of the candidate's progress toward rank advancement. Three members of the RTP committee will evaluate each candidate's progress toward rank advancement and produce a report for inclusion in the portfolio that details the committee's evaluation and recommendations. Additional procedures for rank advancement for tenured faculty (for which faculty are eligible in the sixth year post-tenure or later) are outlined in UVU Policy 632: *Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank*.

Annual portfolio reviews should be honest and thorough and based solely on the portfolio submitted to the committee in light of the criteria outlined in this document. The report produced by the committee should be detailed and help the candidate understand the strengths of their portfolio as well as areas of needed improvement, in order to help the candidate be successful in their eventual application for retention, tenure, or rank advancement.

*Midterm, tenure, and rank advancement portfolio reviews.* Tenure-track faculty applying for midterm or tenure review will submit their portfolio to the SOE RTP committee chair by September 15<sup>th</sup>. Tenured associate professors and non-tenure track faculty applying for rank advancement will submit their portfolio to the SOE RTP committee chair by December 15<sup>th</sup>. The full RTP committee will evaluate each candidate's portfolio using the criteria in this document and produce a detailed report. In the case of midterm review, the committee will evaluate the candidate's progress toward the criteria for tenure, indicating areas of strength and needed improvement. In all cases, the committee may ask for additional evidence or clarification from the candidate or other relevant parties (e.g., the department chair or dean), as needed. The committee will then vote for or against midterm retention, tenure, or rank advancement, and the vote count will be documented in the report, with names omitted.





The recommendation will be determined by simple majority vote. Committee members who disagree with the majority may write a letter of dissent for inclusion with the report, providing a detailed explanation of the rationale for their dissent.

**The School of Education does not conduct external reviews of portfolios. Thus, the *Solicited Peer Evaluations* section of the portfolio should be empty.**

Once the RTP committee has completed its report, the portfolio is passed to the department chair. No further changes to the portfolio can be made at that point, save the addition of the recommendations at each subsequent level of review and any rebuttals to those recommendations provided by the candidate. Additional procedures for midterm review and tenure for tenure-track faculty are outlined in UVU Policy 637: *Faculty Tenure*. Additional procedures for rank advancement are outlined in UVU Policy 632: *Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank*.

*Portfolio structure and contents.* The general structure and many required elements of the portfolio for tenure-track faculty are detailed in Policy 637: *Faculty Tenure* and can be found in the checklist in [Appendix F](#). The School of Education requires tenured associate professors applying for rank advancement to use the same overall portfolio format. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty in the School of Education should follow the same structure, omitting the Service and Scholarship sections.

All faculty hired in 2021 or later and those awarded tenure in 2021 or later should maintain a digital portfolio, using the folder structure provided during the meeting in which the initial tenure/rank advancement plan is established. Faculty hired or awarded tenure prior to 2021 may choose to maintain a digital or physical portfolio, though the digital portfolio is preferred. All faculty will be oriented to the digital portfolio structure.

The portfolio consists of a series of tabs provided by Academic Affairs (if physical) or folders/sections (if digital). The following materials should be placed *in front of* the first tab in the physical portfolio or *in the main folder/section of* a digital portfolio, depending on your faculty status, with the most recent item at the front. Those working with digital portfolios should use clear titles and/or a numbering system to ensure that files are in the proper order.

<i>Items for Inclusion in Main Portfolio Area</i>			
<b>Year of employment/post-tenure</b>	<b>Tenure-track</b>	<b>Non-tenure track</b>	<b>Tenured Associate Professors</b>
Year 1	Documentation of initial appointment and award of years toward tenure, if any, with salary information redacted	Documentation of initial appointment with salary information redacted	Documentation of award of tenure
Year 2	N/A	N/A	N/A





Year 3	Midterm review request letter	N/A	N/A
Year 4	Letter of decision from midterm review	N/A	N/A
Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 6	Application for Tenure form	N/A	Rank advancement request letter
Year 7	N/A	Rank advancement request letter	N/A

Any changes to the tenure clock, as described in the **Timelines for Annual Reviews, Tenure, and Rank Advancement** section of this document and Policy 637, should also be documented in this area through official letters granting the changes.

Tenured faculty should begin a new portfolio *in the year in which they apply for tenure* to document continued teaching, scholarship, and service. However, tenured faculty will need to complete *five full years* of exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service *after tenure was awarded* to apply for rank advancement, submitting their application during or after their sixth year post-tenure (example: if tenure was awarded in Spring 2014 (effective July 1), the faculty member is eligible to apply for rank advancement in Fall 2019, barring a sabbatical or other appointment that resulted in fewer than five years of teaching). As noted previously, tenured faculty pursuing rank advancement are strongly encouraged to have their portfolio reviewed annually, and particularly in the third year post-tenure, by the RTP committee.

The School of Education has determined specific requirements for each section of the portfolio, as outlined in the table in [Appendix G](#) and further explained in the criteria documents that follow.

**\*Please note** that no item should be included in more than one section of the portfolio. Faculty should work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to determine in which category each artifact should be placed.

**\*Also note** that if you have received any official commendations or reprimands from department or University administration (these are somewhat rare), these must be included in your portfolio in the relevant section (teaching, scholarship, or service). If you have questions about this, ask your department chair or the RTP committee chair.





*Guidelines and Criteria for Teaching*





### Guidelines and Criteria for Teaching

Teaching is the primary responsibility and focus of faculty at UVU, as “providing a quality education for students is fundamental to the mission and goals of the University” (Policy 641 §1.1.2). Thus, faculty excellence in teaching is the most significant factor in decisions of tenure and rank advancement.

Full-time, non-tenure track faculty are expected to teach an average of 15 credits per semester and are **not** required to engage in scholarship or service. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to teach an average of 12 credits per semester, with an additional 3 credits dedicated to scholarship and further expectations for service, as outlined in the Scholarship and Service sections of this document (see Policy 641). Course releases are rare and must be connected to significant University service or grant-related scholarship activities, with the approval of the Provost.

All faculty should thoroughly and regularly review Policy 635 § 4.5 to understand their rights and responsibilities in teaching, as well as Policy 601, which outlines University standards and procedures for teaching at UVU. These policies constitute the baseline expectations for teaching, which will be evaluated each year in faculty annual performance reviews.

The purpose of these criteria is to more clearly explain how the School of Education defines and measures the *quality* of a faculty member’s teaching for decisions of tenure and rank advancement, and to outline required and optional documentation of teaching for these purposes. This is the most substantial section of the tenure/rank advancement portfolio and is required of all faculty pursuing tenure or rank advancement. Teaching includes the development of programs, courses, and course materials; engagement in instructional activities with undergraduate and graduate students; interactions with and mentoring of students related to courses; and professional development related to University-level teaching.

Faculty in the School of Education should demonstrate continuous development in their teaching. Development involves the evolution of teaching practice through professional learning, goal-setting, innovation, informed risk-taking, and reflection. Evidence of continuous development may include, but is not limited to, supervisor assessments, peer assessments, overall and annual self-assessments as outlined in the Portfolio Components section below, responses to Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) and other student evaluations, curriculum and course development including syllabi and course materials, professional development.

The School of Education embraces the UVU Advancement of Teaching Committee’s *Teaching Excellence Model* (see [Appendix H](#)), which states that “Excellent teaching is inclusive and engaging and empowers students to achieve their educational, personal, and professional goals.” Thus, faculty in the School of Education must demonstrate that their teaching and professional development related to teaching is focused on inclusion, engagement, and student achievement as defined below:

Inclusive teaching values every student and provides accessible, equitable, and culturally diverse learning experiences and resources for students of all backgrounds. Inclusive teaching fosters an inviting and supportive environment in which students can succeed.





Engaged *teaching* provides meaningful, interactive, and experiential learning opportunities that integrate into the fabric of the community. Engaged *teachers* participate in ongoing dialogue about teaching and learning, professional development, innovation, and reflection about their work.

Achievement-focused teaching empowers students to gain essential knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to face the challenges of a dynamic and complex world. Instructors promote deep learning by integrating disciplinary currency/mastery with metacognitive pedagogy and design of instruction to guide students in realizing outcomes that include learning soft-, hard-, process-, and career-specific skills.

Therefore, faculty in the School of Education should focus their goals, efforts, and assessments of their teaching on these dimensions. The commitment to these dimensions should be evident in all materials submitted in the Teaching section of the portfolio and clearly described in the overall teaching self-assessment at the beginning of that section. Evidence for these dimensions should document efforts by the faculty member to **both** enhance the student experience and improve their own understanding. Review [Appendix I](#) for helpful examples for each of these dimensions.

Tenured and non-tenure track faculty seeking rank advancement must develop and implement a clear plan for professional development and/or course revision in each of the three areas and evaluate their efforts as part of the annual and/or overall self-assessments in the Teaching section of the portfolio. These plans and reflections should document your cycles of development and challenge within each area. It is up to each faculty member to imagine possibilities within their courses and other teaching opportunities, define their plans, and provide evidence of their work. Faculty are encouraged to work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to explore possibilities and evaluate their progress.

---

### *Portfolio Components*

#### **Required documents in this section of the portfolio:**

##### **Main tab/folder/section:**

A detailed table of contents of the documents in the Teaching tab/folder.

##### **Self-assessment section:**

*Overall Self-assessment.* A 2-3 page targeted overview of your teaching during the current evaluation period, and a broad explanation of the documents in the Teaching tab. All faculty should particularly explain how the artifacts in the portfolio demonstrate fulfillment of the criteria for







the rank for which they are applying, including their commitment to the dimensions of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement, as well as how the artifacts demonstrate consistent quality and continuous development in teaching.

*Annual Self-assessments.* A self-assessment of one's teaching and professional development related to teaching for each year of the current evaluation period (beginning 2021). These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member's self-evaluation in the annual review.

### **Supervisor Assessment section**

One supervisor assessment (department chair and/or dean, associate dean, or assistant dean) per year from the current evaluation period (beginning 2021) for non-tenure track and tenure track faculty. A minimum of three supervisor assessments from the current evaluation period (beginning 2021) for tenured faculty—preferably one every other year—with at least one in the year prior to application for rank advancement. These must be direct reviews of your teaching, as outlined previously in this document.

If you have deviated from the minimum requirement, provide a letter of explanation and/or ask the department chair or RTP committee chair to provide a letter of explanation.

### **Peer Assessments Section**

A minimum of one peer assessment of teaching per year (beginning 2021) from the current evaluation period for non-tenure track and tenure track faculty. A minimum of three peer assessments from the current evaluation period (beginning 2021) for tenured faculty—preferably one every other year—with at least one in the year prior to application for rank advancement. These must be direct reviews of your teaching, as outlined previously in this document, and may be conducted by faculty peers in the School of Education, from other departments in the University, or from other institutions.

Peer assessments should reflect:

- a variety of courses you teach, if applicable (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). *This is required for tenured and non-tenure track faculty seeking rank advancement.*

If you have deviated from the minimum requirement, provide a letter of explanation and/or ask the department chair or RTP committee chair to provide a letter of explanation.

### **SRIs**

*Summary Form.* In order to help the RTP committee evaluate your SRIs, complete the *SRI Summary and Reflection Form* (found in [Appendix J](#)) and include it at the beginning of this section of the portfolio.





While the scores on SRIs are less important than the comments, particularly due to known issues of bias (see note below), these scores can alert faculty and their supervisors to issues that must be addressed. It should be noted that the University average SRI scores for the “Instructor Evaluation” section for all courses is 4.5-4.6 (as of 2021). Thus, scores below this standard should be addressed in reflections and annual goal setting to ensure continuous development of teaching and to help the committee contextualize your scores. Likewise, very high average scores (above 4.9) should be noted as evidence of exemplary teaching. That said, it is important for faculty members to take risks in their teaching by incorporating new methods and modalities. Thus, a temporary dip in evaluation scores is not particularly concerning, particularly if the faculty member contextualizes that dip in the annual reflection, but a pattern of lower scores over time may be a cause for concern.

*Annual Reflections.* Include brief annual SRI reflections that evaluate overall scores, describe any potential contributing factors, and respond to student comments that denote areas of strength and areas to work on for the next academic year. These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member’s self-evaluation in the annual review.

*SRIs.* Include **all** Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) from the current evaluation period in their entirety. For faculty completing their portfolios digitally, the Academic IT department can prepare an Excel report that summarizes and documents all SRIs during the evaluation period. The faculty member is responsible for requesting this report, but the faculty member must ensure that all scores and comments for all courses taught are represented. Otherwise, SRIs should be included as PDF files or printed and organized by course and year.

A note on SRI review and criteria: We are well aware that the information presented by SRIs varies widely in validity and reliability. 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 and comments 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 and those with innovative pedagogies (e.g., student-centered approaches, service learning, online or hybrid modalities).

For these and other reasons, responses to and contextualization of student comments in the annual and overall reflections are more important than the scores themselves. The overall and annual reflections should demonstrate commitment to continuous development and to the dimensions of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement. *The RTP Committee will evaluate these carefully, looking for patterns of praise and of critique and then looking for your responses, particularly to the critiques, in your reflections.*

### **Curriculum and Course Development Section**

This section should include an overall self-assessment, syllabi for all courses developed and taught by the faculty member, supplemental evidence to demonstrate how courses are inclusive, engaging, and focused on student achievement, and evidence of academic program development (if any).





### *Curriculum and Course Development Self-assessment*

The faculty member should write a 1-2 page overall self-assessment to explain more specifically this section of the portfolio, describing the artifacts included and their significance, including the faculty member's participation in the development or improvement of each course or program represented, how the artifacts represent the quality of their teaching and their continuous development, and how the artifacts represent the dimensions of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.

*Syllabi.* Include at least one syllabus for each course taught within the current evaluation period. Include the full syllabus if you designed or significantly revised the course. If you taught a course but did not contribute significantly to the course design/development, the front page of the syllabus is sufficient. Do not include redundant syllabi for different sections of the same course in the same semester or for every semester of every course you teach.

Included syllabi should demonstrate new courses developed by the faculty member and/or improvements made to a course the faculty member has previously taught or started teaching during the evaluation period. In the case of substantial course improvements that are reflected in the syllabus, two syllabi may be included for comparison.

*Course Materials.* Assignments, assessments, rubrics, lessons, and other significant course materials may also be included with syllabi as evidence of course development, particularly in response to comments in SRIs or supervisor or peer assessments. Materials should demonstrate how courses have been made to be inclusive, engaging, and focused on student achievement, such as:

- Incorporation of High-Impact Practices
- Alignment with program outcomes (e.g., edTPA), accreditation, legislation, and/or industry requirements
  - Autism faculty should provide evidence of their work to ensure course alignment with ABAI VCS requirements
- Development or teaching of online or hybrid courses to increase flexibility for students
- Development or implementation of innovative teaching practices
- Integration of educational technologies
- References to campus resources (writing lab, library trainings, etc.) to support student learning and rigor
- Incorporation of more diverse and/or critical perspectives
- Efforts to make course materials more accessible (e.g., captions, transcripts, alt text on graphics, readable PDFs, etc.)

See [Appendix I](#) for additional examples of course materials that demonstrate a commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement. However, faculty should resist the urge to include materials that are not significant. The focus here should be on *quality* rather than quantity. Work with your mentor and the RTP committee to determine which materials to include.

*Program Development.* Evidence of participation in academic program development, if any, may also be included, such as:

- Program planning documents





- The R-401 (or a section thereof) for an academic program
  - The Autism VCS Coordinator should provide evidence of their work to ensure program alignment with ABAI requirements
- The self-assessment for this section should clearly describe the role the faculty member played in the development of each program included.

### Other Evidence Section

This section should document additional efforts to improve teaching or evidence of effective teaching beyond what is asked for in the sections above. This section should demonstrate a commitment to ongoing professional development in teaching and to provide support for student learning beyond typical course design and class interactions. The Overall and/or Annual self-assessments should clearly explain the significance of each document included in this section.

#### *Other Evidence Self-assessment*

The faculty member should write a 1-2 page overall self-assessment to specifically explain this section of the portfolio, describing the artifacts included and their significance. For professional development, in particular, the faculty member should explain how each professional development experience included in the portfolio impacted their teaching and contributed to their continuous development, particularly in the dimensions of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.

*Professional Development.* Evidence of professional development related to the faculty member's **University-level** teaching completed within the current evaluation period. This section is **required**. Faculty should work with their department chair and the RTP chair to select professional development that best meets their needs and goals.

The School of Education has identified three "levels" of professional development related to teaching. Each of them is valued by the School of Education. The levels indicate the amount of effort and time that is typically required **and will be converted to "points" for purposes of evaluation**. Tenure-track faculty should strive for at least one "point" per year, while tenured faculty should be closer to two "points" per year. The examples provided below generally represent professional development offerings available through UVU. Faculty are also encouraged to pursue professional development experiences outside of the University and document the amount of time required by each experience to assist the RTP committee in assigning levels/points to each.

**Please note:** Non-tenure track faculty in Autism Studies/Applied Behavior Analysis may count the maintenance of their required certifications for up to 50% of their teaching professional development. Tenure-track and tenured faculty will include these certifications as evidence of scholarship.

Level 3 (approx. 13-20+ hours, 3 pts.):

- Earn Advance HE Associate Fellow, Fellow, or Senior Fellow status, or an equivalent University-level teaching certification





- Advance HE is an international recognition that provides evidence of the quality of a faculty member’s teaching. Equivalent professional development options are also welcome.
  - For those pursuing Advance HE fellowship, faculty who are new to higher education are encouraged to earn their Associate Fellow designation by their third year of employment and the Fellow designation by their tenure or rank advancement review. Faculty with prior experience in higher education may choose to pursue the Fellow designation earlier, within the requirements outlined by the UVU Office of Teaching and Learning.
  - Tenured faculty who serve in positions of leadership are also encouraged to pursue the Senior Fellow designation as part of their rank advancement.
- b. Complete certification for online or hybrid course development and delivery
  - c. University courses related to teaching
  - d. Maintenance of required certifications for non-tenure track Autism Studies/ABA faculty
  - e. Other professional development experiences focused on University-level teaching requiring 13-20+ hours of effort

Level 2 (approx. 6-12 hours, 2 pts.):

- a. Complete a Foundations of Inclusion workshop series
- b. Complete the G/I certification
- c. Earn the Service-Learning certification
- d. Earn the Writing Enriched certification
- e. Earn the Mentoring Academy certification
- f. Earn the Team Based Learning certification
- g. Complete the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Cohort Program
- h. Complete POGIL training
- i. Complete the POET program
- j. Actively participate in and complete a Learning Circle
- k. Attend a full pedagogical conference intended to improve University-level instruction (not K-12)

\*Level 2 activities completed as part of the “Taught” path to Advance HE fellowship may not be counted separately from the fellowship.


- l. Other professional development experiences focused on University-level teaching requiring 6-12 hours of effort

Level 1 (approx. 1-5 hours, 1 pt.):

- a. Attend a conference/workshop session, webinar, etc.
- b. Complete a self-paced workshop
- c. Other professional development experiences focused on University-level teaching requiring 1-5 hours of effort

Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair





See [Appendix I](#) for additional examples of professional development activities that demonstrate a commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.

Professional development should be ongoing and demonstrate a commitment to continuous development. Faculty should ensure that they participate sufficiently for the requirements for their rank. Tenured and non-tenure track faculty should particularly choose professional development opportunities strategically to help them fulfill their plans for inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.

**Attendance is insufficient.** The self-assessment for this section should indicate how the professional development impacted teaching practice.

*Additional Evidence.* Additional documents in this section of the portfolio should document continuous development in teaching and dedication to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement, and could include any of the evidence described above for inclusion, engagement, and student achievement. This section is **optional**, but it does provide faculty members with opportunities to demonstrate strong commitment to the dimensions of effective teaching. The focus here should be on *quality* rather than quantity. Work with your mentor and the RTP committee to determine which materials to include.

Below is a list of additional evidence 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 list is not prioritized, nor does one activity “carry more weight” than any other. Rather, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the significance of each item in relation to the criteria.

- Honors/awards for teaching
- Reports from Student Collaborators on Teaching (SCOTs)
- Materials representing the design of and/or participation in teaching-related aspects of global/intercultural experiences
- Receipt and implementation of grants related to teaching
- Forms and results of supplemental student evaluations of teaching other than the institutional SRIs
- Significant unsolicited notes or letters from current and former students explaining the impact of your teaching (not simple end of year thank you notes)
- Outstanding student submissions that demonstrate significant student learning outcomes
- Evidence of exemplary feedback on student assignment or to students in field/clinical settings
- Evidence of facilitation of teaching-related workshops or discussion, or sharing teaching materials with other faculty at UVU or within one’s discipline, not included in Scholarship or Service
- Signature pages for student honors or master’s theses
- Evidence of substantial mentoring of students beyond course expectations



- Evidence of student learning related to overall program outcomes (e.g., performance on sections of edTPA directly related to your course requirements)
- Documentation of supervision of independent study, directed readings, or student-focused events.
- Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair

See [Appendix I](#) for additional examples of other evidence that demonstrate a commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.

**\*Please note** that no item should be included in more than one section of the portfolio. Faculty should work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to determine in which category each artifact should be placed.

**\*Also note** that if you have received any official commendations or reprimands from department or University administration (these are somewhat rare) for teaching, these must be included in here).

*Teaching Section Checklist*

<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching section table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum and course development overall self-assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall self-assessment of teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Course syllabi
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual self-assessments of teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant course materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual supervisor assessments of teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of program development (if any)
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual peer-assessments of teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Other evidence overall self-assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> SRI Summary Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of professional development related to University-level teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual SRI reflections	<input type="checkbox"/> Other significant evidence to demonstrate achievement of criteria
<input type="checkbox"/> All SRIs	





### Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Evidence should demonstrate the following:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement (apply to both associate professors pursuing advancement to professor and non-tenure track faculty)
<b>Continuous development</b>	<p>Clearly demonstrates development in teaching through professional learning, innovation, and reflection about their work throughout the evaluation period.</p> <p>Participates in professional development related to their University-level teaching equivalent to 6 points during the evaluation period.</p>	<p>Clearly demonstrates ongoing development in teaching through professional learning, innovation, and reflection about their work throughout the evaluation period (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor).</p> <p>Provides evidence of efforts to gain multiple perspectives on their teaching (e.g., a variety of faculty peers, subject matter experts, additional student feedback, SCOTs).</p> <p>Participates in strategic professional development related to their development goals equivalent to 6 points during the evaluation period.</p> <p>Provides evidence of plans for/work toward further development in teaching to demonstrate promise for future achievement.</p>
<b>Consistent quality</b>	<p>Supervisor, peer, student, and other evaluations of teaching are consistently positive on the whole. Occasional dips may occur due to evolving practice but do not become a pattern, and any issues are acknowledged and responded to, resulting in changes to practice where needed.</p>	<p>Supervisor, peer, student, and other evaluations of teaching are exemplary on the whole and reflect the candidate's status as a master teacher. Occasional dips may occur due to evolving practice but do not become a pattern, and any issues are acknowledged and responded to thoughtfully and purposefully, resulting in changes to practice where needed.</p>





<p><b>Inclusive teaching</b></p>	<p>Clearly demonstrates that they value every student by working to provide accessible, equitable, and culturally diverse learning experiences and resources for students of all backgrounds.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., SRIs, course materials, etc.) of an inviting and supportive environment in which students can succeed.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of a developing plan to improve inclusiveness in their teaching (see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>	<p>Provides evidence of deliberate effort to make course materials increasingly accessible.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., SRIs, course materials, etc.) of an inviting and supportive environment in which students can succeed.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of the implementation and evaluation of a clear plan to improve inclusiveness through equitable and culturally diverse learning experiences and resources for students of all backgrounds (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor; see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>
<p><b>Engaging teaching</b></p>	<p>Provides evidence of meaningful, interactive, and experiential learning opportunities.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of a developing plan to improve engagement in their teaching (see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>	<p>Provides evidence of meaningful, interactive, and experiential learning opportunities.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of the implementation and evaluation of a clear plan to improve engagement through pedagogies, activities, and interactions (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor; see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>
<p><b>Teaching that promotes student achievement</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates clear alignment between course objectives, expectations, activities, and assessments.</p> <p>Provides evidence of empowering students to gain essential and current knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to be successful in the course, to meet program outcomes, and to succeed in their profession (see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear alignment between course objectives, expectations, activities, and assessments.</p> <p>Provides evidence of the implementation and evaluation of a clear plan to improve student achievement through disciplinary currency, a strong focus on preparing students for the demands of their careers, and the development of important life skills (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor; see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>



*Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarship*



### Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarship

While teaching is a faculty member's primary responsibility at UVU, scholarship is important as it helps to maintain the faculty member's expertise and to ensure that the information being taught in the faculty member's courses is current. At UVU, scholarship refers to "Research and other creative work unique to each discipline which adds to that discipline in knowledge or skills" (Policy 632 § 3.4). Additionally, "Faculty members have a responsibility to maintain their scholarly/creative competence and strive for improvement as needed" (Policy 635 § 4.6.1).

#### *Non-tenure Track Faculty*

The workload of non-tenure track faculty is focused on teaching; therefore, while these faculty members are required to stay current in their fields in order to best serve students, they are not required to participate in or provide evidence of formal scholarship. However, non-tenure track faculty are welcome to participate in scholarship, particularly local conferences directly connected to their teaching, provided it does not impede effective teaching. This scholarship should be included in the *Other Evidence* section of the Teaching area of the portfolio, and the reflection in that section should clearly indicate how the scholarship helped to improve or extend the faculty member's teaching.

#### *Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty*

Scholarship is included in a tenure-track or tenured faculty member's workload. Each semester, faculty should expect to spend the equivalent of 3 credit hours on scholarly activities (see the definition of Academic Credit Hour Equivalents (ACHE) in Policy 641 § 3.1). These activities should be documented for inclusion in each annual review and in tenure and rank advancement portfolios.

Scholarship is more than simply reading research or sharing your expertise with others. An element of peer or competitive review is required for tenure and rank advancement, as stated in Policy 635 § 5.2:

5.2.1 Faculty members shall submit scholarly or creative works for **peer or competitive review** per their department's RTP criteria. Such review may occur in a variety of academic or professional venues, including but not limited to, conference presentations and proceedings, symposia, seminars, exhibits, performances, and appropriate scholarly or professional publications.

This is typically achieved through presentations at refereed state, regional, national, and international conferences; publication in peer-reviewed journals (research or practitioner focused) or edited volumes; and competitive grants for research, though other possibilities exist and may be planned with your mentor and department chair. **Please note** that the School of Education does not prioritize first authorship. Collaborative scholarship is encouraged.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty in the School of Education should demonstrate a consistent and developing pattern of scholarship increasing in both time (within workload limits) and the depth and/or reach of contribution across their careers. Scholarship includes empirical and theoretical research, creative work, and discipline-related professional development. Scholarship should enhance the faculty member's expertise and advance knowledge of the field.





While the teaching load at UVU often means that faculty will be limited in their ability to participate in intensive research resulting in inclusion in highly prestigious conferences and publications, opportunities for scholarship—particularly scholarship of practice and the scholarship of teaching and learning—are readily available. Additionally, participation in practitioner conferences and publication in practitioner journals/magazines (both peer-reviewed) are welcomed and encouraged in the School of Education as part of our ongoing commitment to improving education, clinical practice, and services within our community. Tenure-track faculty should work with their mentors to identify opportunities that will enhance their teaching and are appropriate for their workload. Mentors are also encouraged to engage their mentees in their scholarship, where appropriate.

It is also important that newly hired tenure-track faculty who have recently graduated from a doctoral program have the opportunity to publish and present scholarship resulting from their doctoral work. Thus, new faculty should work with their mentor and the department chair to ensure that their service load, in particular, meets requirements but does not impede their teaching or scholarship, particularly in the first two years at the University.

Additionally, “Research and creative works conducted by faculty shall be in compliance with UVU Policy 114 Conflict of Interest and UVU Policy 136 Intellectual Property” (Policy 635 § 5.2.2). Faculty should ensure that they are familiar and in compliance with these policies. Faculty should also be mindful that scholarship for tenure and rank advancement must be meaningfully connected to their position at the University and aligned to the area of expertise for which they were hired.

AAQEP, the accrediting body for many of the programs in the School of Education, asks the programs to:

- Engage with local partners and stakeholders to support high-need schools and participate in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes;
- Seek to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce;
- Support teachers’ entry into and continuation in the profession;

Thus, these are potential areas of scholarship of practice that might, in many cases, be paired with service to our partner districts and schools. Likewise, Autism faculty may focus their scholarship on their work with private service providers and the Autism community. Scholarship of teaching and learning is also encouraged to improve and/or demonstrate the effectiveness of a faculty member’s University-level teaching, particularly with regard to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.

### *Creative Works*

Faculty in the School of Education are encouraged to produce creative works such as open educational resources (OERs), K-12 curricula, and media products, particularly in response to identified needs in higher and/or K-12 education. However, these creative works are generally considered service (or could be completed outside of the RTP guidelines as consulting, consistent with Policy 114: *Conflict of Interest and Commitment*, Policy 323: *Guidelines for Consulting*, and other University policies) unless they undergo a systematic peer review process. Ideally,



this peer review process would be completed by a publishing entity. However, faculty may also work with professional organizations or state/district/community entities or form an advisory board of acknowledged experts to have creative works reviewed. This form of review would typically qualify as Level 1 scholarship. Faculty members should work with the RTP committee to determine if their creative works meet this requirement.

### *Levels of Scholarship*

The School of Education has identified three “levels” of scholarship, each of which is valued. The levels indicate the amount of effort and time that is typically required **and will be converted to “points” for purposes of evaluation**. Tenure-track faculty should strive for at least one “point” per year, while tenured faculty should be closer to two “points” per year. **At least one scholarly activity in each evaluation period should result in a peer-reviewed publication.**

#### Level 3 (3 pts.):

- a. Receipt of Regional or National (e.g., Department of Education, NSF) research/creative work grants
- b. Peer-reviewed articles published in academic journals (non-predatory journals)  
\*Predatory journals are those that charge a publication fee or require you to purchase a membership to participate.
- c. Publication of (as editor) or in (as author) an academic book, textbook, or edited volume by a reputable publisher

#### Level 2 (2 pts.):

- a. Receipt of University (e.g., Presidential, Engaged Learning) or private research/creative work grants
- b. Peer-reviewed publications in practitioner books or journals
- c. Peer-reviewed publications in conference proceedings (proceedings and presentations for the same conference only count once)
- d. Peer-reviewed presentations at international or national conferences
- e. Documented support of student-led research outside of course assignments (e.g., URSCA, UCUR, NCUR) not included in the Teaching or Service sections of the portfolio. Those who chaired Master’s theses during the current evaluation period may include the signature pages from those theses.
- f. Uncompensated research consulting or program evaluation resulting in a formal report
- g. Peer- or competitively reviewed creative projects, publications, or other intellectual property that demonstrate innovative ideas or techniques and contribute to professional growth in the field (e.g., published curricula, case studies, etc.)

**\*Note:** Autism faculty may count the maintenance of their required certifications throughout the evaluation period as one Level 2 activity.

#### Level 1 (1 pt.):

- a. Peer-reviewed presentations or posters at regional, local, or University conferences. **Please note:** UVU conferences that are not competitive (e.g., Summer University, Adjunct Faculty Conference, Teaching4Learning) are considered service.
- b. Peer-reviewed contributions to practitioner magazines, blogs, or other media outlets





- c. Invited presentations at national or regional conferences
- d. Compensated research consulting or program evaluation resulting in a formal report
- e. Professional-quality scholarly media (e.g., open educational resources (OERs), websites, blogs, podcasts) with demonstrated significant professional impact

Activities not listed will also be considered and assigned an appropriate level by the RTP committee.

Please note that scholarship that is in process/under review or grant proposals, manuscripts, or presentation proposals that were not accepted after peer-review are welcome as evidence of a consistent commitment to scholarship but do not count toward point totals. Likewise, citations of faculty scholarship by others in the discipline provide evidence of the quality and impact of the scholarship, but do not count toward point totals. Faculty members should work with their mentors and the RTP committee to determine what evidence should be included in the portfolio.

While all faculty are welcome to pursue grants that support their scholarship at any level, due to workload concerns tenure-track faculty are encouraged to pursue internal University grants (e.g., GEL Singular and Quick grants) while tenured faculty are encouraged to pursue more competitive internal grants (e.g., SEED CARROT grants, Presidential Faculty Award, Ethics Faculty Fellowship) and external grants. *Also note that Faculty Travel Grants and other non-competitive grants are not considered scholarship.*

*Professional Development Related to the Discipline.* Significant discipline-related professional development, such as earning or maintaining a professional credential or taking courses to increase disciplinary knowledge, is also considered scholarship but does not count toward point totals. Discipline-related professional development should represent substantial effort toward furthering the faculty member's disciplinary expertise. See the exception for certification for Autism faculty above.

Additionally, instances of professional development may not be included in both the Teaching and Scholarship sections; thus, faculty must determine whether the professional development was intended primarily to improve their University-level teaching or their disciplinary knowledge. This decision can be particularly confusing in the School of Education, as scholarship for many faculty members focuses on teaching. Faculty members should work with their mentors and the RTP committee to make this determination.

**Attendance is insufficient.** The self-assessment for this section should indicate how the professional development impacted disciplinary knowledge or scholarly endeavors.

#### *Demonstrating consistency and development*

Artifacts included in the Scholarship section should demonstrate a consistent dedication to scholarship and development in the faculty member's scholarship over time. *Consistency* is demonstrated through scholarly activities in **each year** during the evaluation period.

*Development* is demonstrated through one or more of the following, and should be explained in the Scholarship self-assessment:





- Increase in scholarship activities over time
- Increase in levels of scholarship over time (e.g., from local/regional to national/international; **required for rank advancement**)
- Increase or strategic adjustments in focus of scholarship over time (e.g., developing a specific research agenda or adapting research focus to emerging priorities)

In certain situations, such as while participating in a large research or grant project or when confronted with insurmountable obstacles (e.g., unforeseen issues with the school districts, global pandemics, etc.), faculty may experience a year in which they are unable to produce public scholarship for peer-review. These circumstances are completely understandable. They should be addressed in annual reviews and evidence should be provided to demonstrate ongoing effort and will only be of concern if no peer-reviewed scholarship is produced for two or more sequential years.

Scholarship will be evaluated through both quantitative benchmarks and a holistic approach. Faculty must meet minimum requirements for peer-reviewed scholarship for tenure or rank advancement AND must demonstrate continuous development in scholarship through discipline-related professional development and/or the documentation of ongoing and progressive scholarship activities.

### *Portfolio Components*

#### **Required documents in this section of the portfolio:**

- *Overall Self-assessment.* A self-assessment (2-3 pages) of one's scholarship during the current evaluation period, including an explanation of the documents in the Scholarship tab. For faculty seeking rank advancement to professor, the self-assessment should clearly explain how their scholarship meets the higher standards in the evaluation criteria.
- *Table of Contents.* A detailed table of contents of the documents in the Scholarship tab/folder.
- *Annual Self-assessments.* Self-assessment of scholarship, for each year of the evaluation period (beginning 2021). These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member's self-evaluation in the annual review.
- *Evidence of Scholarship.* Evidence of peer or competitively reviewed scholarship, as described previously, to meet the requirements in the evaluation criteria.

#### **Additional documents in this section of the portfolio are *optional*. If present, they should document consistency and development in scholarship and could include:**

- Evidence of substantial discipline-related professional development not included in the Teaching tab
- Award(s) for scholarly or creative work
- Evidence of scholarship in progress/under review or that was not accepted after peer-review (see above)
- Citations of faculty scholarship to demonstrate impact in the discipline



- Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair

**\*Please note** that no item should be included in more than one section of the portfolio. Faculty should work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to determine in which category each artifact should be placed.

**\*Also note** that If you have received any official commendations or reprimands from department or University administration (these are somewhat rare) for scholarship, these must be included in here).

#### *Scholarship Section Checklist*

<input type="checkbox"/> Scholarship section table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of peer-reviewed scholarship that meets standards above and fulfills criteria
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall self-assessment of scholarship	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of discipline-related professional development (if any)
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual self-assessments of scholarship	<input type="checkbox"/> Other significant evidence of ongoing scholarship (if any)

#### *Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship*

Evidence should demonstrate the following:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement
<b>Peer-reviewed scholarship</b>	Peer-reviewed scholarship equating to 6 points or more, with at least one being a publication.	Peer-reviewed scholarship equating to 8 points or more, with at least one being a publication.
<b>Consistency and development of scholarship</b>	<p>Evidence of consistent and developing scholarship. Years without any publications, presentations, etc. are explained by providing evidence of ongoing work or insurmountable barriers and are infrequent.</p> <p>Scholarship is meaningfully connected to their position and aligned to the area of expertise for which they were hired, within workload requirements.</p>	<p>Meets requirements for tenure AND</p> <p>Provides evidence of scholarship at the national/international level.</p> <p>Provides evidence of plans for/work toward future scholarship to demonstrate promise for future achievement.</p>





*Guidelines and Criteria for Service*



### Guidelines and Criteria for Service

At UVU, *Service* “refers to service activities at the University, to one’s profession, and in the community that are clearly related to the faculty member’s role” (Policy 637 § 3.7).

It is a baseline service expectation that all full-time faculty in the School of Education attend and actively participate in department meetings (except in extenuating circumstances or when scheduled to teach a course), complete all requested accreditation reports, and “accept reasonable departmental requests for collaboration pertaining to the faculty’s area of study, pedagogical and scholarly goals, or goals of the department and school” (Policy 635 § 4.7.3). These areas will be evaluated in faculty annual performance reviews.

#### *Non-tenure Track Faculty*

The workload of full-time, non-tenure track faculty is focused on teaching; therefore, while these faculty members are required to meet the baseline expectations above and are valued members of the School of Education faculty, they are not permitted to hold official service positions at the University—with the exception of membership on department/School committees if they have needed expertise not found among the tenure-track faculty—due to workload limitations of non-tenure track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty are welcome to engage in service in the community and to the discipline/profession, particularly in ways that connects to their teaching, but this is not required and should not impede effective teaching. This service should be included in the *Other Evidence* section of the Teaching area of the rank advancement portfolio, and the reflection in that section should clearly indicate how the service helped to improve or extend the faculty member’s teaching.

#### *Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty*

All tenure-track faculty should be familiar with their rights and responsibilities in Service, as outlined in Policy 635 § 4.7. While teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at UVU, service is extremely important for community engagement and participation in shared governance. Policy 641: *Salaried Faculty Workload*, identifies two types of service. “Public and community service” can be included in a faculty member’s formally tracked workload as part of their Academic Credit Hour Equivalents (ACHE; Policy 641 § 3.1) and should be documented as such for annual reviews. Additional service (particularly that performed for the department, School, or University as part of shared governance, is considered part of a faculty member’s activities that are not formally tracked as part of their workload, which “establish the faculty member as a good citizen within the department, school, University, community, and discipline. Activities not formally tracked are an integral part of a faculty member’s role, but do not contribute to the calculation of Workload Credit Hour Equivalents (WCHE)” (Policy 641 § 3.4). Therefore, faculty should actively participate in service while taking care to not sacrifice the quality of their teaching and scholarship.

As a comparatively small academic unit, School of Education faculty bear a heavy burden for service that is not formally tracked as part of workload both within their departments and the School of Education and across the University. That said, faculty should work with their mentors and department chairs to thoughtfully select service opportunities that align with their interests and expertise, attend to the needs of the University, are appropriate for their academic rank, and are reasonable for their workload. Mentors are also encouraged to engage their mentees in their service activities, where appropriate. **It is more important that faculty make meaningful contributions with their service than**





**that they serve in numerous capacities.** Though it is difficult to quantify service expectations, as the amount of time required by a faculty member's service obligations can vary widely across an academic year, the School of Education encourages tenure-track faculty to dedicate an average of 2 hours per week and tenured faculty to dedicate an average of 3 hours per week (excluding summers) to service beyond their formal workload. **Please note** that these are not thresholds that guarantee competence in service, but rather representative cases to give a sense of the level of expectation.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty in the School of Education should demonstrate a consistent and developing pattern of service, increasing in both time (within workload limits) and the depth of contribution across their careers. The number of service obligations will carry less weight than the quality, intensity, and consistency of work required by service positions and the contributions made in those roles.

Generally, *tenure-track faculty* are expected to be active participants in service opportunities, while maintaining a focus on teaching and engaging in some scholarship. Tenure-track faculty should focus their service primarily within their department and the School of Education, with some engagement in service to the community. Participation in lower-intensity University service opportunities is also appropriate, though not required. The timeline below provides an example of how a tenure-track faculty member might approach service obligations, though individual circumstances will apply and faculty should work with their mentors and department chair to identify appropriate service.



*Tenured faculty* should endeavor to take greater responsibility for service through leadership roles, participation in higher levels of service, and/or more impactful contributions in their service opportunities. It is important for tenured faculty to use their institutional knowledge and experience to serve while allowing tenure-track faculty to focus more on their teaching and scholarship. Therefore, tenured faculty should increase their service to include higher-intensity University service, greater service to the community, and service to the discipline.

Service will be evaluated through both quantitative benchmarks and a holistic approach. Faculty must meet minimum requirements for domains of service AND demonstrate consistent active participation in service.





### *Faculty with Administrative Appointments*

Faculty with reassigned time for governance (GCHE) should clearly document the active and high-quality fulfillment of the service obligation for which they have reassigned time. This reassignment is typically reserved for positions such as department chair, program director, or Faculty Senate leadership and must be approved by the Provost. In the School of Education, service performed by department chairs, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Director of the Melisa Nellesen Center for Autism typically meets requirements for ongoing and active service in the required domains due to their level of engagement within the School of Education, across the University, and within the community. Faculty in these positions, therefore, are not required to serve in additional capacities (e.g., University-level committees) provided they ensure that their evidence and self-assessments clearly demonstrate active fulfillment of their duties and that these duties include engagement with the domains required for their rank.

### *Types and Examples of Service*

UVU Policies 635 and 637 state that tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to provide service in the following domains:

- The faculty member's department/school,
- The University,
- The community,
- The faculty member's discipline/professional organizations.

Lists of possible service found in this section are not meant to be prescriptive or exhaustive. **Faculty should work with their mentors, the RTP committee, and the department chair to select and create new service opportunities.** All of the options below are valued. Note that some may be more appropriate for tenure-track faculty while others are more appropriate for tenured faculty. All faculty are encouraged to participate in service that impacts inclusion, engagement, and student achievement in the School of Education and at the University, including support of the School and University inclusion, completion, and other targeted plans.

Service to the department, School of Education, and University is an important way for faculty to contribute to shared governance; it allows faculty to have a voice in department, School, and University decision-making. Service in these domains is typically done through active participation in committees, task forces, university councils, and/or other activities relevant to the mission of the University. Participation in temporary appointments such as hiring committees, program assessment, and other ad hoc activities is also valued.

Faculty must also provide evidence of active and meaningful participation in annual peer teaching assessments, and senior faculty must provide evidence of active and meaningful mentoring of junior faculty, as outlined in the mentoring section of this document and indicated in Policy 635 § 4.7.4.

Service to the department or the School of Education might include service as:

- Department chair, program coordinator, adjunct coordinator/course lead (beyond standard teaching load), etc.





- Contributor, organizer, or leader of a School of Education conference, workshop, lecture/lecture series, global/intercultural experience, clinical program, or other student learning experience (not preparing or teaching a course)
- Chair or active member of department/school committees
- Leader of or contributor to program assessment activities
- Chair or member of hiring committees
- Sharing expertise with SOE faculty or students beyond assigned courses (e.g., a student forum, SOE learning circle or book club, etc.)
- Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair

**Please note** that supervision of field experiences that are part of your course load are considered Teaching, not Service.

Service to the University might include service as/in:

- Faculty Senate officer, faculty senator, Faculty Senate committee chair or member (tenured faculty preferred)
- Chair or member of University planning and assessment committees
- Contributor to or organizer of a non-competitive University conference, workshop, lecture/lecture series, global/intercultural experience, learning circle, book club, or other student learning experience (not preparing or teaching a course)
- Developer or presenter of seminars or workshops for Academic Affairs, the Office of Teaching and Learning, the Office of Inclusion, or other campus entities
- Chair or member of policy development groups
- Chair or member of other University committees
- Chair or member of University ad hoc committees/task forces
- Chair or member of University hiring committees
- Mentor for University faculty peer-to-peer programs
- Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair

For faculty in the School of Education, service to the community should focus on providing service to schools/districts, teachers, state education entities, clinicians, private service providers, and/or the Autism community in a professional capacity. Further, AAQEP, the accrediting body for many of the programs in the School of Education, asks the programs to:

- Engage with local partners and stakeholders to support high-need schools and participate in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes;
- Seek to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce;
- Support teachers' entry into and continuation in the profession.



Therefore, service focused on supporting schools and/or providing teacher professional learning is highly valued and is required for those seeking rank advancement to professor, in the programs accredited by AAQEP. Autism faculty should also contribute, where possible, to efforts to provide continuing education for Applied Behavior Analysts and others in the Autism community.

Service to the community might include:

- Developer of or contributor to innovative resources or programs that serve teachers, schools, and/or the autism community
- Active participant in state curriculum committees or other state or district education- or Autism-focused entities
- Developer of or contributor to teacher/clinician professional learning experiences, local conferences, etc.
- Author of or contributor to a University or external service-learning grant (e.g., Community-based Participatory Research Service-learning Fellows, High-Impact Community Partnership grant) if not included in the Teaching tab
- Invited presenter for local practitioner conferences, workshops, etc.
- Organizer of or contributor to school improvement programs
- Organizer of or contributor to projects that recruit students in high-need areas and/or from diverse backgrounds
- Developer of or contributor to courses or programs in local schools or within the Autism community
- Consultant for school boards, district or school administration, school community councils, private service providers, etc.
- Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair

**Please note** that community service not related to your role as a faculty member (e.g., volunteering at the food bank, religious service, etc.) is not considered for tenure or rank advancement.

Service to the discipline includes activities such as “service [not just membership] in professional societies, planning or chairing conferences or conference sessions, participating in peer review for professional or discipline organizations, or reviewing materials for publication, exhibit, or performance” Policy 635 § 4.7.6.

Service to the discipline might include:

- Chair or active contributor in a special interest group within an academic or professional organization
- Chair or member of a conference planning committee for an academic or professional organization
- Reviewer of manuscripts for publication (books, articles, etc.) or presentation proposals
- Member of an advisory board for an organization or grant
- Officer or contributing member of national, regional, state, or local committee connected to the faculty member’s area of expertise.
- Editor or editorial board member for a scholarly or creative outlet.
- Participating as a panelist or invited speaker at national, regional, or local disciplinary conference (unless documented as a research presentation in the scholarship section)





- Providing continuing education opportunities for professional certification (e.g., Autism Studies)
- Others as approved by the RTP committee and department chair

**Please note** that membership in professional organizations does not constitute service on its own. Service in professional organizations involves contribution and/or leadership.

Activities for which the faculty member is paid beyond their salary or teaching overload (e.g., delivering a keynote address, receiving a stipend for developing a professional development program for teachers, etc.) may be considered service, though this should be approved by the RTP committee prior to the submission of the portfolio and should be rare. These activities must also comply with requirements in Policy 114: *Conflict of Interest and Commitment*, Policy 323: *Guidelines for Consulting*, and other University policies.

---

### *Portfolio Components*

#### **Required documents in this section of the portfolio:**

- *Overall Self-assessment.* A self-assessment (2-3 pages) of one's active and ongoing discipline-related service to the department, college/school, University, community, and/or discipline during the current evaluation period, and an explanation of the documents in the Service tab. For faculty seeking rank advancement to professor, the self-assessment should clearly explain how their service meets the higher standards in the evaluation criteria.
- *Table of Contents.* A detailed table of contents of the documents in the Service tab.
- *Annual Self-assessments.* Self-assessment of service for each year of the evaluation period (beginning 2021). These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member's self-evaluation in the annual review.

#### **Additional documents in this section of the portfolio:**

- Evidence of active and meaningful service to the department/School of Education, University, community, and/or professional organizations/your discipline. *This evidence must be measurable and verifiable.* 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.). *These should not merely be thank you notes or agendas; they should clearly demonstrate the quality, intensity, and consistency of the faculty member's service.*
  - Significant materials prepared in the course of service, particularly for service to the community or profession.
  - Documentation of participation in annual peer teaching assessments (with peers' names redacted), and/or documentation of peer mentoring (with peers' names redacted).
- Faculty with reassigned time for governance (GCHE) must document the fulfillment of those service obligations.





- Documentation should demonstrate a pattern of consistent and developing service and that the faculty member has maintained ethical and professional standards.

**\*Please note** that no item should be included in more than one section of the portfolio. Faculty should work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to determine in which category each artifact should be placed.

**\*Also note** that If you have received any official commendations or reprimands from department or University administration (these are somewhat rare) for service, these must be included in here).

---

*Service Section Checklist*

<input type="checkbox"/> Service section table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of active and meaningful service in required domains
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall self-assessment of service	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of high-level fulfilment of GCHE responsibilities (if any)
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual self-assessments of service	

---







### Criteria for Evaluation of Service

Evidence should demonstrate the following:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement
<b>Active Participation</b>	Provides evidence of active participation in service opportunities.	<p>Provides evidence of active participation in service opportunities.</p> <p>Clearly demonstrates an effort to make more impactful contributions in their service through increased involvement and/or leadership roles in service and shared governance.</p> <p>Provides evidence of plans for/work toward future service to demonstrate promise for future achievement.</p>
<b>Domains of Service</b>	Has consistently provided service at two or more levels during the period being reviewed (i.e. [1] department/School of Education, [2] University, [3] community, and [4] disciplinary or professional organization).	<p>Meets requirements for tenure AND</p> <p>Has served in two or more domains beyond/in addition to the department and the School of Education. Service includes peer mentoring and outreach that impacts the community (e.g., schools, teachers, private service providers, the Autism community).</p>





*Appendices*


 Appendix A: School of Education RTP Rubrics

## School of Education RTP Rubrics

**Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

Evidence should demonstrate the following:

	<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Rank Advancement</b> (apply to both associate professors pursuing advancement to professor and non-tenure track faculty)
<b>Continuous development</b>	<p>Clearly demonstrates development in teaching through professional learning, innovation, and reflection about their work throughout the evaluation period.</p> <p>Participates in professional development related to their University-level teaching equivalent to 6 points during the evaluation period.</p>	<p>Clearly demonstrates ongoing development in teaching through professional learning, innovation, and reflection about their work throughout the evaluation period (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor).</p> <p>Provides evidence of efforts to gain multiple perspectives on their teaching (e.g., a variety of faculty peers, subject matter experts, additional student feedback, SCOTs).</p> <p>Participates in strategic professional development related to their development goals equivalent to 6 points during the evaluation period.</p> <p>Provides evidence of plans for/work toward further development in teaching to demonstrate promise for future achievement.</p>
<b>Consistent quality</b>	<p>Supervisor, peer, student, and other evaluations of teaching are consistently positive on the whole. Occasional dips may occur due to evolving practice but do not become a pattern, and any issues are acknowledged and responded to, resulting in changes to practice where needed.</p>	<p>Supervisor, peer, student, and other evaluations of teaching are exemplary on the whole and reflect the candidate's status as a master teacher. Occasional dips may occur due to evolving practice but do not become a pattern, and any issues are acknowledged and responded to thoughtfully and purposefully, resulting in changes to practice where needed.</p>
<b>Inclusive teaching</b>	<p>Clearly demonstrates that they value every student by working to provide accessible, equitable, and culturally diverse learning</p>	<p>Provides evidence of deliberate effort to make course materials increasingly accessible.</p>

	<p>experiences and resources for students of all backgrounds.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., SRIs, course materials, etc.) of an inviting and supportive environment in which students can succeed.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of a developing plan to improve inclusiveness in their teaching (see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>	<p>Provides evidence (e.g., SRIs, course materials, etc.) of an inviting and supportive environment in which students can succeed.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of the implementation and evaluation of a clear plan to improve inclusiveness through equitable and culturally diverse learning experiences and resources for students of all backgrounds (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor; see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>
<b>Engaging teaching</b>	<p>Provides evidence of meaningful, interactive, and experiential learning opportunities.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of a developing plan to improve engagement in their teaching (see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>	<p>Provides evidence of meaningful, interactive, and experiential learning opportunities.</p> <p>Provides evidence (e.g., annual reviews, professional development, course materials) of the implementation and evaluation of a clear plan to improve engagement through pedagogies, activities, and interactions (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor; see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>
<b>Teaching that promotes student achievement</b>	<p>Demonstrates clear alignment between course objectives, expectations, activities, and assessments.</p> <p>Provides evidence of empowering students to gain essential and current knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to be successful in the course, to meet program outcomes, and to succeed in their profession (see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear alignment between course objectives, expectations, activities, and assessments.</p> <p>Provides evidence of the implementation and evaluation of a clear plan to improve student achievement through disciplinary currency, a strong focus on preparing students for the demands of their careers, and the development of important life skills (beyond what was achieved for tenure for those pursuing advancement to professor; see <a href="#">Appendix H</a> and <a href="#">Appendix I</a>).</p>

### Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship

Evidence should demonstrate the following:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement
<b>Peer-reviewed scholarship</b>	Peer-reviewed scholarship equating to 6 points or more, with at least one being a publication.	Peer-reviewed scholarship equating to 8 points or more, with at least one being a publication.
<b>Consistency and development of scholarship</b>	<p>Evidence of consistent and developing scholarship. Years without any publications, presentations, etc. are explained by providing evidence of ongoing work or insurmountable barriers and are infrequent.</p> <p>Scholarship is meaningfully connected to their position and aligned to the area of expertise for which they were hired, within workload requirements.</p>	<p>Meets requirements for tenure AND</p> <p>Provides evidence of scholarship at the national/international level.</p> <p>Provides evidence of plans for/work toward future scholarship to demonstrate promise for future achievement.</p>



### Criteria for Evaluation of Service

Evidence should demonstrate the following:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement
<b>Active Participation</b>	Provides evidence of active participation in service opportunities.	<p>Provides evidence of active participation in service opportunities.</p> <p>Clearly demonstrates an effort to make more impactful contributions in their service through increased involvement and/or leadership roles in service and shared governance.</p> <p>Provides evidence of plans for/work toward future service to demonstrate promise for future achievement.</p>
<b>Domains of Service</b>	Has consistently provided service at two or more levels during the period being reviewed (i.e. [1] department/School of Education, [2] University, [3] community, and [4] disciplinary or professional organization).	<p>Meets requirements for tenure AND</p> <p>Has served in two or more domains beyond/in addition to the department and the School of Education. Service includes peer mentoring and outreach that impacts the community (e.g., schools, teachers, private service providers, the Autism community).</p>







## Appendix B: School of Education Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement Form

### School of Education Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement Form

Faculty in the School of Education are required to make an initial plan to achieve tenure or rank advancement in their first semester at UVU. The goal of this plan is to 1) assist in faculty accountability in the areas of Teaching (all faculty), Scholarship, and Service (tenure-track and tenured faculty only), and 2) align annual goal creation to the overall RTP process. The initial plan should be fairly broad, creating a general picture of how you will meet the RTP criteria given the position into which you were hired, your current research agenda, and your professional interests. The department chair and RTP committee chair will help guide you in setting goals that are reasonable given workload and any other requirements.

You will also meet with your department chair and the RTP committee chair prior to September 15<sup>th</sup> of your third year of employment/post-tenure to revise the plan. This new version should be more specific and more clearly outline your plan for tenure/rank advancement in light of your understanding of your position and the opportunities available to you.

**Take time to thoroughly review the School of Education RTP Guidelines and Criteria.** Consider your current areas of strength and focus, areas in which you may need professional development or support, and personal and professional goals in light of these criteria and the workload requirements at UVU.

Please complete this form to the best of your ability prior to meeting with your department chair and the RTP. Refer to the relevant tenure or rank advancement criteria carefully in this process (overview rubrics are available below). You are encouraged to keep your goals somewhat broad and aimed toward minimum requirements to allow for flexibility and growth. Please **do not** indicate specific journals in which you hope to be published or specific committees on which you hope to serve unless you have already secured approvals. If you brought in years toward tenure from other institutions, please be mindful that all goals must represent work completed while employed at UVU.

Retain a copy of this both the initial and third year plans in the Annual Reviews section of your RTP portfolio and use them to inform annual goal setting in cooperation with your mentor, the department chair, and the RTP committee. Significant changes to this plan—such as a major shift in research agenda, changes in courses taught, or significant service positions—should be made only in consultation with the department chair and RTP committee chair. In this case, a new form should be completed and signed and added to the portfolio to document the change.



**School of Education Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement Form**

**Faculty Member:**

**Type of plan:** Initial | Third Year

**Date:**

Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement	
Domain	Goals
<b>Teaching</b>	<i>All faculty set 3 or more goals in each area. Goals should demonstrate commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement and these factors should be added in parentheses at the end of each relevant goal.</i>
<i>Curriculum and Course Development</i> (your intended contribution to courses and programs in your department, including courses and/or programs you intend to create or revise. Be sure to consider the domains of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement, to the degree you are prepared to do so.)	e.g., Incorporate a more critical lens in EDSC 4550 (inclusion), align course writings to edTPA requirements (student achievement), incorporate a community-based element (engagement)
<i>Teaching Professional Development</i> (efforts to improve your University-level teaching. Be sure to consider the domains of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement, to the degree you are prepared to do so.)	e.g., Pursue the Advance HE Associate Fellow designation (3 pts.), complete the G/I certification (2 pts.), complete the POGIL certification (2 pts.)
<i>Other</i> (optional)	e.g., Invite Student Collaborators on Teaching to evaluate my instruction
<b>Scholarship</b>	<i>Tenure-track and tenured faculty set 3 or more goals consistent with the criteria for their rank.</i>
<i>Intended Research Agenda</i> (on what topic(s) you intend to focus your scholarship, what might your research look like; remember that Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and Scholarship of Practice are welcome)	e.g., The use of team-based learning in Elementary Math Methods through a qualitative study using journaling
<i>Peer- or Competitively-reviewed Scholarship or Creative Work</i> (review the School of Education RTP Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarship to understand expectations.)	e.g., Publish one article stemming from my dissertation (2 pts.), deliver one conference presentation stemming from my dissertation (2pts.), deliver one conference presentation from my team-based learning study (2 pts.)
<i>Discipline-related Professional Development</i> (optional; significant efforts to improve your disciplinary knowledge)	e.g., Complete my Google Level 1 Educator certification





<b>Service</b>	<i>Tenure-track and tenured faculty set 3 or more goals consistent with the criteria for their rank. Goals must represent service in <b>two or more domains</b>. Tenured faculty are <b>required</b> to incorporate service that supports local schools and/or teachers AND two domains of service beyond the department/School of Education.</i>	
<i>Department/School of Education</i>	e.g., Serve on 1-2 committees in my department/the SOE	
<i>University</i> (high level University service is not recommended for tenure-track faculty)	e.g., N/A or Serve on 1 lower-impact University committee (tenure-track) or Pursue a leadership role or membership on a higher-impact University committee (tenured)	
<i>Community</i>	e.g., Provide professional development in my field for local teachers or clinicians	
<i>Discipline/Professional Organizations</i>	e.g., Review presentation proposals for AERA	

<i>Documentation of Approvals</i>			
<b>Role</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Faculty Member</b>			
<b>RTP Committee Chair</b>			
<b>Department Chair</b>			

This form is followed by the School of Education RTP Rubrics, found in [Appendix A](#).





## Appendix C: School of Education Faculty Mentoring Form

### School of Education Faculty Mentoring Form

Each faculty member is assigned a mentor within the School of Education to provide guidance in setting goals and evaluating progress toward tenure or rank advancement as well as general support in their teaching, scholarship, service (depending on rank) and overall success at UVU. Faculty should meet formally with their mentor once each semester to set annual goals and evaluate progress toward tenure or rank advancement. The goal of these mentor meetings is to 1) assist in faculty accountability in the areas of Teaching (all faculty), Scholarship, and Service (tenure-track and tenured faculty only), and 2) align annual goal creation to the overall RTP process.

**Faculty member: Take time to thoroughly review the School of Education RTP Guidelines and Criteria and your Plan for Tenure or Rank Advancement.** Consider your current areas of strength and focus, areas in which you may need professional development or support, and personal and professional goals in light of these criteria and the workload requirements at UVU.

Please complete the “Goals” column of this form to the best of your ability prior to meeting with your mentor in the fall. Refer to the relevant tenure or rank advancement criteria and your plan for tenure or rank advancement carefully in this process. You are encouraged to keep your goals somewhat broad and aimed toward minimum requirements to allow for flexibility and growth. Please **do not** indicate specific journals in which you hope to be published or specific committees on which you hope to serve unless you have already secured approvals.

**Mentor:** Note feedback on the faculty member’s goals in the “Mentor Feedback” column during the fall meeting and send it to the faculty member so they can finalize their annual goals for submission to their department chair. This feedback should be based on the School of Education RTP Guidelines and Criteria, relevant policies, and your own experience at UVU. During the spring meeting, use the second table to take notes about the faculty member’s progress in completing their goals and toward tenure or rank advancement. Refer to the rubrics at the end of this document, as needed. After the meeting, complete the written summary and send a copy to the faculty member and to the RTP committee chair. The faculty member should use your feedback to guide their work on their tenure or rank advancement portfolio and their goals for the next year.

The RTP committee chair will sign the form in recognition of your service as a mentor. Place a copy of the completed form, signed by the department chair and with the faculty member’s name and other identifying information redacted, in the Service section of your rank advancement portfolio/annual performance review.



**School of Education Faculty Mentoring Form**

Faculty Member:

Mentor:

Date of fall meeting:

Fall Mentor Meeting – Feedback on Annual Goals		
Domain	Goals	Mentor Feedback
<b>Teaching</b>	<i>All faculty set 1 or more goals in each area. Goals should demonstrate commitment to inclusion, engagement, and/or student achievement and these factors should be added in parentheses at the end of each relevant goal.</i>	
<i>Curriculum and Course Development (your intended contribution to courses and programs in your department, including courses and/or programs you intend to create or revise. Be sure to consider the domains of inclusion, engagement, and/or student achievement.)</i>		
<i>Teaching Professional Development (efforts to improve your University-level teaching. Be sure to consider the domains of inclusion, engagement, and student achievement, <b>and indicate how many points you will earn this year, if any</b>)</i>		
<i>Other (optional)</i>		
<b>Scholarship</b>	<i>Tenure-track and tenured faculty set 1 or more goals consistent with the criteria for their rank.</i>	
<i>Research Agenda (on what topic(s) you intend to focus your scholarship, what might your research look like)</i>		
<i>Peer- or Competitively-reviewed Scholarship or Creative Work (review the School of Education RTP Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarship to understand expectations; <b>be sure to indicate how many points you will earn this year or how you will work toward earning points next year</b>)</i>		



<i>Discipline-related Professional Development</i> (optional; significant efforts to improve your disciplinary knowledge)			
<b>Service</b>	<i>Tenure-track and tenured faculty set 2 or more goals in two or more domains of service, consistent with the criteria for their rank.</i>		
<i>Department/School of Education</i>			
<i>University</i> (high level University service is not recommended for tenure-track faculty)			
<i>Community</i>			
<i>Discipline/Professional Organizations</i>			

*Faculty member's response to/rebuttal of mentor's feedback, if any*

Respond to your mentor's feedback as needed in preparation for your annual review with your department chair. Remember that mentoring in the School of Education is formative and is not in any way binding, but your mentor's feedback should be thoughtfully considered.

--





**Faculty Member:**

**Mentor:**

**Date of spring meeting:**

<i>Spring Mentor Meeting – Evaluation of Progress</i>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Notes on Progress on Goals and Toward Tenure or Rank Advancement</b>	<b>Mentor Recommendations</b>
<b>Teaching</b>		
<i>Curriculum and Course Development</i>		
<i>Teaching Professional Development</i>		
<i>Other (optional)</i>		
<b>Scholarship</b>		
<i>Research Agenda</i>		
<i>Peer- or Competitively-reviewed Scholarship or Creative Work</i>		
<i>Discipline-related Professional Development (optional)</i>		
<b>Service (enter N/A for any domain in which service was not performed this academic year)</b>		
<i>Department/School of Education</i>		
<i>University (high level University service is not recommended for tenure-track faculty)</i>		
<i>Community</i>		
<i>Discipline/Professional Organizations</i>		

<i>Mentor’s written summary of the faculty member’s progress on their annual goals and toward tenure or rank advancement</i>
Include overall evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service. Ensure that your evaluation is based on the appropriate RTP criteria.





<i>Faculty member's response to/rebuttal of mentor's summary, if needed</i>
Respond to your mentor's summary as needed to give your mentor feedback and help the RTP committee better understand the efficacy of the mentoring program. Remember that mentoring in the School of Education is formative and is not in any way binding, but your mentor's summary should be thoughtfully considered

<i>Recognition of Service by RTP Committee Chair</i>		
<b>Name of RTP Committee Chair</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

This form is followed by the School of Education RTP Rubrics, found in [Appendix A](#).





## Appendix D: School of Education Peer Assessment of Teaching Form

[Instrument Forthcoming]

Additional factors may be considered based on the faculty member's goals and/or the observer's expertise.





## Appendix E: School of Education Supervisor Assessment of Teaching Form

[Instrument Forthcoming]

Supervisors will also evaluate the faculty member's compliance with Policy 635 § 4.5 and 5.1







## Appendix F: Tenure Portfolio Checklist from Policy 637

**CHECKLIST BASED ON POLICY 637, *Faculty Tenure***  
**Midterm and tenure portfolio due to RTP Committee by September 15.**  
**Please note: department criteria may have additional requirements to university criteria in Policy 637.**

### Faculty member adds:

\_\_\_\_\_ A tenure application form.

\_\_\_\_\_ A detailed table of contents listing every entry in the portfolio

\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty member's brief statement describing 1) the nature of their contribution to the profession and to the University, 2) the extent to which department expectations were met, 3) any circumstances that helped or hindered their progress, and 4) any other information that shall be beneficial to the reviewers in evaluating the material in the portfolio

\_\_\_\_\_ An up-to-date curriculum vitae

### TEACHING

\_\_\_\_\_ Self-assessment of the faculty member's teaching performance and experiences

\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor assessment of teaching

\_\_\_\_\_ Peer assessments of teaching

\_\_\_\_\_ Students Ratings of Instruction (SRI) from all courses taught during evaluation period (full SRIs, including all student ratings and comments)

\_\_\_\_\_ Evidence of contributions to curriculum and course development,

\_\_\_\_\_ Professional development related to teaching, and

\_\_\_\_\_ Any other evidence related to teaching, as determined by department criteria

### SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS

\_\_\_\_\_ Evidence of scholarly and/or creative works, such as publications, presentations, performances, and discipline-related professional development

### DISCIPLINE RELATED SERVICE

\_\_\_\_\_ department





- \_\_\_\_\_ college/school
- \_\_\_\_\_ University
- \_\_\_\_\_ profession
- \_\_\_\_\_ community

**The RTP committee chair adds:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Copies of the faculty member's annual reviews from the evaluation period,

\_\_\_\_\_ Departmental and University tenure criteria,

\_\_\_\_\_ all solicited (external) peer evaluations, if required by department criteria (these are NOT to be known by the faculty member, per Policy 637, Section 5.6.4.2) **THESE ARE NOT REQUIRED IN THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_ 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.





**Appendix G: Portfolio Contents Required by the School of Education**

\***Please note** that no item should be included in more than one section of the portfolio. Faculty should work with their mentors, department chairs, and the RTP committee to determine in which category each artifact should be placed.

Portfolio Structure		
Portfolio Tab	Description	Guidelines and Tips
<p><b>Main</b></p> <p>This is the section in front of all tabs or in the main portfolio digital folder.</p>	<p>This section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A title page with the Faculty Member’s name and current position.</li> <li>• In formal review years, the appropriate request letter or application form.</li> <li>• Letters acknowledging award of retention at midterm review and tenure, as applicable.</li> <li>• Documentation of initial appointment and award of years toward tenure, if any, with salary information redacted.</li> <li>• Documentation of any changes to the tenure clock, as applicable.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Keep this section clean and simple, in chronological order, with the newest item after the title page.</i></p>
<p><i>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, save that they are complete. In order to facilitate review of your portfolio, each of these three documents should strive for clarity and organization.</i></p>		
<p><b>Table of Contents</b></p> <p>Not required for portfolios submitted in Digital Measures</p>	<p>A detailed table of contents listing every entry in the portfolio in order.</p>	<p><i>A Table of Contents should be clear and thorough. Materials included should be aligned with the expectations in this document and from the current evaluation period. All required sections should be represented.</i></p>



<p><b>Informational Statement</b></p> <p>This only needs to be included in years that require formal evaluation outside of the School of Education, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Midterm review for tenure-track faculty</li> <li>• Tenure review for tenure-track faculty</li> <li>• Rank advancement review for all faculty</li> </ul>	<p>A cover letter (2-3 pages) about overall performance during the current evaluation period.</p> <p>The cover letter should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlight accomplishments of note.</li> <li>• Describe contributions to the profession and university.</li> <li>• Describe the extent to which departmental expectations (criteria) have been met.</li> <li>• Describe any circumstances that helped or hindered progress.</li> <li>• Describe any other information that shall be beneficial to the reviewers in evaluating the material in the portfolio.</li> <li>• Refer to any critical documents mentioned in the portfolio, by tab name.</li> </ul>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p><b>Curriculum Vitae</b></p>	<p>A current curriculum vitae.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delineates work done throughout the faculty member's career, in the context of earlier academic training and work.</li> <li>• Matches materials provided in the portfolio.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> Not all items in the vitae must be represented in the portfolio artifacts.</p>	<p><i>The best CVs make it easy for readers to find dates and categories. CVs should be current, complete, clear, and well-organized.</i></p> <p><i>Those pursuing rank advancement to full professor may elect to change the font color to note work completed post-tenure.</i></p>
<p><i>The Teaching section of the portfolio is the most substantial and significant, and weighs the heaviest in considerations of tenure and rank advancement. Faculty must demonstrate the quality of their teaching, as outlined in the teaching criteria later in this document. Be mindful that this demonstration of quality is more important than the quantity of documentation in this section of the portfolio. <b>This section is required of all faculty.</b></i></p>		
<p><b>Teaching</b></p>	<p>A table of contents for the Teaching section</p>	



<p><b>Self-assessment</b></p>	<p><b>Overall Self-assessment</b>                  A brief overview (2-3 pages) of one’s teaching and professional development related to teaching during the current evaluation period. The overview should reflect specifically on how you have demonstrated continuous improvement and worked to make your teaching more:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inclusive</li> <li>• engaging</li> <li>• and focused on student achievement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduces, contextualizes, and summarizes materials included in the Teaching tab.</li> <li>• Provides evidence of an intentional, reflective pedagogical practice focused on student learning.</li> <li>• Provides evidence of teaching that maintains appropriate standards of academic rigor and content.</li> <li>• Highlights your strengths as a teacher and unique aspects of your pedagogy.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Annual Self-assessments</b>                  A self-assessment of one’s teaching and professional development related to teaching for each year of the current evaluation period. These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member’s self-evaluation in the annual review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a pattern of self-reflection, pedagogical development, and incorporation of supervisor, peer, and student feedback from year to year.</li> <li>• Provides evidence that, within your “intentional, reflective pedagogical practice,” you have learned and grown pedagogically.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>





<p><b>Supervisor Assessment</b></p>	<p><b>Beginning Fall 2021:</b>  <b>Non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty:</b> A supervisor assessment of teaching for each year of the current evaluation period.</p> <p><b>Tenured faculty:</b> A minimum of three supervisor assessments of teaching from the current evaluation period—preferably one every other year—with at least one occurring in the year prior to application for rank advancement.</p> <p>These must be direct reviews of your teaching, as outlined previously in this document, and may be conducted by the department chair, assistant dean, associate dean, or dean.</p> <p>If you have deviated from the minimum requirement, provide a letter of explanation and/or ask the department chair or RTP committee chair to provide a letter of explanation.</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
-------------------------------------	---	---



<p><b>Peer Assessments</b></p>	<p><b>Beginning Fall 2021:</b></p> <p><b>Non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty:</b> A minimum of one peer assessment of teaching per year from the current evaluation period.</p> <p><b>Tenured faculty:</b> A minimum of three peer assessments from the current evaluation period—preferably one every other year—with at least one in the year prior to application for rank advancement.</p> <p>These must be direct reviews of your teaching, as outlined previously in this document, and may be conducted by faculty peers in the School of Education, from other departments in the University, or from other institutions.</p> <p>If you have deviated from the minimum requirement, provide a letter of explanation and/or ask the department chair or RTP committee chair to provide a letter of explanation.</p>	<p>Taken together, peer assessments should trace a reflective practice that encourages growth and development.</p> <p><i>The RTP Committee will evaluate these carefully, looking for patterns of praise and of critique and then looking for your responses, particularly to the critiques, in your self-assessment.</i></p>
<p><b>SRI</b></p>	<p>This section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRI Summary and Reflection Form</li> <li>• Annual SRI reflections</li> <li>• Complete Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) from <b>all</b> courses taught during the period being reviewed, clearly organized by course and year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate an overall pattern of student comments that is positive about the faculty member’s teaching and the courses taught.</li> <li>• Provides a record in which negative comments are infrequent and unsubstantiated or are addressed by the faculty member in their annual self-assessments.</li> </ul> <p>Responses to student comments are more important than the scores themselves. <i>The RTP Committee will evaluate these carefully, looking for patterns of praise and of critique and then looking for your responses, particularly to the critiques, in your self-assessment.</i></p>





<p><b>Curriculum and Course Development</b></p>	<p>This section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum and Course Development Self-assessment</li> <li>• Syllabi of courses taught.</li> <li>• Course materials as evidence of course development, particularly in response to comments in SRIs or supervisor or peer assessments and to demonstrate commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of academic program development, if any, may also be included.</p> <p>The Overall and/or Annual self-assessments should clearly explain the significance of each document included in this section.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-assessment clearly explains the significance of each artifact included.</li> <li>• Syllabi are thoughtful and rigorous in ways that develop student knowledge and skills and that support departmental aims.</li> <li>• Syllabi change based on experience and professional development.</li> <li>• Courses change and evolve with the broader discipline and other developments related to courses and the discipline.</li> <li>• Tests, assignments, rubrics, practice, and projects accurately and productively assess student learning aligned to course outcomes and provide both formative and summative feedback to students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other Evidence</b></p>	<p>This section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other Evidence Self-assessment</li> <li>• Evidence of professional development related to teaching (required)</li> <li>• Thoughtfully selected additional evidence to demonstrate continuous growth and commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-assessment clearly explains the significance of each artifact included.</li> <li>• Professional development is ongoing and demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement and meets “point” requirements.</li> <li>• Other evidence is included thoughtfully and demonstrates continuous growth and commitment to inclusion, engagement, and student achievement.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Scholarship is an important component of a faculty member’s work, as it helps to ensure that course content and activities are current and relevant. Faculty must demonstrate the quality of their scholarship, as outlined in the Scholarship criteria later in this document. Be mindful that this demonstration of quality is more important than the quantity of documentation in this section of the portfolio.</i></p> <p><b>Non-tenure track faculty are not required to include evidence of scholarship in their portfolios.</b></p>		





<p><b>Scholarship</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Overall Self-assessment:</b> A self-assessment (2-3 pages) of one's scholarship during the current evaluation period, and an explanation of the documents in the Scholarship tab.</li> <li>• A table of contents for the scholarship section.</li> <li>• <b>Annual Self-assessments:</b> A self-assessment of one's scholarship and discipline-related professional development for each year of the current evaluation period. These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member's self-evaluation in the annual review.</li> <li>• Evidence of peer-reviewed scholarship that meets the minimum thresholds outlined in the Scholarship section of this document.</li> <li>• <b>Optional:</b> Additional evidence demonstrating consistent and developing scholarship, as outlined in the Scholarship section of this document.</li> </ul>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>
<p><i>Service establishes the faculty member as a good citizen within the department, school, University, community, and discipline. Faculty must demonstrate the quality of their service, as outlined in the Service criteria later in this document. Be mindful that this demonstration of quality is more important than the quantity of documentation in this section of the portfolio.</i></p> <p><b>Non-tenure track faculty are not required to include evidence of service in their portfolios.</b></p>		



<p><b>Service</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Overall Self-assessment:</b> A brief overview (2-3 pages) of one’s service during the current evaluation period, and an explanation of the documents in the Service tab.</li> <li>• A table of contents for the service section.</li> <li>• <b>Annual Self-assessments:</b> A self-assessment of one’s service for each year of the current evaluation period. These can/should be copied directly from the faculty member’s self-evaluation in the annual review.</li> <li>• Evidence demonstrating consistent and developing service, as outlined in the Service section of this document</li> </ul>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Note also that the self-assessments 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.</i></p>
<p><i>The sections below are more administrative and often completed by the RTP committee. While the faculty member can add the RTP criteria (this document), annual reviews, and policy, these sections are technically the responsibility of the RTP committee chair, according to Policy 637. Additionally, the candidate should <b>not</b> add anything to the Solicited Peer Evaluations section.</i></p>		
<p><b>RTP Criteria</b></p>	<p>A copy of the department RTP criteria against which the faculty member shall be evaluated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For tenure, these are generally the criteria under which the faculty member was hired, though they can choose to be evaluated under more recent criteria. Faculty who choose to use more recent criteria should document this decision with the RTP chair and the department chair and include this documentation.</li> <li>• For rank advancement, these should be the most recently approved criteria for the department.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Annual reviews</b></p>	<p>This section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The initial tenure/rank advancement plan and the third year revision</li> <li>• The completed annual performance review (not just the faculty self-evaluation) for each year in the evaluation period</li> <li>• RTP committee portfolio evaluations from each year in the evaluation period (strongly encouraged for tenured and non-tenure track faculty)</li> <li>• Letters of recommendation from the RTP committee, department chair, and dean at midterm review, as applicable</li> <li>• Documentation of any significant changes to the original tenure/rank advancement plan, as outlined in this document</li> <li>• Annual review improvement plans, if any</li> </ul> <p>These documents should be in chronological order, with the most recent first.</p>	<p>Annual reviews are generally positive and free from recurring issues. If there are issues in an annual review, subsequent annual reviews document that those issues have been resolved, without sacrificing other areas of performance.</p>
<p><b>Solicited Peer Evaluations</b></p>	<p>The School of Education does not utilize Solicited Peer Evaluations. These are reviews that are <i>unknown</i> to the faculty member.</p> <p>This section of your portfolio should be empty.</p> <p><b>Do not solicit letters of support for your application for tenure or rank advancement.</b></p>	
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>A copy of the relevant policy (Tenure 637, Rank Advancement 632).</p>	



## Appendix H: Advancement of Teaching Committee's Teaching Excellence Model

### Teaching Excellence Model

Definition of Teaching Excellence:

*Excellent teaching is inclusive and engaging and empowers students to achieve their educational, personal, and professional goals.*

#### INCLUDE

Inclusive teaching values every student and provides accessible, equitable, and culturally diverse learning experiences and resources for students of all backgrounds. Inclusive teaching fosters an inviting and supportive environment in which students can succeed.

*For example, UVU faculty may demonstrate through:*

- Curate course materials that represent global diversity, the diversity of the field, and the contested and evolving status of knowledge. [1] [13] [22]
- Design courses and select course resources with physical and content accessibility in mind, including through the integration of Universal Design for Learning principles. [20][18]
- Develop and demonstrate intercultural competence in instruction and communication. [10] [13]
- Maximize student motivation by leveraging students' sense of the relevance, rigor, and supportiveness of a course—and of their own self efficacy within it. [17] [25]
- Increase the expression of diverse perspectives in class and through online fora, with collegiality and mutual respect, to advance students' understanding. [6] [16] [24]

#### ENGAGE

Engaged *teaching* provides meaningful, interactive, and experiential learning opportunities that integrate into the fabric of the community.

Engaged *teachers* participate in ongoing dialogue about teaching and learning, professional development, innovation, and reflection about their work.

*For example, UVU faculty may demonstrate through:*

- Facilitate group work, collaborative learning, problem-based learning, or team-based learning. [8] [21] [26]
- Implement appropriate technologies to facilitate learner outcomes. [19]
- Communicate regularly and promptly with students to address concerns and questions. [7] [23]
- Demonstrate course content/activities that are authentic to future career opportunities. [12] [27]





- Reflect on their teaching practice and make changes over time that are informed by experimentation, professional teaching development, collegial interactions and class observations, student feedback (e.g., SRI), SCOTs observations, and the scholarship of teaching and learning. [4] [5]

### **ACHIEVE**

Achievement-focused teaching empowers students to gain essential knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to face the challenges of a dynamic and complex world. Instructors promote deep learning by integrating disciplinary currency/mastery with metacognitive pedagogy and design of instruction to guide students in realizing outcomes that include learning soft-, hard-, process-, and career-specific skills.

*For example, UVU faculty may demonstrate through:*

- Create assignments to practice application of course concepts in discipline-relevant situations. [17] [28]
- Provide low-stakes formative assessments with feedback in preparation for high-stakes summative assessments. [2] [3] [28]
- Build occasions for student reflection about their own learning processes, challenges, and growth (metacognition). [1] [11] [25]
- Lead with questions and model expert thought by “thinking aloud” when encountering problems. [14]
- Clearly communicate compelling goals for student learning and design courses tightly aligned with those goals (backward design). [28]
- Clearly convey the purpose, process for completion, and criteria for evaluation of class assignments before students begin work (transparency). [29]





## Appendix I: Examples of Inclusion, Engagement, and Achievement

Examples of Inclusion, Engagement, and Student Achievement		
	Enhancing the Student Experience	Improving Faculty Understanding and Practice
<b>Inclusion</b>	<p>Course Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiated/inclusive course materials</li> <li>• Efforts to ensure that course materials are ADA compliant</li> <li>• Inclusion of open educational resources</li> <li>• Syllabus statements and policies focused on inclusion</li> <li>• Syllabi that reflect the Global/Intercultural course designation</li> <li>• Flexible delivery of the curriculum to increase access for working students</li> <li>• Curriculum shows evidence of diverse perspectives and provides multiple means of representation and expression</li> </ul> <p>Other Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of and reflection on responses to class feedback instruments created by the faculty member that include items about the classroom atmosphere. For example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students report an atmosphere devoid of discrimination or stereotyping</li> <li>○ Students report feeling safe asking questions that might challenge the cultural mindset of other classmates</li> <li>○ Students report feeling supported by the instructor and that their personal background and experiences are being used in a positive to promote in-class learning</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Communication artifacts</li> <li>• Office hours and flexible methods of communication</li> <li>• Supervisor, peer, or SCOT observations or material reviews focused on inclusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundations of Inclusion certification</li> <li>• Global/Intercultural certification</li> <li>• Universal Design for Learning training</li> <li>• Online Teaching Academy certification</li> <li>• Online/hybrid course design training</li> <li>• Research completed that focuses on inclusion and diversity</li> <li>• Participation in workshops (e.g., Learning Circles) that focus on inclusion and diversity</li> <li>• Reflections on participation that impacted teaching practice</li> </ul>
<b>Engagement</b>	<p>Course Materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service-Learning certification</li> <li>• Mentoring Academy certification</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing contemporary curriculum anchored in real world application</li> <li>• Syllabi, lesson plans, and/or assignments that demonstrate attention to collaborative, problem-/project-based, team-based, and/or authentic learning.</li> <li>• Syllabi, assignments, or other evidence that reflect the implementation of High Impact Practices (i.e., service-learning, undergraduate research, internships, and/or capstone experiences, etc.) anchored in contemporary real-world applications.</li> <li>• Syllabus statements and policies focused on engagement.</li> <li>• Evidence and evaluation of the use of technology in teaching practice. Evaluation of the use of technology demonstrates what worked well and what didn't; and, specific ideas for improving on what did not work.</li> </ul> <p>Other Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisor, peer, or SCOT observations or material reviews focused on student engagement.</li> <li>• Implementation of and reflection on responses to class feedback instruments created by the faculty member that include items about teaching methods. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students report an active learning experience that is tied to their own ability to learn in the classroom</li> <li>○ Students indicate that technology was used effectively to support learning and assessment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Student mentoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Based Learning certification</li> <li>• POGIL training</li> <li>• Participation in workshops that focus on the effective use of technology in instruction, with reflection on how this participation impacted teaching practice.</li> <li>• Participation in workshops that focus on engaged pedagogies, with reflection on how this participation impacted teaching practice.</li> <li>• Research completed that focuses on the scholarship of teaching and learning generally or within the given discipline.</li> <li>• Grants to enhance teaching (e.g., Course Development grants, Service-learning grants, etc.)</li> <li>• Development of global/intercultural student experiences (not included in Service)</li> <li>• Development of clinical programs</li> </ul>
<b>Student Achievement</b>	<p>Course Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of new courses and/or programs to meet community demands</li> <li>• Assessments that demonstrate rigor, currency, and/or alignment with course and/or program outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HEA fellowship</li> <li>• Teaching awards</li> <li>• Evidence of discipline-related professional development specifically intended to improve course content and outcomes (not included in Scholarship)</li> </ul>





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly articulated course objectives that are aligned to program learning outcomes and industry expectations.</li> <li>• Demonstrated alignment between course objectives, content, and assessments.</li> <li>• Assignments with clearly articulated purpose, instructions, and success criteria.</li> <li>• Lesson plans, assignments, etc. that demonstrate opportunities for student reflection or self-assessment.</li> <li>• Syllabi and/or lesson plans that clearly indicate the inclusion of current disciplinary research and/or industry practices.</li> <li>• Lesson plans that include clear modeling of expert thought, discourse, or practice within the discipline.</li> </ul> <p>Other Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of use of Early Alert, Civitas, and Success Specialists to intervene with struggling students (attention to improving pass rates).</li> <li>• Evidence of student learning aligned to course and/or program outcomes</li> <li>• Implementation of and reflection on responses to class feedback instruments created by the faculty member that include items about student achievement. For example:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students report that course content and assignments are relevant and authentic</li> <li>○ Students report timely and useful feedback on assignments</li> <li>○ Students report new insights about themselves as learners that could be leveraged in future learning</li> <li>○ Students report that instructor helped them understand why the requirements of the course were included, and helped them to see how the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired in the class will be useful upon graduation and in the future.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation and reflection on the impact of professional development related to curriculum alignment, assessment, metacognition, or student success.</li> </ul>
--	---	--





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of reflection on course outcomes, including class feedback, and iterative course improvements based on those outcomes; evidence of application of pedagogical research-based methods.</li><li>• Growth in student knowledge/ability as measured by a standardized assessment collected in a pre-/post-test format.</li></ul>	
--	---	--





**Appendix J: School of Education Summary of SRIs Form**

**School of Education SRI Summary and Reflection Form**

In the table below, list each course you have taught during the current evaluation period in the first column. Identify the dates of each year of the current evaluation period in the top row. Add additional rows and columns, if needed. Then average your SRI “Instructor Evaluation” scores for all sections of that course during each year. Below each average score, note how many sections and how many student responses are represented in the score.

Place an asterisk next to any averages that represent fewer than 50 total students. Place an N/A in any year in which you did not teach a given course. Bold any average scores over 4.9.

<i>Average Yearly Instructor Evaluation Scores Per Course</i>					
<b>Courses</b>	<b>Year 1: e.g., 2018-2019</b>	<b>Year 2: e.g., 2019-2020</b>	<b>Year 3: e.g., 2020-2021</b>	<b>Year 4:</b>	<b>Year 5:</b>
e.g., EDEL 1010 – Introduction to Education	e.g., 4.75* 2 sections, 38 total responses	e.g., N/A	e.g., <b>4.92</b> 3 sections, 64 students		

Reflect on areas in which your scores and/or comments suggest you are doing particularly well. Cite specific student comments to support your reflection.

Reflect on areas in which your scores and/or comments suggest that improvement is needed. Cite specific student comments and include how you have adjusted or plan to adjust your teaching practice in response to these comments.





Provide context in cases in which the scores and/or comments may have resulted from factors outside of your control (e.g., course modality being changed suddenly), bias, pedagogical experimentation, or student misperceptions.

