

English and Literature Department RTP Criteria

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

Date of Approval:

	Tenure	Rank Advancement	Post-tenure Review
Department Faculty	11/20/2020	NA	NA
Department Chair	NA	BW 11.23.20	NA
College RTP Committee	NA		NA
Dean			NA
SVPAA			
President		NA	NA
Faculty Senate Committee	NA		NA

DRAFT

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

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

RTP Criteria

Relevant Policies and Statements

- UVU Policy 632: Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank
- UVU Policy 635: Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities
- UVU Policy 637: Faculty Tenure
- UVU Policy 646: Faculty Appeals for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Because granting tenure has longterm consequences related to employment in the department, college, and university, it should be awarded only when the department will be improved by granting tenure rather than by hiring anew. This is the overriding criterion. The RTP criteria below are to help reviewers of the portfolio make this determination. The department should not accept a longterm commitment if there is any doubt on this matter.

Rank advancement to Professor is reserved for faculty members who are clearly exemplary in teaching, scholarship, and service. To advance to Professor, the candidate must be exemplary and have achieved distinction above requirements for tenure and the rank of Associate Professor. The RTP criteria below are to help reviewers of the portfolio make this determination.

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

Faculty employed in tenure track positions prior to the approval of these criteria may apply for tenure under these criteria if approved by the department chair, dean, and senior vice president for academic affairs. Faculty should include any such documents prior to the approval of these criteria.

Tenured faculty and lecturers are subject to these criteria upon their approval. A complete record of SRIs and annual reviews is expected for faculty who apply for rank advancement, but a complete record of other elements is not required for years prior to approval of these criteria. Faculty should include any such documents acquired prior to the approval of these criteria.

The committee will review each item of evidence presented in the portfolio, first, to determine whether it properly conforms to the criteria listed below, i.e., whether it is situated appropriately with respect to the Portfolio Tabs; second, to determine the degree to which the evidence substantiates the claims made in either or both the Informational Statement and the self-assessment or introductory statement in the appropriate tab; and third, as one aspect of a total picture of the candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to present this total picture, as the committee makes its recommendation based upon a holistic assessment of the portfolio, its demonstration of accomplishment and ongoing professional development in all three areas (teaching, scholarship, service), and indications of future professional promise. For these reasons, the candidate should treat the narrative components of the portfolio with extreme care, as these provide the framework and context within which the committee will interpret all additional evidence. Narratives should specify the function each piece of evidence is meant to serve in the candidate's case for tenure or promotion. Criteria are primarily qualitative, although even when the candidate meets or exceeds criteria that can be quantitatively measured (as designated below), evidence should be provided and accounted for in the appropriate narrative, as in such cases the RTP committee defers to the qualitative proof of excellence specified throughout the present document. Narratives also should address any outstanding areas of possible concern and make clear how the candidate has addressed or intends to address these concerns, providing additional corroborating evidence as appropriate. While there is no minimum or maximum expected number of individual evidentiary items, the candidate should incorporate any such items that help educate the committee as to the scope and potential impact of the candidate's contributions to the department, discipline, and profession. Evidence without context lacks the appropriate weight adequately to inform the RTP committee's deliberations. Because the RTP Committee is not generally comprised of faculty with extensive expertise in the candidate's area(s) of specialization, its deliberations concerning scope and impact with respect to the candidate's scholarly activities are additionally informed by solicited external reviews.

Tenured faculty shall make themselves available as mentors for tenure-track faculty, beginning the first semester of the tenure-track faculty member's appointment. It is the candidate's responsibility to designate a mentor and make full use of available mentorship opportunities, which will include without being limited to matters of retention, tenure, and promotion. The frequency of mentorship engagements between junior and senior faculty may vary, but such engagements should take place at least annually. At the beginning of the academic year, the RTP Committee Chair shall meet with all tenure-track faculty to discuss policy, process and deadlines, and to facilitate mentorship relationships between tenured and tenure-track faculty. At the end of the academic year, each designated faculty mentor shall provide a brief memo of their mentorship activities to the RTP Committee Chair; in turn, the RTP Committee Chair will provide each faculty mentor documentation of their proof of this service to the department.

The English and Literature Department's timeline for submission and evaluation of midterm review and tenure applications conforms with the timeline specified in UVU Policy 637. The timeline for submission and evaluation of rank advancement applications conforms with the timeline specified in with UVU Policy 632.

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
Table of Contents	A detailed, organized list of everything in the portfolio*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thoroughness • Clarity • All required sections/tabs are present and contain credible documentation. 	NA
Informational Statement	A cover letter (typically 2-3 pages) introducing and reflecting on overall performance during the period under review*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes contributions to department, college, university, and profession • Describes extent to which departmental expectations were met • Describes circumstances that helped or hindered progress • Offers guidance to reviewers in how to evaluate portfolio materials 	NA
Curriculum Vitae	A current and complete curriculum vitae*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thoroughness & accuracy of reporting • Organization and clarity • Emphasizes work done during the period under review 	NA
Teaching	A narrative (typically 2-3 pages) of the faculty member's teaching that defines and details excellence, or deliberate progress towards excellence, of teaching*	<p>Faculty are expected to create learning environments that allow for the free pursuit of learning in an atmosphere of civility, respect the rights of all students, exhibit and foster honest academic conduct, and evaluate students fairly.</p> <p>Evidence of educational rigor, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A focus on engaged teaching and learning (see www.uvu.edu/otl/faculty/index.html for faculty development resources from the Office of Teaching and Learning) • Innovative teaching techniques • Continual improvement, evolution, diversification, and reflection as a teacher • Pedagogical development and/or pedagogical research <p>Rank Advancement to Professor (in addition to the above):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A professional development agenda demonstrating a measurable broadening of pedagogical activities and abilities. • An increasingly active role in ensuring teaching excellence across the department, such as through mentorship of junior faculty, leading department-wide teaching workshops, or providing reports to department faculty detailing how and why one's scholarly activities inform and improve teaching. • Conference participation for the purpose or with the result of enhancing one's pedagogy. • Research presentation(s) to department faculty in order to develop a wider local audience for one's work • Responses to comments in the SRIs, substantive reflection on those comments, and demonstrable action in response. • As per the "Teaching Excellence" model, demonstrated success in the three core areas of: inclusivity; student engagement; and academic achievement (see https://www.uvu.edu/otl/faculty/tep.html for additional resources, guidance, and learning opportunities) 	NA

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
Self-Assessment	Collected copies of teaching self-assessment sections from all annual reviews during probationary years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continual improvement, evolution, diversification, and reflection as a teacher <p>Documents in this section will be assessed according to same criteria listed under "Teaching" above.</p>	NA
Supervisor Assessment	Supervisor assessments of teaching (one for each year) that describe and evaluate the faculty member's teaching performance, based on direct classroom observation*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete record of supervisor assessments Flexibility in accepting teaching schedule to meet department needs Evidence of addressing problem areas from assessments in other parts of the portfolio 	NA
Peer Assessment	Peer assessments solicited by the faculty member prior to submitting the Faculty Portfolio for review (at least 1 peer assessment per each year of the period under review)*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates subject matter mastery, the ability to clearly present material, and effective pedagogical strategies. Demonstrates a positive working relationship with students, according to measures such as: student interaction with course materials and lesson content; student engagement in classroom activities; effective use of class time; and instructional professionalism. 	NA
SRIs	Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) from all courses taught on load during the evaluation period. Gaps due to course releases or untaken SRIs (e.g. individual student internships) should be noted and explained*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive and negative patterns of student comments Evidence of addressing issues from SRIs in other parts of the portfolio Evidence of meeting obligations pertaining to course instruction, including holding class as scheduled and being available to assist students. 	NA
Curriculum & Course Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum proposals Materials for development of new courses. Substantive revisions to courses Contributions to First Year Writing Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum changes address department need Demonstrate commitment of time and effort in support of student learning, according to the "Teaching Excellence" model (inclusivity, engagement, achievement). Running workshops and discussions that improve the quality of teaching amongst peers Implementation of new course materials and courses as appropriate and possible. 	NA
Other Evidence	<p>Other evidence should draw widely from the following list of possible evidence and demonstrate varied methods of excellence and dedication to one's development as a teacher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample syllabi Honors/awards for teaching (college, university, state, regional, national) Additional or new course preparations beyond typical course assignments Engaged learning, service-learning, online, hybrid, or other experiential-learning (e.g., study abroad program, etc.) Supervising independent study, directed readings, and internships Mentoring students towards on and off campus publication opportunities Mentoring students to present academic work at campus, local, regional, or national conferences Team teaching Presenting at national, regional, or on-campus teaching-oriented workshops or conferences Additional peer analysis of classroom teaching techniques or materials Other student evaluations of teaching, distinct from course assignments Organizing and hosting writing or literary colloquia, writing groups, reading series, in-service for students and/or faculty Sponsoring and/or judging writing contests Letters from students 	<p>Documents in this section will be assessed according to same criteria listed under "Self-Assessment" above: educational rigor; a focus on engaged teaching and learning; innovative teaching techniques; pedagogical development and/or pedagogical research; and continual improvement, evolution, diversification, and reflection as a teacher.</p>	<p>In the document, how will a faculty member know how to define "rigor" and "innovative?"</p> <p>Is the "Teaching Excellence" model a particular document available to faculty members?</p>

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using campus resources (such as programs and services offered by the Office of Teaching and Learning) to improve pedagogy or implement engaged learning strategies Other documentation or evidence of effective teaching, as determined by the faculty member 		
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An introductory statement (typically 2-3 pages) that explains the documents in the Scholarship section* Evidence detailing achievements from the following hierarchical list:* <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Scholarly or creative monographs (books and other major works) appropriate to the faculty member's field(s) of expertise after peer or similarly competitive review. Short scholarly or creative works (articles, essays, poems, short stories, etc.) appropriate to the faculty member's field(s) of expertise after peer or similarly competitive review. Peer reviewed, national edition textbooks. Editor for special issue of a peer reviewed publication or essay collection. Research presentations at refereed regional or national conferences. Proceedings presented in peer reviewed periodicals. Review articles in peer reviewed periodicals. Invited scholarly lectures or public readings of creative works. Winning, or being named a finalist in, creative writing contests. Award(s) for scholarly or creative work, such as the Dean's Scholarship Award, Presidential Scholar, etc. Other measures of scholarship, as proposed and justified by the faculty member; the evidentiary validity of such measures carry a rebuttable presumption—i.e., an expectation that they are insufficient evidence of scholarship—which it is the faculty member's burden to overcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introductory statement accurately represents and categorizes the work based on the nature of publication/venue and the type of review underwent. Production of regular contribution to academic discourse beyond the classroom that contributes to the candidate's field(s) of study Demonstrates the scholarly productivity delineated in tenure plans and annual reviews, primarily through peer reviewed or similarly juried publications Value and contribution to the field as assessed by outside, solicited peer evaluations Given the expectation of regular effort towards peer or competitive review of work, the <i>quality</i> of faculty members' scholarly or creative contribution will be considered more important than the number of contributions. Custom contract and other vanity publications will not be considered meaningful contributions. 	<p>Tenure: The faculty member publishes 1 or more pieces of peer reviewed scholarship before tenure. The number of pieces deemed sufficient will vary by candidate, but is determined by characteristics such as: length (e.g. article versus monograph); citations generated; journal impact score; adoptions into course syllabi and/or programs; etc.</p> <p>Rank advancement to Professor: 1 or more additional pieces of peer reviewed scholarship since earning tenure that represents continued evidence of scholarly activity beyond that required for tenure, evaluated according to criteria above.</p>
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An introductory statement (typically 2-3 pages) that explains the documents in the Service section* <p>Artifacts that document service in the following capacities, most often in the form of letters from committee leaders/other members or documents (co-)created in the process:*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department chair or assistant department chair Program director, writing program administrator, or similar administrative assignment Advisor for student publications sponsored by the department, college, university, or other academic entity Established and ad hoc committees at department, college, and university levels Faculty senator Coordinator for study abroad programs, domestic multicultural experiences, and other experiential learning endeavors Search committees National, regional, state, or local committee connected to the faculty member's area of expertise Officer for a national, regional, state, or local committee connected to the faculty member's area of expertise Organizer or leader for a workshop or other student learning experience Club advisor Referee for students' applications to internships, post-baccalaureate studies, and similar endeavors Thesis director or advisor, e.g., for Honors or Integrated Studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates record of regular contributions at varied levels (department, college, and university) Letters from colleagues detail the intensity of the service obligations (frequency of meetings, number of meetings, preparation time, unique contributions of candidate). When possible, service work highlights the unique contributions made based on the candidate's area(s) of expertise. Number of committees and positions held will be considered less important than the intensity of work required by service positions. 	<p>Tenure: The number of activities deemed sufficient will vary by candidate, but is determined by characteristics such as: impact of contribution (minimal versus substantial); rank in group (chair versus member); scope of committee (department versus university); required time commitment (1 hour per month versus 12 hours per week); etc.</p> <p>Rank advancement to Professor: Activity that represents continued evidence of service beyond that required for tenure, evaluated according to criteria above.</p>

Portfolio Tabs	Contents	Qualitative RTP Criteria	Quantitative RTP Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer evaluator Attendance at department and committee meetings Other measures of service, as determined by the faculty member 		
RTP Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain a copy of the department RTP criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated* Document appropriate review criteria as per UVU policy 637 	NA	NA
Annual Reviews	Copies of all annual reviews from the period under review*	<p>Tenure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reviews are generally free from problematic behaviors (student complaints, missing or being late to classes, not attending department or committee meetings, not turning in grades, etc.). If there are problematic behaviors, subsequent annual reviews document that issues were resolved. <p>Rank advancement to Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per UVU Policy 632, Letters of commendation must be included in the portfolio; letters of reprimand must be included in the portfolio. Any previously submitted rebuttals to letters of reprimand may be included in the portfolio but are not required. 	NA
Solicited Peer Evaluations	<p>At least 2 evaluation letters from peers focusing primarily on the candidate's professional standing, evidenced in the candidate's scholarly or creative works*</p> <p>External peer evaluators will be clearly informed, in writing, of the intensive nature of teaching at Utah Valley University at the time they are selected to contribute evaluations. External peer evaluators will receive a copy of the English and Literature Department's criteria for retention or tenure and be asked to complete evaluations with these criteria in mind.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer evaluations will inform the committee's assessment of the candidate's contributions to the profession. 	NA
Policy	Copies of Policy numbers 632 and 637*	NA	NA

Annual Review and Post-tenure Review Criteria

Annual Reviews:

The criteria for annual reviews is that faculty performance be consistent with the principles set forth in the above RTP criteria, with the recognition that tenure and rank advancement are based on the cumulative work of faculty over multiple years while annual reviews reflect what might reasonably be accomplished in a single year. In addition, faculty need to follow UVU policies and procedures, including completion of required trainings.

Post-Tenure Review – Annual:

Same as the annual review criteria.

Post-Tenure Review – 5th Year:

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

DRAFT ONLY