

Annual Review, Tenure, and Academic Rank Criteria
Department of Mathematics
College of Science
Utah Valley University

1. Department Philosophy on Tenure and Academic Rank

1.1. Tenure

1.1.1. Tenure represents a commitment on the part of an academic institution to an individual to support academic inquiry and to protect academic freedom in the classroom. Tenure is also an acknowledgement of the value placed on faculty members by the department and the institution for their contributions to the academic institution and the greater community. The tenure review process is intended to build a distinguished and highly professional faculty that will bring vitality and academic excellence to the department.

1.1.2. A tenured faculty member will make ongoing contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service in support of the mission of the Department of Mathematics and the University.

1.2. Academic Rank

1.2.1. Academic rank recognizes accomplishment and excellence in the work of university faculty. Advancements are granted after service in the previous ranks. These advancement steps provide the opportunity for faculty members to develop and for departments to make academic judgements about a faculty member's readiness for advancement. Advancement beyond the entry level, instructor or assistant professor, is based upon productive work as a faculty member that is exemplary and will bring distinction to the department, the school, and the college.

2. General Guidelines

2.1. Department of Mathematics Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee

2.1.1. RTP Committee Composition

2.1.1.1. The Department of Mathematics RTP Committee (hereafter referred to as the RTP Committee) will consist of five full-time tenured mathematics faculty members. The department chair and associate chairs are not eligible to serve as RTP Committee members.

2.1.1.2. To fill a vacancy on the RTP Committee, the department chair will solicit nominations from the department faculty. The department chair may also nominate RTP Committee members.

2.1.1.3. Each nominee will be voted on individually by the department tenured and tenure-track faculty and is only named to the RTP Committee after receiving a majority of votes from the department.

2.1.1.4. If there are more nominees than available positions, the appropriate number of nominees will be selected through a ranked-choice ballot and Borda count. The nominees will then be voted on individually by the department and is only named to the RTP Committee after receiving a majority of votes from the department.

- 2.1.1.5.** Members of the RTP Committee serve for a term of three years. There is no limit to the number of terms an RTP Committee member may serve, consecutive or otherwise, but they must be reelected every three years. Faculty members are encouraged to not serve more than two consecutive terms at a time.
- 2.1.1.6.** Members of the RTP Committee may resign at any time by written notice to the department chair. They will be replaced via the process outlined in this section. The replacement committee member will be elected to a term consisting of the remainder of the current year and two additional academic years so that elections can occur between academic years.
- 2.1.1.7.** Members of the RTP Committee may be removed from the committee by a majority vote of the department tenured and tenure-track faculty. Such a vote may be initiated by a complaint of at least three tenured and/or tenure-track faculty members made to the department chair. The chair must keep confidential the identities of the faculty members making the complaint, but may announce the substance of the complaint to the department faculty so long as doing so does not reveal the identity of a complaining faculty member. This process will be done under the consultation and direction of the dean of the College of Science.
- 2.1.1.8.** After any change to the composition of the RTP Committee, the new composition must be approved by the dean.
- 2.1.1.9.** Each year by September 10, the RTP Committee will elect one of its members as chair of the committee. This will be done by a simple majority vote.

2.1.2. General Duties and Responsibilities of the RTP Committee

- 2.1.2.1.** The RTP Committee will monitor the progress of tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty seeking rank advancement and clarify departmental expectations of faculty members regarding tenure and rank advancement.
- 2.1.2.2.** The RTP Committee will meet with each tenure and rank advancement candidate by September 30 each year to review progress on the candidate's tenure or rank advancement plan.
- 2.1.2.3.** The RTP Committee will meet at other times upon request by either a tenure or rank advancement candidate or the RTP Committee chair.
- 2.1.2.4.** The RTP Committee is charged to make every effort to mentor faculty members to assist them in achieving appropriate goals as they seek tenure and advancement in rank.
- 2.1.2.5.** In all proceedings, the RTP Committee will respect the rights of the candidate as specified in University policies.
- 2.1.2.6.** All decisions and recommendations of the RTP Committee are decided by a simple majority vote of the committee.
- 2.1.2.7.** The RTP Committee will review and revise, if necessary, this criteria document once every five years coinciding with the year that the UVU Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Committee has scheduled the Department of Mathematics criteria for review.

2.2. Department Chair Responsibilities to Provide Faculty Mentors to Tenure-Track Faculty

- 2.2.1. The department chair will assign a mentor to each new tenure-track faculty member and inform the new faculty member. The mentor must be a tenured Department of Mathematics faculty member. The department chair may serve as a mentor if the chair desires so. The department chair will keep a record of mentors assigned to faculty members.
- 2.2.2. The department chair will also serve as a resource to help faculty members understand their roles as members of the department and to assist them in meeting their annual review, tenure, and rank advancement goals.

2.3. Duties of Department Faculty to Support Junior Faculty

- 2.3.1. Tenured department faculty should be willing to serve as faculty mentors unless there is an extenuating circumstance as determined by the department chair.
 - 2.3.2. In general, senior faculty will provide advice and assistance to junior faculty colleagues as needed on matters relating to retention, tenure, and promotion.
- 2.4. The UVU university-wide and College of Science tenure and academic rank policies shall take precedence over this department policy in the event of any conflict between policies.

2.5. Revisions to this Criteria Document

- 2.5.1. Revisions to this document can be initiated at most once per year by the RTP Committee, but must at least occur once every five years coinciding with the year that the UVU Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Committee has scheduled the Department of Mathematics criteria for review.
- 2.5.2. Revisions to this criteria document must first be approved by the RTP Committee. The RTP Committee should work with the UVU Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Committee to identify and correct deficiencies to this criteria document.
- 2.5.3. The department chair then reviews the criteria and can either approve the criteria or send it back to the RTP Committee for revision.
- 2.5.4. After the chair approves, the changes must be voted on in favor of by a majority of Department of Mathematics faculty. If not approved, the criteria document is sent back to the RTP Committee for revision.
- 2.5.5. After the department approves the criteria, the RTP Committee sends the criteria to the dean who reviews and approves the criteria or sends it back to the department.
- 2.5.6. The department may make revisions and submit the criteria through this process again. Unless revision is required by the Office of Academic Affairs, the department may vote to suspend the revision process for an academic year.
- 2.5.7. After the dean approves the criteria, the dean submits the proposed criteria to the Provost.
- 2.5.8. Once approved by the Provost, the criteria goes into effect at the beginning of the next Fall semester.

2.6. General Rank Guidelines

2.6.1. Initial Rank

- 2.6.1.1. Newly hired tenure-track faculty members are typically assigned the rank Assistant Professor.
- 2.6.1.2. Newly hired tenured or tenure-track faculty members may be assigned the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with or without tenure according to UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank if they have previous academic experience. Initial rank and a tenure clock reduction is negotiated with the dean of the College of Science at the time of hire.
- 2.6.1.3. To be considered for an Assistant Professor position, the faculty member must possess a doctorate from a regionally accredited academic institution or have received one by the time of hire.
- 2.6.1.4. If a faculty member is hired and has not yet obtained a doctorate by the time of employment, they will be assigned the rank of Instructor. In such cases, the letter of appointment will include specific conditions that must be met to qualify for advancement to Assistant Professor and a fixed term for completion of these requirements. The rank of Instructor is always a limited time appointment and will not extend beyond five years. Once the conditions are met (as defined in the letter of appointment), which will include attainment of the expected terminal degree from a regionally accredited academic institution, the faculty member is granted the rank of Assistant Professor and begins the first year of a tenure-track position.
- 2.6.1.5. Typically, the tenure-track lasts for six years with a midterm review initiated at the beginning of the third year and a tenure review initiated at the beginning of the sixth year.
- 2.6.1.6. Exceptions to the above guidelines must be approved by the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs after recommendation by the department chair and dean.

2.6.2. Tenure-Track Ranks

- 2.6.2.1. Instructor – Pre-tenure-track faculty member who does not yet possess a doctorate from a regionally accredited academic institution.
- 2.6.2.2. Assistant Professor – Tenure-track faculty member who has a doctorate from a regionally accredited academic institution.
- 2.6.2.3. Associate Professor – Either (1) a tenure-track faculty member who has a doctorate from a regionally accredited academic institution, received tenure or its equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university besides UVU, and negotiated with the dean to start with the rank of Associate Professor; or (2) a UVU-tenured faculty member with a doctorate from a regionally accredited academic institution.
- 2.6.2.4. Professor – Tenured faculty member who has a doctorate from a regionally accredited academic institution, a minimum of five years of teaching, scholarship, and service as a tenured associate professor, and successful fulfillment of the requirements of this criteria document for promotion to Professor.

2.6.3. Non-Tenure-Track Ranks in the Department of Mathematics

- 2.6.3.1. Lecturer – Non-tenure-track teaching faculty member who has at least a master's degree from a regionally accredited academic institution. A Lecturer in the Department of Mathematics typically teaches for their entire workload, but may have some of this workload replaced for an appropriate administrative appointment. This appointment is negotiated with the dean of the College of Science and must be approved through the office of academic affairs. The

appointment of a Lecturer may be on a temporary or recurring basis as negotiated with the dean of the College of Science. This position does not have rank advancement.

2.6.3.2. Visiting Faculty – Non-tenure-track visiting faculty member with a temporary appointment at the academic rank negotiated with the department chair, dean of the College of Science, and the office of academic affairs at the time of appointment. The academic rank is typically consistent with the rank held in a previous faculty position or commensurate with the visiting faculty's experience. Faculty of this type are not otherwise covered by this criteria document.

2.6.3.3. Adjunct Faculty – Non-tenure-track faculty member paid hourly or by semester. Faculty of this type are not otherwise covered by this criteria document.

2.6.4. Basic Rank Advancement Guidelines

2.6.4.1. Advancement from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is automatic upon obtaining tenure. If the faculty member is already an Associate Professor when they receive tenure, then no rank advancement accompanies the awarding of tenure. Application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor follows the procedure described in UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure.

2.6.4.2. Advancement from Associate Professor to Professor requires a minimum of five years of experience in teaching, scholarship, and service as a tenured Associate Professor, with exemplary achievement in each of these three categories as defined in this criteria document. Such individuals are expected to have achieved distinction clearly above that of Associate Professor. Application for promotion to Professor follows the procedure described in UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank.

2.6.4.3. It is not expected that all faculty members will eventually advance to Professor. A faculty member may contribute satisfactorily to the institution and receive appropriate recognition and appreciation while remaining at an academic rank below that of Professor.

3. Annual Reviews

3.1. Purpose and General Criteria

3.1.1. Annual reviews are essential to the meaningful evaluation of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty members. These reviews are used to help advance faculty members' professional goals and expectations and to foster and support faculty in teaching, scholarship, service, and compliance with university policies. These reviews also serve to inform decisions regarding tenure and rank advancement and to track progress on tenure and rank advancement goals.

3.2. Annual Review Submission Procedure

3.2.1. Annual reviews will be submitted by faculty in the Department of Mathematics according to the procedure and timeline outlined in UVU Policy 633 Annual Faculty Reviews. The department chair will follow the procedure in the policy as well.

3.2.2. Faculty in the Department of Mathematics will use the approved template provided by the College of Science and the University.

3.2.3. Faculty will include goals for their work every year which should align with the expectations in this criteria document. Their reviews should discuss the previous year's goals. If the faculty member has

an approved tenure plan or rank advancement plan, faculty annual goals should align with the long-term goals of their plans.

- 3.2.4. If the faculty member has an approved tenure plan or rank advancement plan, they should discuss their progress towards the goals of their plan as well and provide any evidence of that progress. The department chair should comment on this alignment and the progress a faculty member has made toward their tenure plan or rank advancement plan.
- 3.2.5. Annual reviews should include a current CV that should be attached to the review template.
- 3.2.6. Annual reviews of faculty members considers variations in assignments given by the department, college, and University in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Understanding that external forces can heavily impact a faculty member, the annual review should also determine whether any tenure plan or rank advancement plan remains realistic or if it needs to be adjusted for the upcoming year. If the plan should be adjusted, this should be done in the annual meeting of the faculty member and the RTP Committee.
- 3.2.7. The department chair will provide feedback on annual reviews that promotes growth in the classroom, discipline, and as citizens of the Department of Mathematics.

3.3. General Expectations

- 3.3.1. Faculty members in the Department of Mathematics are expected to be in compliance with UVU policies. They are also expected to submit an annual Conflict of Interest form, complete mandatory HR trainings, and other mandated university trainings and requirements.
- 3.3.2. Faculty members in the Department of Mathematics are expected to regularly participate in department meetings. This includes attendance at department meetings unless other responsibilities, such as teaching, prevent it. The department chair shall make a reasonable effort to schedule department meetings at a time that optimizes the number of faculty that can attend.

3.4. Expectations of Teaching

- 3.4.1. UVU is primarily a teaching institution. Excellence in teaching is a paramount objective of every faculty member. The criteria we use to evaluate an excellent teacher are the following.

3.4.2. Positive Learning Environments

- 3.4.2.1. Excellent teachers in the Department of Mathematics are expected to provide a positive learning environment to students.
- 3.4.2.2. A positive learning environment includes respecting diversity in courses and supporting student success by providing fair evaluations, timely feedback, holding class as scheduled, holding regular office hours, and attention to student needs including personal attention, as needed.
- 3.4.2.3. Excellence in providing a positive learning environment is defined as going beyond providing just a standard positive learning environment. Excellence entails a proactive effort to innovate and improve upon the level of a positive learning environment that a faculty member already employs or sustaining a high level of a positive learning environment when compared to the average learning environment. Excellence may also include specific efforts promoting inclusion and diversity in course learning environments either in or out of the classroom.

3.4.2.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.4.2.4.1. Instructor evaluation and comments in SRIs relevant to a positive learning environment.

3.4.2.4.2. Peer evaluation comments relevant to a positive learning environment.

3.4.2.4.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to a positive learning environment.

3.4.2.4.4. Other evaluations, such as participation in the SCOTS or POET programs, related to providing a positive learning environment.

3.4.2.4.5. Participation in professional development programs designed to improve an instructor's capability in providing a positive learning environment.

3.4.3. Effective Academic Standards

3.4.3.1. Excellent teachers in the Department of Mathematics are expected to employ effective academic standards.

3.4.3.2. Effective academic standards include setting clear grading standards, presenting approved curriculum, and maintaining high, but reasonable academic expectations avoiding the two extremes of grade inflation and unobtainable standards.

3.4.3.3. Excellence in providing effective academic standards is defined as a proactive effort to innovate and improve upon the level of academic standards that a faculty member already employs or sustaining effective academic standards when compared to average standards. Excellence includes reflecting on the accuracy of evaluation methods and striving to improve upon deficiencies in those methods. Excellence may also include finding new ways to evaluate students' abilities more accurately.

3.4.3.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.4.3.4.1. Instructor evaluation and comments in SRIs relevant to academic standards including grading and course expectations.

3.4.3.4.2. Peer evaluation comments relevant to academic standards including grading and course expectations.

3.4.3.4.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to academic standards including grading and course expectations.

3.4.3.4.4. Other evaluations, such as participation in the SCOTS or POET programs, related to providing effective academic standards including grading and course expectations.

3.4.3.4.5. Participation in professional development programs designed to improve an instructor's capability in providing effective academic standards including grading and course expectations.

3.4.3.4.6. Comparison of an instructor's academic standards to the norm for mathematics instruction at UVU to avoid the two extremes of grade inflation and unobtainable standards.

3.4.4. Robust Preparation and Reflection Practices

- 3.4.4.1. Excellent teachers in the Department of Mathematics are expected to be well prepared for their courses and to reflect on how to improve.
- 3.4.4.2. Robust preparation includes preparing syllabi, well-organized lectures, assessments, in-class activities, and other course materials that promote student learning and meet department course expectations. It also includes maintaining mastery of the content of the courses the instructor teaches.
- 3.4.4.3. Robust reflection practices include making changes to one's instruction in light of SRIs, peer evaluations, supervisor evaluations, and participating in professional development activities related to teaching.
- 3.4.4.4. Excellence in robust preparation and reflection practices is defined as not only seeking out innovative ideas to improve course delivery, but also sharing the positive impacts that such ideas had and how others might employ them. Excellence could be demonstrated by presenting at conferences or leading instructional development programs geared toward improving course delivery.
- 3.4.4.5. The above criteria will be evaluated by
 - 3.4.4.5.1. Instructor evaluation and comments in SRIs relevant to preparation.
 - 3.4.4.5.2. Peer evaluation comments relevant to preparation and reflection.
 - 3.4.4.5.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to preparation and reflection.
 - 3.4.4.5.4. Other evaluations, such as participation in the SCOTS or POET programs, related to preparation and reflection.
 - 3.4.4.5.5. Evidence of participation in and using suggestions from professional development programs designed to improve an instructor's teaching.
 - 3.4.4.5.6. Evidence of participation in teaching conferences or other professional development activities designed to improve teaching. This includes both attending and presenting at such conferences or other professional development activities.

3.4.5. Instructional Performance

- 3.4.5.1. Excellent teachers in the Department of Mathematics are expected to exhibit high instructional performance.
- 3.4.5.2. High instructional performance includes using effective pedagogical techniques and appropriate strategies for engaging students to help students succeed at course learning outcomes.
- 3.4.5.3. Excellence in instructional performance is defined as using innovative instructional practices and showing their efficacy. Excellence may also be indicated by significant improvement in passing and DFW rates when compared to one's average so long as this is not caused by a lowering of academic standards.

3.4.5.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.4.5.4.1. Instructor evaluation and comments in SRIs relevant to instructional performance including using effective pedagogical practices and engaging students.

3.4.5.4.2. Peer evaluation comments relevant to instructional performance including using effective pedagogical practices and engaging students.

3.4.5.4.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to instructional performance including using effective pedagogical practices and engaging students.

3.4.5.4.4. Other evaluations, such as participation in the SCOTS or POET programs, related to instructional performance including using effective pedagogical practices and engaging students.

3.4.5.4.5. Improvements in or better than average passing and DFW rates in courses taught.

3.4.6. Curriculum Development

3.4.6.1. Excellent teachers in the Department of Mathematics are expected to participate in improving the department's programs and curriculum.

3.4.6.2. Curriculum and program development includes participating in creating new courses or programs, participating in modifying existing courses or programs, or participating on committees that evaluate curriculum at the department, college, or University level.

3.4.6.3. Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to participate in curriculum or program development while seeking tenure or rank advancement, and should be willing to participate when the department otherwise has need of curriculum or program changes.

3.4.6.4. Excellence in curriculum or program development is defined as participating in an average of three curriculum or program development activities in a six-year period.

3.4.6.5. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.4.6.5.1. Evidence of participation in curriculum or program development. This may take the form of letters from curriculum or program development committee chairs, documentation of submission of course or program changes, or letters from curriculum committee chairs at the department, college, or University level indicating participation on such committees.

3.4.6.5.2. Annual review self-assessments relevant to curriculum or program development.

3.4.7. Other Instructional Activities

3.4.7.1. Other instructional activities include becoming a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy, supervising undergraduate research (which overlaps with scholarship), teaching an independent study course, supervising student teaching, writing letters of recommendation for students, or serving as a course facilitator (which overlaps with service).

3.4.7.2. Other instructional activities are typically not required. If the activity is required, such as being assigned to serve as a course facilitator, successful execution of these duties is the

expectation. If the activity is not required, such as teaching an independent study course, participation in the activity adds to the case of exceeding expectations in teaching, but is not sufficient on its own to warrant a rating of exceeds expectations in teaching.

3.4.7.3. Other instructional activities are only evaluated if a faculty member participates in them or is assigned to participate in them.

3.4.7.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.4.7.4.1. Documentation of participation in other instructional activities.

3.4.7.4.2. Annual review self-assessments relevant to other instructional activities.

3.4.8. Peer Evaluations of Teaching

3.4.8.1. Each faculty member in the Department of Mathematics must have a peer observe and evaluate one of their classes at least once per year. This peer could be any full-time faculty member of the Department of Mathematics or any other department.

3.4.8.2. Peer evaluators of teaching should use the Department of Mathematics Faculty Peer Evaluation form. This form can be found at the end of this document.

3.4.8.3. Faculty are encouraged to have a different peer evaluator each year. Ideally, a faculty should not use the same evaluator twice in a five-year period.

3.4.8.4. The faculty member must include this peer evaluation in their annual review.

3.4.9. Evaluating Teaching in Annual Reviews

3.4.9.1. The faculty member and department chair both submit an evaluation of teaching in the annual review. The possible ratings of “does not meet expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations” are defined here. Both the faculty member and the department chair will use the definitions below when assigning their rating to teaching.

3.4.9.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

3.4.9.2.1. A faculty member “does not meet expectations” if they fail to achieve expectations in three of the five (six if seeking tenure or rank advancement) expectation criteria above (see sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.4.8; section 3.4.6 is included if seeking tenure or rank advancement).

3.4.9.3. Meets Expectations

3.4.9.3.1. A faculty member “meets expectations” if they achieve at least three of the five (four of the six if seeking tenure or rank advancement) expectation criteria above (see sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.4.8; section 3.4.6 is included if seeking tenure or rank advancement) but does not qualify for “exceeds expectation” defined below.

3.4.9.4. Exceeds Expectations

3.4.9.4.1. A faculty member “exceeds expectations” if they meet all of the five (six if seeking tenure or rank advancement) expectation criteria above (see sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4,

3.4.5, 3.4.8; section 3.4.6 is included if seeking tenure or rank advancement) and achieve excellence in at least three of the expectation criteria above (see section 3.4.2 to section 3.4.8; note that excellence always can include sections 3.4.6 and 3.4.7).

3.5. Expectations of Scholarship

- 3.5.1.** Scholarship is only required of tenured and tenure-track faculty. In this section, the term “faculty members” refers to tenured or tenure-track faculty members unless otherwise specified.
- 3.5.2.** Non-tenure-track faculty members may skip the scholarship portion of the annual review form and should select “meets expectations” for scholarship if the form requires it.
- 3.5.3.** UVU is primarily a teaching institution, but a strong scholarship program is expected and an important objective of every tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The criteria we use to evaluate scholarship are the following.

3.5.4. Scholarly Activity

- 3.5.4.1.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to engage in research or other scholarly activity in a math related field with the goal of giving a talk, publishing a paper or book, or acquiring a patent.
- 3.5.4.2.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to give at least one talk at UVU every three years.
- 3.5.4.3.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to give an academic talk external to UVU, publish a paper or book, acquire a patent, or be awarded a grant from a source external to UVU at least once every three years.
- 3.5.4.4.** Excellence in scholarly activity is defined as significantly larger amounts of scholarly activity than the expectation above. This includes, but is not limited to, more than two papers in three years, more than six talks in three years including at least four talks external to UVU, receiving a grant from an organization outside of UVU or several internal UVU grants, or participating in undergraduate research projects. Excellence may also include scholarly activity that focuses on issues of inclusion and diversity in mathematics.
- 3.5.4.5.** The above criteria will be evaluated by
 - 3.5.4.5.1.** Evidence of the successful completion of an academic talk or presentation.
 - 3.5.4.5.2.** Evidence of the publication of a paper or book or the acquisition of a patent.
 - 3.5.4.5.3.** Annual review self-assessments relevant to scholarly activity.

3.5.5. Conferences

- 3.5.5.1.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to participate and present in academic conferences. This may include planning or chairing conferences or conference sessions and faculty are encouraged to do so.
- 3.5.5.2.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to attend an academic conference at least once every two years.

3.5.5.3. Excellence in the conferences category is defined as significantly greater participation in conferences than the expectation above. This includes, but is not limited to, giving an average of one invited or contributed talk at a conference each year over the course of three years, organizing or co-organizing a conference or conference session, or obtaining a grant for a conference and holding the supported conference. Excellence may also include participating in conferences or conference events that focus on issues of inclusion and diversity in mathematics.

3.5.5.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.5.5.4.1. Evidence of attendance at an academic conference.

3.5.5.4.2. Evidence of planning, organizing, or chairing a conference or conference session.

3.5.5.4.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to conference participation and/or organization.

3.5.6. Professional Service Related to Scholarship

3.5.6.1. Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to be willing to provide professional service related to scholarship.

3.5.6.2. Examples of professional service include, but are not limited to, serving as a referee for a scholarly journal, serving as a reviewer for MathSciNet, providing service or leadership to academic associations, or serving as an editor or on the editorial board of a scholarly journal.

3.5.6.3. Faculty should strive to provide service professionally. However, professional service is only evaluated if a faculty member participates in it.

3.5.6.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.5.6.4.1. Willingness to serve professionally when asked and when circumstances allow.

3.5.6.4.2. Letters from professional or community organizations verifying the professional service.

3.5.6.4.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to professional service.

3.5.7. Undergraduate Research

3.5.7.1. Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to seek out opportunities to conduct research with undergraduates. While undergraduate research is not required, it is strongly encouraged. Participation in undergraduate research adds to the case of exceeding expectations in scholarship, but is not sufficient on its own to warrant a rating of exceeds expectations in scholarship.

3.5.7.2. Undergraduate research is only evaluated if a faculty member participates in it.

3.5.7.3. Undergraduate research activities include, but are not limited to, applying for grants, associated travel, submission of abstracts to conferences, submission of papers with undergraduate authors, and undergraduates presenting research at UVU or at conferences.

3.5.7.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.5.7.4.1. Documentation of undergraduate research activities.

3.5.7.4.2. Annual review self-assessments relevant to undergraduate research.

3.5.8. Other Scholarship Activities

3.5.8.1. Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are encouraged to participate in other scholarship activities that enhance their academic abilities. These activities include, but are not limited to, participation in study groups investigating graduate level mathematics topics, graduate level mathematics course work, undergraduate or graduate level course work in fields related to mathematics, and passing actuarial exams that lead to Associate or Fellow status in the Society of Actuaries.

3.5.8.2. Other scholarship activities are not required. Participation in these activities adds to the case of meeting or exceeding expectations in scholarship, but is not sufficient on its own to warrant a rating of meets or exceeds expectations in scholarship.

3.5.8.3. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.5.8.3.1. Documentation of participation in other scholarship activities such as transcripts.

3.5.8.3.2. Annual review self-assessments relevant to other scholarship activities

3.5.9. Evaluating Scholarship in Annual Reviews

3.5.9.1. The faculty member and department chair both submit an evaluation of scholarship in the annual review. The possible ratings of “does not meet expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations” are defined here. Both the faculty member and the department chair will use the definitions below when assigning their rating to scholarship.

3.5.9.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

3.5.9.2.1. A faculty member “does not meet expectations” if they have not fulfilled the scholarly activities requirement (see section 3.5.4) in the last three years or have not fulfilled the conferences requirement (see section 3.5.5) in the last two years.

3.5.9.3. Meets Expectations

3.5.9.3.1. A faculty member “meets expectations” in scholarship if they have fulfilled both the scholarly activities requirement (see section 3.5.4) in the last three years and the conferences requirement (see section 3.5.5) in the last two years, but do not qualify for “exceed expectations” as defined below.

3.5.9.4. Exceeds Expectations

3.5.9.4.1. A faculty member “exceeds expectations” in scholarship if they achieve excellence in at least one of the scholarly activities requirement (see section 3.5.4) or the conferences requirements (see section 3.5.5) and either also achieve excellence in the other one or participate meaningfully in one of the other three categories.

3.6. Expectations of Service

- 3.6.1.** Service is only required of tenured or tenure-track faculty. In this section, the term “faculty members” refers to tenured or tenure-track faculty members unless otherwise specified.
- 3.6.2.** Non-tenure-track faculty members may skip the service portion of the annual review form and should select “meets expectations” for service if the form requires it.
- 3.6.3.** UVU is primarily a teaching institution, but active service to the department, college, and the university is expected and an important objective of every tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The criteria we use to evaluate service are the following.

3.6.4. Committee Service and Administrative Assignments

- 3.6.4.1.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to engage meaningfully in committee work or administrative assignments at the department, college, and University level.
- 3.6.4.2.** While faculty are not expected to participate in committee work at every level (department, college, and University) every year, they should strive to diversify their participation and should participate on at least one committee outside the department in a seven-year period. Tenure-track faculty members must participate on at least one committee outside the department during their probationary period.
- 3.6.4.3.** Faculty members will be actively engaged in and contribute to at least two committees or administrative assignments at UVU per year. The department chair will ensure that each faculty member is assigned to two committees in the department every year so that this requirement is never not met for lack of opportunity. However, assignment to a committee is not sufficient to indicate engagement on that committee.
- 3.6.4.4.** Excellence in the committee service and administrative assignments is defined as high quality work on all committees and administrative assignments that the faculty member is assigned. Excellence includes serving well on more committees or assignments than the two required. Excellence may also include serving on committees or assignments that are related to inclusion and diversity.
- 3.6.4.5.** The above criteria will be evaluated by
- 3.6.4.5.1.** Letters from committee chairs and other supervisors verifying the faculty member’s participation on a committee or administrative assignment.
- 3.6.4.5.2.** Annual review self-assessments relevant to committee service or administrative assignments.

3.6.5. Mentoring Faculty

- 3.6.5.1.** Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are expected to mentor junior faculty when necessary. This could be in an official or unofficial capacity.
- 3.6.5.2.** Mentoring faculty is only evaluated if a faculty member has been asked to serve as a faculty mentor to a tenure-track faculty member in an official capacity.
- 3.6.5.3.** The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.6.5.3.1. Willingness to serve as a faculty mentor when asked unless there is an extenuating circumstance as determined by the department chair.

3.6.5.3.2. Annual review self-assessments relevant to mentoring faculty.

3.6.6. Professional Service Unrelated to Scholarship

3.6.6.1. Faculty in the Department of Mathematics are willing to serve professionally and within the community when asked and their circumstances allow.

3.6.6.2. Examples of professional service include, but are not limited to, providing service or leadership to professional associations, providing professional expertise in service to the community that enhance a positive image of the department, college, and university, and participating in outreach or other activities that promote inclusion and diversity. Professional and community service should only be counted if the service is provided by the faculty member in their capacity as an employee of the university.

3.6.6.3. Faculty should strive to provide service professionally. However, professional service is only evaluated if a faculty member participates in it.

3.6.6.4. The above criteria will be evaluated by

3.6.6.4.1. Willingness to serve professionally when asked and when circumstances allow.

3.6.6.4.2. Letters from professional or community organizations verifying the professional or community service.

3.6.6.4.3. Annual review self-assessments relevant to professional or community service.

3.6.7. Evaluating Service in Annual Reviews

3.6.7.1. The faculty member and department chair both submit an evaluation of service in the annual review. The possible ratings of “does not meet expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations” are defined here. Both the faculty member and the department chair will use the definitions below when assigning their rating to service.

3.6.7.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

3.6.7.2.1. A faculty member “does not meet expectations” if they fail to participate meaningfully on at least two committees or administrative assignments at UVU in an academic year.

3.6.7.3. Meets Expectations

3.6.7.3.1. A faculty member “meets expectations” if they successfully participate meaningfully on at least two committees or administrative assignments at UVU in an academic year and do not qualify for “exceeds expectations”.

3.6.7.4. Exceeds Expectations

3.6.7.4.1. A faculty member “exceeds expectations” if they “meet expectations” as defined in section 3.6.7.3.1 and successfully participate meaningfully on at least five committees,

administrative assignments, mentoring faculty, and/or professional service activities (including the two required to meet expectations) in an academic year.

3.7. Overall Expectations

3.7.1. The department chair submits an overall evaluation in the annual review. The possible ratings of “does not meet expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations” are defined here. The department chair will use the definitions below when assigning their overall rating.

3.7.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

3.7.2.1. A faculty member “does not meet expectations” overall if they received a “does not meet expectations” in any one category of teaching, scholarship, or service.

3.7.3. Meets Expectations

3.7.3.1. A faculty member “meets expectations” overall if they did not receive a “does not meet expectations” in any category of teaching, scholarship, or service.

3.7.4. Exceeds Expectations

3.7.4.1. A faculty member “exceeds expectations” overall if they at least meet expectations in each of the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, and exceed expectations in at least two of those categories.

4. Tenure Criteria

4.1. Purpose and General Criteria

4.1.1. The purpose of these criteria is to provide a clear understanding of the department’s expectations of candidates for tenure and advancement from assistant professor to associate professor (if applicable) and to provide candidates an opportunity to play an active role in designing their own plan for advancement. These criteria are implemented with clearly measurable goals to allow maximum objectivity in tenure decisions.

4.1.2. Faculty members may receive tenure by contributing to the department, college, and university in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Each faculty member has unique strengths and may accomplish more in one area than another. Even so, a necessary condition for receiving tenure is that each individual faculty member’s performance is satisfactory in all three areas as required by UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure.

4.2. Tenure Plan

4.2.1. A tenure plan is a list of goals and planned activities to be completed during the probationary period. The plan should include goals and/or activities in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The plan must align with this criteria document, College of Science tenure criteria, and UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure. The content of the plan must be such that the successful completion of the goals and activities listed in the plan is sufficient to warrant tenure under this criteria document, College of Science tenure criteria, and UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure.

4.2.2. The department chair will provide a list of all current tenure-track mathematics faculty to the RTP Committee by September 1 each year.

4.2.3. The RTP Committee will meet with each new tenure-track faculty member during the first two months of employment to provide copies of this criteria document, UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure, and other official University and/or College of Science documents relevant to receiving tenure. They will also discuss with the faculty member suitable activities for obtaining tenure and help the faculty member start to create a tenure plan.

4.2.4. Approval of the Tenure Plan

4.2.4.1. The RTP Committee will meet again with each tenure-track faculty member by January 31 of the first year of their employment where they will review the faculty member's tenure plan. The RTP Committee will share the proposed tenure plan with the department chair.

4.2.4.2. By February 14, the RTP Committee and department chair will submit written feedback on the tenure plan to the tenure-track faculty member.

4.2.4.3. By February 28, the faculty member will submit a revised tenure plan to the RTP Committee. The RTP Committee will again share the proposed tenure plan with the department chair.

4.2.4.4. The RTP Committee and faculty member may agree to revise the tenure plan further, but all revisions must be approved by the RTP Committee and department chair by March 15. The RTP Committee and department chair should only approve the plan if the plan is such that the successful completion of the goals and activities listed in the plan is sufficient to warrant tenure under this criteria document, College of Science tenure criteria, and UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure.

4.2.4.5. The tenure plan will be reviewed and may be revised each year during the probationary period to reflect new developments, but the new plan should be approved by October 31 of each academic year. The approval process for a new plan follows a similar process to the one above and must include department chair feedback and approval.

4.3. Tenure Criteria for Teaching

4.3.1. Tenure-track Department of Mathematics faculty are expected to meet or exceed the Department of Mathematics annual review expectations in teaching (see section 3.4 of this criteria document) throughout their probationary period.

4.3.2. Meeting expectations in teaching in the chair's evaluation every annual review during a tenure-track faculty member's probationary period should typically warrant a favorable teaching review from the RTP Committee at the midterm review and tenure review. Under these circumstances, the RTP Committee must give significant justification for a negative teaching review at either the midterm review or tenure review and explain why they disagree with the chair's assessment. Failure of the tenure-track faculty member to provide the evidence required by this criteria document qualifies as significant justification.

4.3.3. If a tenure-track faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching in any given year of their probationary period, they will meet with the department chair and RTP Committee within 30 days to determine how to improve their teaching in order to meet or exceed expectations in subsequent years. The RTP Committee should view it favorably if a tenure-track faculty member then improves and meets or exceed expectations in all subsequent years.

4.3.4. Evaluating Teaching

4.3.4.1. Evidence that the tenure-track faculty member meets the tenure standard for teaching should emphasize work performed at UVU during the probationary period. The evaluation of overall teaching performance considers teaching loads, the number of preparations required, and any additional instructional activities.

4.3.4.2. Evidence that a tenure-track faculty member meets the tenure standard for teaching should include the following documentation organized in the order described in section 4.6 of this criteria document.

4.3.4.3. Narrative Report of Teaching Activities

4.3.4.3.1. The narrative report of teaching activities should include an honest personal appraisal of the faculty member's efforts in teaching. The report should include a discussion of both the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching. In addressing weaknesses in teaching, the faculty member should indicate how they plan to improve in those aspects of their teaching.

4.3.4.3.2. The narrative report should explain how the tenure-track faculty member has met the annual review expectations in teaching each year during their probationary period. If they have failed to meet expectations in any given year, the faculty member should include an explanation of how they improved and evidence that they now currently meet expectations in teaching.

4.3.4.3.3. The narrative report should include a discussion of the teaching goals of the tenure plan and how the faculty member has met, failed to meet, or exceeded those goals. If the faculty member has failed to meet any of the goals, an explanation of the failure and why this should not disqualify the faculty member from receiving tenure should be provided.

4.3.4.4. Descriptive Documentation

4.3.4.4.1. List of courses taught, by semester.

4.3.4.4.2. List of curriculum and program development activities, with dates.

4.3.4.4.3. A teaching portfolio containing sample class syllabi, sample assignments or learning exercises, and sample exams.

4.3.4.4.4. List of teaching awards and honors received.

4.3.4.4.5. List of other instructional activities as defined in section 3.4 of this criteria document.

4.3.4.5. Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs)

4.3.4.5.1. Copies of all SRIs during the probationary period.

4.3.4.5.2. A document highlighting representative student comments, both positive and negative. This document should include how the faculty member addressed or plans to address any trends in negative student comments. This document should also include a discussion of any changes made to the faculty member's teaching as a result of student comments.

4.3.4.6. Peer Evaluations

4.3.4.6.1. At least one peer evaluation of teaching for every year of the probationary period.

4.3.4.7. Rebuttals

4.3.4.7.1. Any rebuttals to negative evaluations in teaching by supervisors or the RTP Committee during annual reviews, the midterm review, or the tenure review.

4.4. Tenure Criteria for Scholarship

4.4.1. Tenure-track Department of Mathematics faculty are expected to meet or exceed the Department of Mathematics annual review expectations in scholarship (see section 3.5 of this criteria document) throughout their probationary period.

4.4.2. Meeting expectations in scholarship in the chair's evaluation every annual review during a tenure-track faculty member's probationary period should typically warrant a favorable scholarship review from the RTP Committee at the midterm review and tenure review. Under these circumstances, the RTP Committee must give significant justification for a negative scholarship review at either the midterm review or tenure review and explain why they disagree with the chair's assessment. Failure of the tenure-track faculty member to provide the evidence required by this criteria document qualifies as significant justification.

4.4.3. If a tenure-track faculty member does not meet expectations in scholarship in any given year of their probationary period, they will meet with the department chair and RTP Committee within 30 days to determine how to improve their scholarship in order to meet or exceed expectations in subsequent years. The RTP Committee should view it favorably if a tenure-track faculty member then improves and meets or exceed expectations in all subsequent years.

4.4.4. Evaluating Scholarship

4.4.4.1. Evidence that the tenure-track faculty member meets the tenure standard for scholarship should emphasize work performed at UVU during the probationary period or at other institutions where the faculty member held a tenure-track position during any years that were awarded toward tenure.

4.4.4.2. Evidence that a tenure-track faculty member meets the tenure standard for scholarship should include the following documentation organized in the order described in section 4.6 of this criteria document.

4.4.4.3. Narrative Report of Scholarship Activities

4.4.4.3.1. The narrative report of scholarship activities should include an honest personal appraisal of the faculty member's efforts in scholarship. The report should list the faculty member's research projects and efforts to give talks, publish papers or books, or acquire patents related to those projects. The report should also include a discussion of any grants applied for, conferences attended or organized, talks given, undergraduate research performed, academic papers or books published, submitted, or in preparation, and patents applied for or acquired.

4.4.4.3.2. The narrative report should explain how the tenure-track faculty member has met the annual review expectations in scholarship each year during their probationary period

each year. If they have failed to meet expectations in any given year, the faculty member should include an explanation of how they improved and evidence that they now currently meet expectations in scholarship.

4.4.4.3.3. The narrative report should include a discussion of the scholarship goals of the tenure plan and how the faculty member has met, failed to meet, or exceeded those goals. If the faculty member has failed to meet any of the goals, an explanation of the failure and why this should not disqualify the faculty member from receiving tenure should be provided.

4.4.4.4. Descriptive Documentation

4.4.4.4.1. List of papers published, submitted, or in preparation. This list should also include books and book chapters that have been published or accepted for publication.

4.4.4.4.2. List of patents applied for or acquired (if any).

4.4.4.4.3. List of grants applied for or awarded.

4.4.4.4.4. List of academic conferences attended or organized including locations and dates.

4.4.4.4.5. List of talks and presentations given including locations and dates. This includes talks at UVU and outside UVU.

4.4.4.4.6. List of awards or honors for scholarship.

4.4.4.4.7. List of other scholarship activities as defined in section 3.5 of this criteria document.

4.4.4.5. Optional Evaluations

4.4.4.5.1. Peer evaluations from faculty at UVU or otherwise who are qualified to evaluate the faculty member's scholarship. Peer evaluations should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the scholarly work.

4.4.4.6. Rebuttals

4.4.4.6.1. Any rebuttals to negative evaluations in scholarship by supervisors or the RTP Committee during annual reviews, the midterm review, or the tenure review.

4.5. Tenure Criteria for Service

4.5.1. Tenure-track Department of Mathematics faculty are expected to meet or exceed the Department of Mathematics annual review expectations in service (see section 3.6 of this criteria document) throughout their probationary period.

4.5.2. Meeting expectations in service in the chair's evaluation every annual review during a tenure-track faculty member's probationary period should typically warrant a favorable service review from the RTP Committee at the midterm review and tenure review. Under these circumstances, the RTP Committee must give significant justification for a negative service review at either the midterm review or tenure review and explain why they disagree with the chair's assessment. Failure of the tenure-track faculty member to provide the evidence required by this criteria document qualifies as significant justification.

4.5.3. If a tenure-track faculty member does not meet expectations in service in any given year of their probationary period, they will meet with the department chair and RTP Committee within 30 days to determine how to improve their service in order to meet or exceed expectations in subsequent years. The RTP Committee should view it favorably if a tenure-track faculty member then improves and meets or exceed expectations in all subsequent years.

4.5.4. Evaluating Service

4.5.4.1. Evidence that the tenure-track faculty member meets the tenure standard for service should emphasize work performed at UVU during the probationary. The evaluation of a faculty member's service considers the opportunities available, other assignments, the faculty member's individual strengths, and other similar factors.

4.5.4.2. Evidence that a tenure-track faculty member meets the tenure standard for service should include the following documentation organized in the order described in section 4.6 of this criteria document.

4.5.4.3. Narrative Report of Service Activities

4.5.4.3.1. The narrative report of service activities should include an honest personal appraisal of the faculty member's efforts in service. The report should explain how the faculty member has contributed to the furthering of the missions of the department, college, and University. The report should describe all service activities at all levels during the probationary period and how the faculty member participated in them.

4.5.4.3.2. The narrative report should explain how the tenure-track faculty member has met the annual review expectations in service each year during their probationary period. If they have failed to meet expectations in any given year, the faculty member should include an explanation of how they improved and evidence that they now currently meet expectations in service.

4.5.4.3.3. The narrative report should include a discussion of the service goals of the tenure plan and how the faculty member has met, failed to meet, or exceeded those goals. If the faculty member has failed to meet any of the goals, an explanation of the failure and why this should not disqualify the faculty member from receiving tenure should be provided.

4.5.4.4. Descriptive Documentation

4.5.4.4.1. List of committee service and administrative assignments at the department, college, and University level, including supervision of student groups and assigned course facilitator roles.

4.5.4.4.2. List of professional and/or community service activities unrelated to scholarship.

4.5.4.4.3. For each committee, administrative assignment, or professional and/or community service activity, a letter from the supervisor of that service activity verifying the faculty member's participation in that activity should be included. The supervisor could be the chair of the committee, the supervisor that committee reports to, the supervisor of the administrative assignment, or an organizer of the professional and/or community service activity.

4.5.4.4. List of service awards and honors.

4.5.4.5. Optional Evaluations

4.5.4.5.1. Peer evaluations of service from UVU faculty members or other qualified to make evaluations of the candidate's department, college, and/or University service. These peer reviewers should have closely observed these activities. Peer evaluations should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

4.5.4.5.2. Reports from those affected by the faculty member's service activities.

4.5.4.6. Rebuttals

4.5.4.6.1. Any rebuttals to negative evaluations in service by supervisors or the RTP Committee during annual reviews, the midterm review, or the tenure review.

4.6. Tenure Portfolio

4.6.1. It is the responsibility of each tenure-track faculty member to create and maintain a Tenure Portfolio with full documentation to support their tenure application. This portfolio must contain all the required documentation listed above as well as any required documentation outlined in UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure. For convenience, the order in which these files should be organized is given in this criteria document.

4.6.2. The tenure portfolio is submitted for review at the midterm review and tenure review.

4.6.3. The tenure-track faculty member should meet with the RTP Committee well in advance of submitting the portfolio for midterm review and tenure review to ensure that it is in order and provide feedback. The College of Science dean's office also may review tenure portfolios in advance of the official review to provide feedback, but this must be requested well in advance of the actual review.

4.6.4. For both the midterm and tenure reviews, the RTP Committee will solicit at least one peer evaluation from someone outside the department that can speak to the faculty member's deservedness of tenure. The RTP Committee may ask the faculty member for recommendations of who would be good peer evaluators.

4.6.5. Tenure Portfolio Organization - The tenure portfolio will be organized as follows. All lists should be accompanied by evidence. All items are required unless otherwise specified.

4.6.5.1. Letter of Submission for Review (at midterm review) or Letter of Application for Tenure (at tenure review)

4.6.5.2. Third Year Review Letters (only included at the tenure review)

4.6.5.3. Table of Contents (must list every item in the portfolio; page numbers are not required, but the contents should be in order)

4.6.5.4. Informational Statement (a brief narrative statement wherein the faculty member describes the nature of their contribution to the profession and to the University, the extent to which department expectations were met in teaching, scholarship, and service, any circumstances that

helped or hindered their progress, and any other information that will be beneficial to the reviewers in evaluating the material in the portfolio)

4.6.5.5. Curriculum Vitae

4.6.5.6. Teaching Section

4.6.5.6.1. Narrative Report of Teaching Activities

4.6.5.6.2. Supervisor Teaching Evaluations (may consist of just a letter indicating that these evaluations are found in the Annual Reviews section)

4.6.5.6.3. Peer Teaching Evaluations

4.6.5.6.4. List of Teaching Awards

4.6.5.6.5. List of Courses Taught (by semester)

4.6.5.6.6. List of all SRIs (from all courses taught during the probationary period) and the SRI Supporting Document (see 4.3.4.5.2 above)

4.6.5.6.7. Teaching Portfolio (sample class syllabi, sample assignments or learning exercises, and sample exams)

4.6.5.6.8. List of Curriculum and Program Development Activities

4.6.5.6.9. List of Professional Development Activities in Teaching

4.6.5.6.10. List of Other Instructional Activities (as defined in section 3.4 of this criteria document)

4.6.5.7. Scholarship Section

4.6.5.7.1. Narrative Report of Scholarship Activities

4.6.5.7.2. Peer Scholarship Evaluations

4.6.5.7.3. List of Scholarship Awards

4.6.5.7.4. List of Publications (published, accepted, or submitted; may also contain in preparation)

4.6.5.7.5. List of Patents (applied for and/or acquired)

4.6.5.7.6. List of Grants (applied for and/or awarded)

4.6.5.7.7. List of Talks or Presentations

4.6.5.7.8. List of Conferences Attended or Organized

4.6.5.7.9. List of Other Scholarship Activities (as defined in section 3.5 of this criteria document)

4.6.5.8. Service Section

4.6.5.8.1. Narrative Report of Service Activities

4.6.5.8.2. Peer Service Evaluations

4.6.5.8.3. List of Service Awards

4.6.5.8.4. List of Committee Service and Administrative Assignments

4.6.5.8.5. List of Professional Service

4.6.5.8.6. Letters of Recognition for Committee Service, Administrative Assignments, and Professional Service

4.6.5.9. Evaluation Section

4.6.5.9.1. Copies of Annual Reviews (all annual reviews during the probationary period) including the department chair's comments

4.6.5.9.2. Letters of Commendation (if any)

4.6.5.9.3. Letters of Reprimand (if any)

4.6.5.9.4. Rebuttal Letters (if any)

4.6.5.10. Evaluations solicited by the RTP Committee (added by the RTP Committee)

4.6.5.11. Policies

4.6.5.11.1. UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure

4.6.5.11.2. UVU Department Annual Review, Tenure, and Rank Advancement Criteria

4.7. Procedure for Midterm Review and Applying for Tenure

4.7.1. Tenure-track faculty create and maintain their own tenure portfolio.

4.7.2. The tenure portfolio is submitted and reviewed according to the procedure defined in UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure. Typically, this includes a midterm review submitted at the beginning of the third year of the faculty member's probationary period, and a tenure review submitted at the beginning of the sixth year of the faculty member's probationary period. Alternative arrangements may be made with the Office of Academic Affairs as allowed by and described in UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure.

4.7.3. For both midterm review and tenure review, Tenure Portfolios must be submitted to the RTP Committee by September 15 of the academic year in which the review is conducted. The review process then follows the dates contained in UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure.

4.7.4. If the final decision is to deny tenure, the candidate may appeal the decision to the UVU Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Committee. Procedures follow those outlined in UVU Policy 646 Faculty Appeals for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.

5. Rank Advancement Criteria

5.1. Purpose and General Criteria

- 5.1.1.** The purpose of these criteria is to provide a clear understanding of the department's expectations of candidates for advancement from associate professor to professor and to provide candidates an opportunity to play an active role in designing their own plan for advancement. These criteria are implemented with clearly measurable goals to allow maximum objectivity in advancement decisions.
- 5.1.2.** Faculty members may advance in rank by contributing to the department, college, and university in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Each faculty member has unique strengths and may accomplish more in one area than another. Even so, a necessary condition for rank advancement to full professor is that each individual faculty member's performance is "exemplary" in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as required by UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank. This ensures that promotion to full professor requires performance above and beyond that required for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Specific qualifications that constitute exemplary performance are detailed in this criteria document.
- 5.1.3.** Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor must have five years' experience as a tenured Associate Professor.
- 5.1.4.** Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor must receive an "exceeds expectations" overall rating from the department chair in at least three annual reviews since receiving tenure.
- 5.1.5.** If a tenured faculty member has been required to participate in remediation due to Post-Tenure Review (see UVU Policy 638 Post Tenure Review), they must have successfully completed that remediation prior to applying for rank advancement. The RTP Committee should view it favorably if a tenured faculty member successfully completes such remediation.

5.2. Rank Advancement Plan

- 5.2.1.** A rank advancement plan is a list of goals and planned activities to be completed by a faculty member while a tenured Associate Professor. The plan should include goals and/or activities in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The plan may include work already completed since receiving tenure. The plan must align with this criteria document, College of Science rank advancement criteria, and UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank. The content of the plan must be such that the successful completion of the goals and activities listed in the plan is sufficient to warrant promotion to Professor under this criteria document, College of Science rank advancement criteria, and UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank.
- 5.2.2.** Creation of a rank advancement plan is optional, and an Associate Professor may be considered for rank advancement without it. However, it is strongly encouraged that Associate Professors that wish to be considered for rank advancement create a rank advancement plan. The significant advantage to the plan is that it makes concrete what is individually required of a faculty member and what they should be measured against.
- 5.2.3.** The RTP Committee will meet with each newly tenured faculty member during the first two months of the academic year after the faculty member receives tenure to provide copies of this criteria document, UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank, and other official University and/or College of Science documents relevant to rank advancement. They will also discuss with the faculty member suitable activities for rank advancement to Professor and encourage the faculty member to create a rank advancement plan.

5.2.4. At any time, a tenured Associate Professor may decide to start working towards rank advancement to Professor and is encouraged at that time to call a meeting with the RTP Committee to start creating a rank advancement plan.

5.2.5. Approval of a Rank Advancement Plan

5.2.5.1. If the faculty member creates a rank advancement plan, the RTP Committee will meet again with the faculty member where they will review the faculty member's rank advancement plan. This meeting is scheduled between the faculty member and the RTP chair. The RTP Committee will share the proposed tenure plan with the department chair.

5.2.5.2. Within two business weeks, the RTP Committee and department chair will submit written feedback on the rank advancement plan to the faculty member.

5.2.5.3. Within two business weeks of receiving the feedback, the faculty member will submit a revised rank advancement plan to the RTP Committee. The RTP Committee will again share the proposed tenure plan with the department chair.

5.2.5.4. The above process is repeated until the RTP Committee and department chair approve the rank advancement plan. The RTP Committee, department chair, and the faculty member should come to an agreement on the rank advancement plan and the RTP Committee and department chair should approve the plan within three months of the faculty member's initial submission of the rank advancement plan. The RTP Committee and department chair should only approve the plan if the plan is such that the successful completion of the goals and activities listed in the plan is sufficient to warrant promotion to Professor under this criteria document, College of Science tenure criteria, and UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank.

5.2.5.5. The rank advancement plan may be revised as often as necessary to reflect new developments, but the new plan should be approved via the same process described above.

5.2.6. A tenured Associate Professor with an approved rank advancement plan will continue to meet annually with the RTP Committee using the same schedule as tenure-track faculty until the faculty member submits their rank advancement portfolio or decides to no longer pursue a rank advancement plan.

5.3. Rank Advancement Criteria for Teaching

5.3.1. Tenured Department of Mathematics faculty are expected to meet or exceed the Department of Mathematics annual review expectations in teaching (see section 3.4 of this criteria document) every year. To qualify for rank advancement to Professor, tenured Associate Professors must receive an "exceeds expectations" in teaching from the department chair for at least five annual reviews since receiving tenure.

5.3.2. Exceeding expectations in teaching in the chair's evaluation for at least five annual reviews since receiving tenure should typically warrant a favorable teaching review from the RTP Committee at the rank advancement review. Under these circumstances, the RTP Committee must give significant justification for a negative teaching review at the rank advancement review and explain why they disagree with the chair's assessment. Failure of the faculty member applying for rank advancement to provide the evidence required by this criteria document qualifies as significant justification.

5.3.3. Evaluating Teaching

5.3.3.1. Evidence that the tenured Associate Professor meets the rank advancement standard for teaching should emphasize work performed at UVU since receiving tenure. The evaluation of overall teaching performance considers teaching loads, the number of preparations required, and any additional instructional activities.

5.3.3.2. Evidence that a tenured Associate Professor meets the rank advancement standard for teaching should include the following documentation organized in the order described in section 5.6 of this criteria document.

5.3.3.3. Narrative Report of Teaching Activities

5.3.3.3.1. The narrative report of teaching activities should include an honest personal appraisal of the faculty member's efforts in teaching. The report should include a discussion of both the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching. In addressing weaknesses in teaching, the faculty member should indicate how they plan to improve in those aspects of their teaching.

5.3.3.3.2. The narrative report should explain how the tenured Associate Professor has exceeded the annual review expectations in teaching in at least five years since receiving tenure. If they were required to complete remediation due to Post Tenure Review, the faculty member should include an explanation of how they improved and evidence that they now currently meet or exceed expectations in teaching.

5.3.3.3.3. The narrative report should include a discussion of the teaching goals of the rank advancement plan (if the faculty member used one) and how the faculty member has met, failed to meet, or exceeded those goals. If the faculty member has failed to meet any of the goals, an explanation of the failure and why this should not disqualify the faculty member from receiving rank advancement should be provided. If the faculty member elected to not use a rank advancement plan, they should discuss the annual review goals in teaching for the last five years instead.

5.3.3.4. Descriptive Documentation

5.3.3.4.1. List of courses taught, by semester.

5.3.3.4.2. List of curriculum and program development activities, with dates.

5.3.3.4.3. A teaching portfolio containing sample class syllabi, sample assignments or learning exercises, and sample exams.

5.3.3.4.4. List of teaching awards and honors received.

5.3.3.4.5. List of other instructional activities as defined in section 3.4 of this criteria document.

5.3.3.5. Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs)

5.3.3.5.1. Copies of all SRIs during the last five years. The faculty member may include more than this, but five years is all that is required.

5.3.3.5.2. A document highlighting representative student comments, both positive and negative, received during the last five years. This document should include how the faculty member addressed or plans to address any trends in negative student comments. This

document should also include any changes made to the faculty member's teaching as a result of student comments.

5.3.3.6. Peer Evaluations

5.3.3.6.1. At least one peer evaluation of teaching for each of the last five years. The faculty member may include more than this, but five years is all that is required.

5.3.3.6.2. The faculty member may also include other evidence of the faculty member's reputation as a teacher, for example, professional invitations and appointments based on that reputation.

5.3.3.7. Rebuttals

5.3.3.7.1. Any rebuttals to negative evaluations in teaching by supervisors or the RTP Committee during annual reviews or the rank advancement review.

5.4. Rank Advancement Criteria for Scholarship

5.4.1. Tenured Department of Mathematics faculty are expected to meet or exceed the Department of Mathematics annual review expectations in scholarship (see section 3.5 of this criteria document) every year. To qualify for rank advancement to Professor, tenured Associate Professors must receive an "exceeds expectations" in scholarship from the department chair for at least three annual reviews since receiving tenure.

5.4.2. Exceeding expectations in scholarship in the chair's evaluation for at least three annual reviews since receiving tenure should typically warrant a favorable scholarship review from the RTP Committee at the rank advancement review. Under these circumstances, the RTP Committee must give significant justification for a negative scholarship review at the rank advancement review and explain why they disagree with the chair's assessment. Failure of the faculty member applying for rank advancement to provide the evidence required by this criteria document qualifies as significant justification.

5.4.3. Evaluating Scholarship

5.4.3.1. Evidence that the tenured Associate Professor meets the rank advancement standard for scholarship should emphasize work performed at UVU since receiving tenure.

5.4.3.2. Evidence that a tenured Associate Professor meets the rank advancement standard for scholarship should include the following documentation organized in the order described in section 5.6 of this criteria document.

5.4.3.3. Narrative Report of Scholarship Activities

5.4.3.3.1. The narrative report of scholarship activities should include an honest personal appraisal of the faculty member's efforts in scholarship. The report should list the faculty member's research projects and efforts to give talks, publish papers or books, or acquire patents related to those projects. The report should also include a discussion of any grants applied for, conferences attended or organized, talks given, undergraduate research performed, academic papers or books published, submitted, or in preparation, and patents applied for or acquired.

5.4.3.3.2. The narrative report should explain how the Associate Professor has exceeded the annual review expectations in scholarship in at least three years since receiving tenure. If they were required to complete remediation due to Post Tenure Review, the faculty member should include an explanation of how they improved and evidence that they now currently meet or exceed expectations in scholarship.

5.4.3.3.3. The narrative report should include a discussion of the scholarship goals of the rank advancement plan (if the faculty member used one) and how the faculty member has met, failed to meet, or exceeded those goals. If the faculty member has failed to meet any of the goals, an explanation of the failure and why this should not disqualify the faculty member from receiving rank advancement should be provided. If the faculty member elected to not use a rank advancement plan, they should discuss the annual review goals in scholarship for the last five years instead.

5.4.3.4. Descriptive Documentation

5.4.3.4.1. List of papers published, submitted, or in preparation. This list should also include books and book chapters that have been published or accepted for publication.

5.4.3.4.2. List of patents applied for or acquired (if any).

5.4.3.4.3. List of grants applied for or awarded.

5.4.3.4.4. List of academic conferences attended or organized including locations and dates.

5.4.3.4.5. List of talks and presentations given including locations and dates. This includes talks at UVU and outside UVU.

5.4.3.4.6. List of awards or honors for scholarship.

5.4.3.4.7. List of other scholarship activities as defined in section 3.5 of this criteria document.

5.4.3.5. Optional Evaluations

5.4.3.5.1. Peer evaluations from faculty at UVU or otherwise who are qualified to evaluate the faculty member's scholarship. Peer evaluations should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the scholarly work.

5.4.3.6. Rebuttals

5.4.3.6.1. Any rebuttals to negative evaluations in scholarship by supervisors or the RTP Committee during annual reviews or the rank advancement review.

5.5. Rank Advancement Criteria for Service

5.5.1. Tenured Department of Mathematics faculty are expected to meet or exceed the Department of Mathematics annual review expectations in service (see section 3.6 of this criteria document) every year. To qualify for rank advancement to Professor, tenured Associate Professors must receive an "exceeds expectations" in service from the department chair for at least three annual reviews since receiving tenure.

5.5.2. Exceeding expectations in service in the chair's evaluation for at least three annual reviews since receiving tenure should typically warrant a favorable service review from the RTP Committee at the rank advancement review. Under these circumstances, the RTP Committee must give significant justification for a negative service review at the rank advancement review and explain why they disagree with the chair's assessment. Failure of the faculty member applying for rank advancement to provide the evidence required by this criteria document qualifies as significant justification.

5.5.3. Evaluating Service

5.5.3.1. Evidence that the tenured Associate Professor meets the rank advancement standard for service should emphasize work performed at UVU since receiving tenure. The evaluation of a faculty member's service considers the opportunities available, other assignments, the faculty member's individual strengths, and other similar factors.

5.5.3.2. Evidence that a tenured Associate Professor meets the rank advancement standard for service should include the following documentation organized in the order described in section 5.6 of this criteria document.

5.5.3.3. Narrative Report of Service Activities

5.5.3.3.1. The narrative report of service activities should include an honest personal appraisal of the faculty member's efforts in service. The report should explain how the faculty member has contributed to furthering the missions of the department, college, and University. The report should describe all service activities at all levels during at least the last five years and how the faculty member participated in them.

5.5.3.3.2. The narrative report should explain how the Associate Professor has exceeded the annual review expectations in service in at least three years since receiving tenure. If they were required to complete remediation due to Post Tenure Review, the faculty member should include an explanation of how they improved and evidence that they now currently meet or exceed expectations in service.

5.5.3.3.3. The narrative report should include a discussion of the service goals of the rank advancement plan (if the faculty member used one) and how the faculty member has met, failed to meet, or exceeded those goals. If the faculty member has failed to meet any of the goals, an explanation of the failure and why this should not disqualify the faculty member from receiving rank advancement should be provided. If the faculty member elected to not use a rank advancement plan, they should discuss the annual review goals in service for the last five years instead.

5.5.3.4. Descriptive Documentation

5.5.3.4.1. List of committee service and administrative assignments at the department, college, and University level, including supervision of student groups and assigned course facilitator roles.

5.5.3.4.2. List of professional and/or community service activities unrelated to scholarship.

5.5.3.4.3. List of activities mentoring new faculty members or established faculty members initiating activity in your area of interest.

5.5.3.4.4. For each committee, administrative assignment, or professional and/or community service activity, a letter from the supervisor of that service activity verifying the faculty member's participation in that activity should be included. The supervisor could be the chair of the committee, the supervisor that committee reports to, the supervisor of the administrative assignment, or an organizer of the professional and/or community service activity.

5.5.3.4.5. List of service awards and honors.

5.5.3.5. Optional Evaluations

5.5.3.5.1. Peer evaluations of service from UVU faculty members or others qualified to make evaluations of the candidate's department, college, and/or University service. These peer reviewers should have closely observed these activities. Peer evaluations should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

5.5.3.5.2. Reports from those affected by the faculty member's service activities.

5.5.3.6. Rebuttals

5.5.3.6.1. Any rebuttals to negative evaluations in service by supervisors or the RTP Committee during annual reviews or the rank advancement review.

5.6. Rank Advancement Portfolio

5.6.1. It is the responsibility of each tenured faculty member seeking rank advancement to create and maintain a rank advancement portfolio with full documentation to support their rank advancement application. This portfolio must contain all the required documentation listed in this criteria document as well as any required documentation outlined in UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank. For convenience, the order in which these files should be organized is given in this criteria document.

5.6.2. The rank advancement portfolio is submitted for the rank advancement review.

5.6.3. The tenured faculty member should meet with the RTP Committee well in advance of submitting the rank advancement portfolio for rank advancement review to ensure that it is in order and provide feedback. The College of Science dean's office also may review rank advancement portfolios in advance of the official review to provide feedback, but this must be requested well in advance of the actual review.

5.6.4. For the rank advancement review, the RTP Committee will solicit at least one peer evaluation from someone outside the department that can speak to the faculty member's deservedness of rank advancement. The RTP Committee may ask the faculty member for recommendations of who would be good peer evaluators.

5.6.5. Rank Advancement Portfolio Organization - The rank advancement portfolio will be organized as follows. All lists should be accompanied by evidence. All items are required unless otherwise specified.

5.6.5.1. Request for Rank Advancement Form (this can be found at <https://www.uvu.edu/academicaffairs/admin-faculty/docs/rank-advancement-request-2018.pdf>)

5.6.5.2. Table of Contents (must list every item in the portfolio; page numbers are not required, but the contents should be in order)

5.6.5.3. Personal Narrative (a brief narrative statement wherein the faculty member describes the nature of their contribution to the profession and to the University, the extent to which department expectations were exceeded in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with this criteria document, any circumstances that helped or hindered their progress, and any other information that will be beneficial to the reviewers in evaluating the material in the portfolio)

5.6.5.4. Curriculum Vitae

5.6.5.5. Teaching Section

5.6.5.5.1. Narrative Report of Teaching Activities

5.6.5.5.2. Peer Teaching Evaluations

5.6.5.5.3. List of Teaching Awards

5.6.5.5.4. List of Courses Taught (by semester)

5.6.5.5.5. List of all SRIs (from all courses taught during the probationary period) and SRI Supporting Document (see 5.3.3.5.2 above)

5.6.5.5.6. Teaching Portfolio (sample class syllabi, sample assignments or learning exercises, and sample exams)

5.6.5.5.7. List of Curriculum and Program Development Activities

5.6.5.5.8. List of Professional Development Activities in Teaching

5.6.5.5.9. List of Other Instructional Activities (as defined in section 3.4 of this criteria document)

5.6.5.6. Scholarship Section

5.6.5.6.1. Narrative Report of Scholarship Activities

5.6.5.6.2. Peer Scholarship Evaluations

5.6.5.6.3. List of Scholarship Awards

5.6.5.6.4. List of Publications (published, accepted, or submitted; may also contain in preparation)

5.6.5.6.5. List of Patents (applied for or acquired)

5.6.5.6.6. List of Grants (applied for or awarded)

5.6.5.6.7. List of Talks or Presentations

5.6.5.6.8. List of Conference Attended or Organized

5.6.5.6.9. List of Other Scholarship Activities (as defined in section 3.5 of this criteria document)

5.6.5.7. Service Section

5.6.5.7.1. Narrative Report of Service Activities

5.6.5.7.2. Peer Service Evaluations

5.6.5.7.3. List of Service Awards

5.6.5.7.4. List of Committee Service and Administrative Assignments

5.6.5.7.5. List of Professional Service

5.6.5.7.6. Letters of Recognition for Committee Service, Administrative Assignments, and Professional Service

5.6.5.8. Evaluation Section

5.6.5.8.1. Copies of Annual Reviews (all annual reviews during the probationary period)

5.6.5.8.2. Letters of Commendation (if any)

5.6.5.8.3. Letters of Reprimand (if any)

5.6.5.8.4. Rebuttal Letters (if any)

5.6.5.9. Department Chair's Rank Advancement File (added by the RTP Committee)

5.6.5.10. Evaluations solicited by the RTP Committee (added by the RTP Committee)

5.6.5.11. Policies

5.6.5.11.1. UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank

5.6.5.11.2. UVU Department Annual Review, Tenure, and Rank Advancement Criteria

5.7. Procedure for Applying for Rank Advancement

5.7.1. Tenured Associate Professors create and maintain their own rank advancement portfolio.

5.7.2. No later than November 15 of the year that faculty member applies for rank advancement, candidates for rank advancement submit any requests for exceptions to UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank and/or this criteria document by written petition to the Department RTP Committee.

5.7.3. The rank advancement portfolio is submitted and reviewed according to the procedure defined in UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank. The review process follows the dates contained in that policy.

5.7.4. The department chair (or dean if the candidate is a department chair) will create and maintain a rank advancement file for each member of the department who desires to advance in rank. The rank advancement file maintained by the department chair shall contain documentation about the candidate related to or received as a function of the duties of a department chair. The rank

advancement file maintained by the department chair shall be submitted to the Department RTP Committee according to the due dates established by UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank. If the candidate is a department chair, the dean shall be responsible for creating and maintaining the candidate's rank advancement file.

- 5.7.5. The rank advancement file must contain letters of commendation or reprimand, but these may be rebutted in writing by the candidate. The department chair (or dean if the candidate is a department chair) shall notify the candidate of any negative information contained in the rank advancement file and provide the candidate with the opportunity to rebut the negative information in writing. Such rebuttals shall be included in the rank advancement file.
- 5.7.6. After the candidate and the department chair (or dean if the candidate is a department chair) submit their rank advancement portfolio and rank advancement file to the chair of the Department RTP Committee, the two files will be combined into one rank advancement portfolio.
- 5.7.7. Once the rank advancement portfolio and rank advancement file have been combined, no additional documents shall be added to the rank advancement portfolio except for the written recommendations of the reviewers, any written rebuttals to those recommendations, or material specifically requested by the Department RTP Committee.
- 5.7.8. The approval process then follows the Rank Advancement File Review Process outlined in UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank.
- 5.7.9. If the final decision is to deny promotion, the candidate may appeal the decision to the UVU Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Committee. Procedures follow those outlined in UVU Policy 646 Faculty Appeals for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.
- 5.7.10. A tenured Associate Professor who was denied promotion may reapply in any future year.

6. References

- 6.1. [UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank](#)
- 6.2. [UVU Policy 633 Annual Faculty Reviews](#)
- 6.3. [UVU Policy 635 Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities](#)
- 6.4. [UVU Policy 637 Faculty Tenure](#)
- 6.5. [UVU Policy 638 Post-Tenure Review](#)
- 6.6. [UVU Policy 646 Faculty Appeals for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion](#)

History of Approval

Type	Date	Approved by
Created	March 13, 2021	Department
Created		Dean
Created		Provost

Faculty Peer Evaluation

Classroom Observation

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Number of students present: _____ Date: _____

Observer(s): _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Several days prior to the classroom observation, the instructor should provide the observer(s) with a copy of the course syllabus containing course objectives, content, and organization. The instructor should explain to the observers(s) the instructional goals and methods of accomplishing them for the class that will be observed. Within three days after the visit, the observer(s) should meet with the instructor to discuss observations and conclusions.

Please use these to guide your tenure letter.

1. Describe the lesson taught, including the subject, objectives, and methods used.
2. Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, breadth, and depth.
3. How well organized and clear is the presentation?
4. How appropriate were the teaching techniques used for the instructor's goals for this class?
5. Describe the level of student interest and participation.
6. What are the instructor's major strengths? Weaknesses?
7. What specific recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's classroom teaching?

Classroom Teaching Observation

(5 = as much as possible, 4 = very much, 3 = sufficiently, 2 = insufficiently, 1 = not at all, NA= not applicable)

CONTENT

Main ideas are clear and specific: _____
Sufficient variety in supporting information: _____
Relevancy of main ideas was clear: _____
Higher order thinking was required: _____
Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge: _____
Definitions were given for vocabulary: _____

ORGANIZATION

Introduction captured attention: _____
Introduction stated organization of lecture: _____
Effective transitions (clear w/summaries): _____
Clear organizational plan: _____
Concluded by summarizing main ideas: _____
Reviewed by connecting to previous classes: _____
Previewed by connecting to future classes: _____

INTERACTION

Instructor questions at different level: _____
Sufficient wait time: _____
Students asked questions: _____
Instructor feedback was informative: _____
Instructor incorporated student responses: _____
Good rapport with students: _____

VERBAL/NON-VERBAL

Language was understandable: _____
Articulation and pronunciation clear: _____
Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc.): _____
Instructor spoke extemporaneously: _____
Accent was not distracting: _____
Effective voice quality: _____
Volume sufficient to be heard: _____
Rate of delivery was appropriate: _____
Effective body movement and gestures: _____
Eye contact with students: _____
Confident & enthusiastic: _____

USE OF MEDIA

Overheads/Chalkboard content clear & well-organized: _____
Visual aids can be easily read: _____
Instructor provided an outline/handouts: _____
Computerized instruction effective: _____

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS RATING : _____

Date of Observation _____