Recommendations for Faculty Preparing Portfolios (and beyond)

This document contains recommendations compiled by the members of the University RTP Committees while reviewing portfolios in AY19-20 and AY20-21. The recommendations are presented with the intent of demystifying RTP processes and providing helpful guidance to faculty subject to RTP reviews. A separate document contains our recommendations for administrators and faculty who oversee or engage in RTP reviews.

Contents

General Recommendations for Preparing Portfolios

- Collect evidence early and regularly. Collect and organize documents into Teaching/ Librarianship, Scholarship, and Service categories on a semester or an annual basis. Update your CV while organizing documents.
- Obtain a good portfolio template and make a plan for completing your portfolio in a timely manner.
- Consider the university RTP policy applicable to your review.
    - Different policies have different language about tenure and promotion, particularly when applying early for associate or full professor.
    - If you are applying for early tenure and/or promotion under SP 17-08, explicitly address the criterion "brought widespread recognition to the individual or the university, from academia or the community."

- o Former lecturers under review using SP 17-08: Provide narratives and supporting documents for the activities you conducted as a lecturer that you wish to be part of your RTP review.
- Align your narratives directly and explicitly with your PPS and with the relevant university RTP policy.
- Stay within the maximum word counts for your narratives. More ≠ better!
- Consult a mentor in your program for advice on their read of the PPS, especially in terms of scholarship and service. Seek feedback on the format and structure of your portfolio.
- Strategize about the single "bucket" (teaching/ librarianship, scholarship and creative activities, service) in which to place specific accomplishments. Avoid redundancy.
  - o If an activity has aspects that apply to more than one performance area, identify and place it under the most appropriate performance area.
  - o Identify the appropriate performance area for student research mentorship according to your program's PPS.
- Assist reviewers in understanding your work by providing an accounting of your WTUs by semester.

General Recommendations for Organizing Portfolios

- Delete prior years' files and old narratives before uploading new ones (for electronic portfolios). Clarify the period of review and submit aggregated files for the entire review period.
- Avoid missing or confusing supporting evidence
  - o Provide complete and clearly labeled appendices that include all required supporting evidence. Documents mentioned in narratives must be included in the appendices.
  - o Clearly identify the period under review. This is especially important for faculty applying for early tenure/promotion and/or granted prior service credit(s).
  - o Refer to the relevant university RTP policy to ensure you are submitting all required materials.

General Recommendations for Preparing Narratives

- The narratives become your "story" about your achievements – tell it with clarity and evidence.
- Your portfolios for your third-year review and tenure and promotion candidacies will be read by audiences outside your discipline: write in a way that is accessible to non-specialists.
- The reviewers will not be able to discern your accomplishments' significance or meaning from lists or linked documents. The narrative is the place to help the readers understand your accomplishments.
- The narrative is also the place to provide context and address any challenges. (For example, see the advice concerning SRTs in the Recommendations for the Teaching Section. Pandemic-related additional challenges could well be noted in your narrative.)
- Request feedback on narrative drafts, particularly from mentors outside of your program.

Recommendations for the CV (as part of the Portfolio)

- The CV submitted within your RTP portfolio should be prepared for the purpose of RTP evaluations – it will be much longer than a CV used to demonstrate general qualifications.
- If your PPS criteria includes peer reviewed scholarship, create a separate category for it in your CV, listing other types of scholarship elsewhere.
- Within your publications section, clearly differentiate **works in press** (accepted, but still in the publication process).
- In a **separate** part of the publications section, clearly label **works in progress** and **works under review** (and where they are being reviewed). These are not required, but they provide an idea of your publication agenda.
- If you have works under review, you can include them in your appendix, so that reviewers can see your progress.
- It is helpful to provide descriptive labels for other types of scholarship or creative activity on your CV, for those outside of your discipline.

Recommendations for the Teaching or Librarianship Section of the Portfolio

- Ask for teaching peer evaluations from colleagues both inside and outside your program.
- Review your SRTs carefully each semester. Look for overall patterns and include your reflection on these patterns (based on scores **and** student comments) in your teaching narrative.
- Consider whether reviewers need context for SRTs and/or peer evaluations (e.g., new prep, class was a 3-hour format as opposed to the normal twice a week, etc.)
- Indicate how your reflections on the SRTs and on your peer evaluations have shaped changes to your teaching practice. If SRTs have improved as a result, discuss this improvement.
- Consider providing examples that illustrate your teaching (beyond your syllabi). In your narrative, discuss how you've adapted or changed classes, with reference to documentation in the appendix, when applicable.
- Do not include teaching that is outside the scope of your state-side contract unless you have confirmed that such teaching is relevant to your RTP evaluations. Clarify the scope and document performance if it is relevant.
- Consider providing an accounting of WTUs by semester to provide context and scope for reviewers. This is especially helpful for reviewers from colleges other than your own.

Recommendations for the Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities Section of the Portfolio

- Use this section to educate your reader about your field. Use your narrative to make the case for why your work (your questions, field of interest, accomplishments) is important. Contextualize the work and articulate what is meaningful and significant.

- Feel free to use first person ("I" or "we") in the narrative.
- Narratives should reference both the PPS and the appendix.
- Clarify which book chapters, articles, and other creative activities are peer reviewed. Evidence should go into the appendix. For work not yet published, you may include correspondence with editors to indicate where the work is in the editorial process.
- Petition to add material to your RTP file if you have something accepted (not just submitted) after the RTP deadline only when it will make a difference in that year's review.

Recommendations for the Service Section of the Portfolio

- Create a service narrative rather than a simple list of committees served.
- In your narrative, provide a sense of your overall service focus, agenda, or purposes.
- In discussing particular service activities, help reviewers understand what was accomplished as part of your service. For example, what role did you play on the committee? What level of service or leadership did you take on?
- If you have service credit from a prior institution, discuss the service you performed there and provide evidence in the appendix.
- As always, align this section with your PPS requirements.

Recommendations for Writing a Rebuttal

If you need to write a rebuttal…
- Do submit a concise, factual rebuttal written in an appropriate tone, in cases of factual errors or complicating factors that need explanation or context.
- Help reviewers to correctly interpret your file in light of the previous level(s) of review.
- Do not use the rebuttal process to insert new information into your file that cannot be verified by other evidence already in the file.