

## Policy 6.1 Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Proposal Highlights (as of April 6, 2018)

1. Allows the Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policy to value **engaged faculty contributions** that align with SUU's student-centered mission.
  - a. Expands the expectations for faculty to include various forms and levels of engagement.
  - b. Adds definitions for terms used throughout the document, including Faculty Engagement, Peer Review, Tenure, Teaching Effectiveness, Shared Governance, etc.
  - c. Broadens the definition of scholarship to include scholarly work with students and the community. Departments determine appropriate scholarly contributions.
  - d. Outlines a conceptual model of faculty contributions that includes traditional areas and other contributions that meet SUU's student-centered mission.
2. Recognizes the **developmental nature** of a faculty member's career and the role of departments in outlining specific expectations.
3. Describes a **developmental approach** to faculty evaluation.
  - a. Lecturers and Assistant Professors complete annual contribution plans/reports according to departmentally defined criteria.
  - b. Mentorship teams, as defined by departments, review the contribution plans/reports.
    - i. Mentors guide faculty to align contributions with SUU's student-centered mission and departmental evaluation criteria, providing a transparent, collaborative environment for ongoing feedback.
    - ii. Departments determine the process by which mentors are assigned.
    - iii. TT faculty have at least 2 mentors; NTT faculty have at least 1 mentor.
    - iv. Departments design a process by which faculty can request a change to the mentors.
    - v. Faculty can request an ad hoc Department LRT Committee for the Mid-Point and Tenure Reviews in place of the mentorship team.
  - c. Associate and Full Professors complete a 5-Year Plan/Report.
4. Aligns **evaluative responsibilities** with appropriate administrative levels.
  - a. Departments articulate specific criteria for evaluation.
  - b. Annual plans/reports follow templates limited to 3 pages.
  - c. Faculty mentors are the first to review annual plans/reports, as opposed to administrators.
  - d. Faculty have the opportunity to review and respond to mentors' evaluations during annual reviews and mid-point reviews.
  - e. Deans do not evaluate faculty annually; instead, they ensure parity of departmental evaluation criteria across the college/school.
  - f. Mid-Point Review materials reviewed by mentors, Chair, College LRT Committee, and Dean.
  - g. Tenure, and Rank Advancement materials reviewed by mentors, Chair, College LRT Committee, Dean, and University LRT Committee.
  - h. 5-Year Plans/Reports are reviewed by the Chair and the Dean.
  - i. Evaluative ratings include:
    - i. Acceptable Progress toward Faculty Engagement & Contribution Plans
    - ii. Development Required (followed by a detailed justification and a description of necessary actions).
5. Shifts **workload** to more meaningful mentorship relationships by decreasing the size of annual reports for Lecturers and Assistant Professors, and by removing annual reports for Associate and Full Professors.
6. Removes leave (sabbatical) and merit sections, to be covered by other policies.