

**2017-2018 LRT Revision Plan (the “blueprint” document)
Southern Utah University**

1. Re-Cap of Previous Efforts, Main Concerns, & Insights:

During the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years, Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office have tackled the issue of revising SUU Policy #6.1 (Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure). During this time, dedicated groups of faculty representatives explored different models, worked with a consultant, and proposed different revisions (some fairly minor, others fairly extensive). However, at this point, SUU Policy #6.1 has not been revised.

During the previous two academic years, several “themes” emerged around these discussions related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure. What follows is a broad inventory (not a prioritized list) of the various concerns and insights into what revisions are desired.

- *SUU’s Values, Priorities, & Overall Purpose of 6.1*
 - Define, value, and reward “engagement” in all of its dimensions in alignment with SUU’s new mission, vision, and core themes (and the Strategic Plan as a whole).
 - Align our system of incentives and rewards with what we value (not just what’s easy to measure). And ensure that what we value is a reflection of SUU’s new mission, vision, and core themes (and the Strategic Plan as a whole).
 - Ensure that LRT policies and procedures are both evaluative (summative) and developmental (formative). This helps to create trusting relationships and a healthy working environment.
- *Performance and Evaluation Expectations*
 - Ensure that evaluation of teaching effectiveness is based on a robust Teaching Portfolio that includes more than student evaluations.
 - Encourage and reward multiple paths toward tenure (because there are multiple ways to contribute to the overall success of the university). This will be accomplished by embracing the notion that faculty are also life-long learners and we should encourage their evolving expertise that ultimately shapes their academic pursuits.
 - Develop a shared understanding of the % of “weight” assigned to each evaluative category. (Note: currently, those evaluative categories are Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, Service, and Collegiality. The revision process itself might alter these evaluative categories.) If Engagement (of some kind) is also included in LRT revisions, this should also be reflected in the relative “weight” assigned to the various categories of evaluation. This will also help faculty to guide what % of their effort, time, and energy they devote to these different areas. It will also help faculty to STOP doing some things (because we cannot keep adding new things).
 - Identify needs for professional development and training in order to implement the revised policy (i.e., training for Chairs, LRT committees, and Deans on evaluation methods). This will help to ensure the revised policy is implemented in fair and consistent ways.
 - Support corresponding revisions to Departmental LRT Criteria. This will ensure alignment with the revised university policy.
 - Ensure SUU’s evaluation, promotion, and tenure policies are consistent with national standards for peer institutions.
- *Parity across Colleges/Schools/Departments*
 - Address uneven expectations across campus, especially regarding teaching and scholarship. This helps to bring about fairness.
 - Develop a campus-wide definition of scholarship. Clarify what the Boyer Model is (and isn’t).

2. Overall Aim:

- Revise SUU Policy #6.1 (Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure) to better reflect our values and priorities.
- Clarify expectations regarding faculty performance and evaluation.
- Achieve greater parity across Colleges/Schools/Departments.

3. Responsible Parties:

Provost Cook, Associate Provost Sage, Faculty Senate President Barker, Co-Chairs of Faculty Workgroup

4. LRT Revision Work Group:

Johnny MacLean (co-chair), Steve Barney (co-chair), and four more faculty members to be selected by Brad Cook, James Sage, Nathan Barker, Bruce Howard, Johnny MacLean, and Steve Barney.

Note: while it might be tempting to assemble a large committee with individual members who represent all sub-groups on campus (e.g., each College/School, tenured / untenured, non-tenure track, Chairs, Deans, etc.), this would result in a very large group that would be inefficient. Instead, we must trust that these six faculty members will fulfill their responsibility to collect input from all relevant stakeholders.

5. Overall Approach:

Releasing a comprehensive revision of the entire policy all at once may not produce the desired results (i.e., numerous proposed changes across 30 pages all at the same time produces a wide range of different types of feedback and can be unwieldy).

Instead, a step-by-step method will be used to allow focused conversation and feedback to take place based on each part of the policy. For example, one of the first steps will be to consider the overall *Purpose* and *Value Statement*. Focusing just on these parts will help generate a shared understanding that serves as the foundation for the next step.

In order to meet the May 2018 goal, a proposed timeline has been developed (see below). For each step of the revision process, faculty will have the opportunity to make suggestions and comment on proposed changes. However, faculty must embrace this opportunity as a responsibility and devote the required time and attention to these matters within the time provided.

For each step of the process, proposed policy revisions will be accompanied by a support document that includes the feedback received and describes the work group's deliberations. In addition to open forums and online feedback surveys (open to all faculty), key campus stakeholders (e.g., Faculty Senate and Dean's Council) will be consulted.

- 1. Purpose**
- 2. References**
- 3. Value Statement**
- 4. Definitions**
- 5. Evaluation Criteria - “Evaluative Categories”**
 - a. Teaching Effectiveness
 - b. Scholarly/Creative Activity
 - c. Service
 - d. Collegiality
- 6. Ratings - “Levels of Performance”**
 - a. Unacceptable Professional Performance
 - b. Low Professional Performance
 - c. Standard Professional Performance
 - d. Exceptional Professional Performance
- 7. Review Process**
 - a. Overview of Timing / Sequencing / Routing
 - i. “Appendix A” -- deadline schedule for Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track
 - b. Responsibilities (these may need to be repeated for each type of review below)
 - i. Faculty Member
 - ii. Chair
 - iii. Department LRT
 - iv. College LRT
 - v. Dean
 - vi. University LRT
 - vii. Provost
 - viii. President / Board of Trustees
 - c. FAAR
 - i. Non-Tenure Track
 - ii. Untenured + Tenure Track
 - iii. Tenured
 - d. Three-Year Review
 - i. Untenured + Tenure Track
 - e. Tenure Review
 - i. Untenured + Tenure Track
 - ii. Administrators
 - f. Rank Advancement
 - i. Tenure Track
 1. To Associate Professor
 2. To Full Professor
 - ii. Non-Tenure Track
 1. To Assistant Professor (NTT)
 2. To Associate Professor (NTT)
 - iii. Administrators
 - g. Post-Tenure Review

("Anatomy" of LRT policy – *continued*)

8. Defining Ranks

- a. Tenure Track
 - i. Assistant Professor
 - ii. Associate Professor
 - iii. Full Professor
- b. Non-Tenure Track
 - i. Lecturer
 - ii. Assistant Professor (NTT)
 - iii. Associate Professor (NTT)

9. Sabbatical Leave

- a. Eligibility
- b. Process

~~10. Merit Pay Process~~

11. Appendices

- a. Appendix A -- deadline schedule for Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track
- b. Appendix B -- FAAR Report
- c. Appendix C -- FAAR Evaluation
- d. Appendix D -- Application for: Three-Year, Rank Advancement, Tenure, Post-Tenure
- e. Appendix E -- Evaluation for: Three-Year Review
- f. Appendix F -- Evaluation for: Rank Advancement, Tenure
- g. Appendix G -- Evaluation for: Post-Tenure
- h. Appendix H -- Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures
- i. Appendix I -- Minimum Degrees Expected for Full Professor
- ~~j. Appendix J -- Sample Merit Pay Regulation~~

7. Proposed Timeline:

1. **Introduction** of the plan to the following stakeholders on their respective dates:
 - a. Dean's Council (August 28)
 - b. Faculty Senate (September 14)
2. **Faculty Town Hall** before September 30 to discuss the *Purpose* and *Value Statement* sections, and to record other comments and concerns.
3. October 10 - Draft **Purpose** and **Value Statement** sections available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Faculty Senate (October 12)
 - b. Dean's Council (October 16)
4. October 20 - Completion of revised *Purpose* and *Value Statement* sections based on feedback.
5. November 1 - Draft **Definitions** and **Evaluation Criteria** sections available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Dean's Council (November 6)
 - b. Faculty Senate (November 9)
6. November 21 - Completion of revised *Definitions* and *Evaluation Criteria* sections based on feedback.
7. November 30 - Draft **Ratings** section available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Dean's Council (December 4)
 - b. Faculty Senate (December 14) (*No Faculty Senate meeting in December - Finals.*)
8. December 22 - Completion of revised *Ratings* section based on feedback.
9. January 2 - **Status Report** describing current progress available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Dean's Council (January 8)
 - b. Faculty Senate (January 11)
10. February 2 - Draft **Review Process** section available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Faculty Senate (February 8)
 - b. Dean's Council (February 12)
11. February 16 - Completion of revised *Review Process* section based on feedback.
12. March 2 - Draft **Defining Ranks** and **Sabbatical Leave** sections available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Faculty Senate (March 8) (*No Faculty Senate meeting in March*)
 - b. Dean's Council (March 26)
13. March 30 - Completion of revised *Defining Ranks* and *Sabbatical Leave* sections based on feedback.
14. April 6 - Draft **Disciplinary Procedures** and **Appendices** sections available for feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Faculty Senate (April 12)
 - b. Dean's Council (April 23)
15. April 27 - Completion of revised *Disciplinary Procedures* and *Appendices* sections based on feedback.
16. May 4 - **Complete draft of revised policy** available for final feedback from the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Dean's Council. Discussion will occur with each group during their respective meetings:
 - a. Dean's Council (May 7)
 - b. Faculty Senate (May 10) (*No Faculty Senate meeting in May.*)
17. May 15 - Submission of final document to the Provost's Office for consideration.

8. Review Steps: (table version of the above timeline)

Step	Date of first draft	Date of revised draft	Parties Involved/Responsible
1. Consensus about the plan	n/a	August 15	Provost Cook, Assoc Provost Sage, Faculty Senate President Barker, Former Faculty Senate President Howard, and Working Group Co-Chairs MacLean and Barney
2. Meeting to on-board the LRT Revision Work Group	n/a	August 23	LRT Revision Work Group Members (TBD) Cook, Sage, Barker, Howard
3. Introduction of the plan to Faculty Senate and Dean's Council	n/a	August 28 (Dean's Council) and September 14 (Faculty Senate)	LRT Revision Work Group
4. Faculty Town Hall	n/a	Before September 15?	LRT Revision Work Group
5. Purpose of LRT Policy, Value Statement (review definitions)	October 10	October 20	LRT Revision Work Group
6. Definitions and Evaluation Criteria (Evaluative Categories)	November 1	November 21	LRT Revision Work Group
7. Ratings (Levels of Performance) (ensure complete descriptions for each combination of Evaluation vs. Ratings; see matrix below)	November 30	December 22	LRT Revision Work Group
8. Progress Report	n/a	January 2	LRT Revision Work Group
9. Review Process (steps, timing, transparency issues)	February 2	February 16	LRT Revision Work Group
10. Defining Ranks (expectations, eligibility) and Sabbatical Leave	March 2	March 30	LRT Revision Work Group
11. Disciplinary Procedures and Appendices, Forms, and Supporting Documents	April 6	April 27	LRT Revision Work Group
12. Final document	May 4	May 15	LRT Revision Work Group

9. “Matrix” of Current *Evaluation Criteria* (Evaluative Categories) and *Ratings* (Levels of Performance)

Example 1: For tenure-track faculty seeking Tenure and rank advancement to Associate Professor:

	Exceptional PP	Standard PP	Low PP	Unacceptable PP
Teaching Effectiveness				
Scholarly/Creative Activity				
Service				
Collegiality				

Example 2: For tenure-track faculty seeking rank advancement to Full Professor:

	Exceptional PP	Standard PP	Low PP	Unacceptable PP
Teaching Effectiveness				
Scholarly/Creative Activity				
Service				
Collegiality				

Note: these examples use the *existing* Evaluation Criteria and Ratings found in SUU Policy #6.1.