**LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback
From April 6 to April 16, 2018**

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the right hand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the left hand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise any part of Policy 6.1, its appendices, and/or the revision process	
Several of my comments for the March 2 to April 6, 2018 period didn't show up, and weren't addressed in the document titled All Responses to All Anonymous Comments, as of April 6, 2018. Are all comments from this survey included, or is there some selection process of which comments to include?	We have double- and triple-checked the Google Form survey where the anonymous survey responses are collected. We cannot find any comments that were not included in the previous report. Anyone is welcome to look through the Google Forms and any other documentation at any time. Please feel free to contact the work group if you would like.
Could a little more light be shed on the exchange included below that was found in the Responses to Feedback document. Specifically why the response mentors non-Senators; does this mean Senators are the vocal minority the commenter speaks of. This seems to be an infantile attack on those in the faculty senate that disagree with the LRT policy. This passive aggressive attitude and several actions taken by the current LRT work group should be of grave concern to all faculty. Comment: I think the team should be applauded for their work. I do worry that a loud vocal minority (who seem to be the ones who support traditional scholarship as a means of evaluating faculty) will threaten progress and keep SUU from reaching its full potential. I suspect that the faculty who have yet to provide input are the ones who are heavily engaged with students and as such, have precious little time for much else.	The work group simply receives anonymous comments, so we're not always aware of the commenter's specific frame of reference. In this case, it appears that the commenter is concerned about the possibility that what they perceive as a vocal minority might "threaten progress and keep SUU from reaching its full potential." The Faculty Senate asked the work group to create a poll about the general themes and major changes in the revision so we could all gain a better idea about faculty-wide perspectives. Since the Faculty Senate presumably knows their own perspectives already, it seems reasonable to assume the Faculty Senate was looking for non-Senators' perspectives. Our response doesn't seem like a passive-aggressive attitude at all. In fact, the work group was simply responding to the Faculty Senate request. The work group would love to know more about any of our actions that

Response: Thank you for your comment. Our hope is that the Faculty Poll will show how non-Senators feel about some of the major proposed changes.	"should be of grave concern to all faculty." We have worked hard to carry out a transparent, communicative, and collaborative process. If this commenter would like to speak with us about specific concerns, we would love to schedule a meeting.
1) we need guidelines in the policy on how members for the college school LRT are chosen outside the college (as needed) if a college doesn't have enough tenured faculty please (I don't think I saw that anywhere) 2) on the part that says there is a dispute and a 3 member team (Dean Chair and faculty member choice) is chosen we need to include that the annual plan that was approved prior will be an important factor in those discussions since the 3 member team is university administrator dominant 3) in the ratings section, it gives two options - 1) progress on plan and 2) development required - shouldn't our development required become part of the plan and then in one sense this is redundant - on the other hand this leaves a lot of interpretation for an administrator - I would like to see that number 2 is removed and somewhere else (if needed) it says development required must become part of the plan I know this was an anonymous survey - but in case my suggestions need clarification I am happy to clarify - thus I am letting you know this is from Leilani Nautu	Thank you for your comments. Are responses follow: 1) We agree. Due to the variability of each department, the proposed policy allows each department to create their own processes for creating P&T Mentorship Teams. 2) We agree. Our hope is that all appropriate documentation will be available to the evaluators in the case of a dispute. Clearly, the Faculty Engagement & Contribution Plan would be an important document for all to consider. 3) We agree that any required development should show up in the subsequent plan. If we were to remove the second option for a rating, evaluators would only have one option, which seems inappropriate.

LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback
From March 2 to April 6, 2018

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the right hand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the left hand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise any part of Policy 6.1? What suggestions do you have to improve the text?	
It is important to reference Regent's Policy R481, Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post Tenure Review. SUU should be aligned with this Policy. There appears to be inconsistency in stating the responsibility of the Dean to notify non-reappointments no later than March 1st. This should be for a 1st year appointments only, all others should receive a 6 month notification, or by Dec. 15th. Double check full alignment with this policy.	Thank you for this notice. We have communicated with the Provost's Office regarding this concern. The language in Regent's Policy R481 contains some ambiguity, so the Provost's Office is in communication with the Board of Regents to find clarification. When clarification is provided, we will revise accordingly. In the meantime, the proposed language is identical to the existing Policy 6.1, so SUU will remain in its current level of compliance.
In reviewing the Purpose statement, I am concerned that part-time appointments are now included in the faculty evaluation process. Recognizing that at least part of the goal here is to reduce workload, the inclusion of part-time faculty cannot help but increase workload, considering that we currently do not include those individuals in the evaluation process. That being said, there probably needs to be a mechanism for the evaluation of part-time faculty appointments. Since part-time faculty would likely only be held responsible to teaching related activities, do we really need to assess their contributions in scholarship? Perhaps it is sufficient to directly evaluate their teaching and let that decide their future role at the University? Which brings me back to my concern about the Purpose statement, should part-time faculty have a place in this document?	Thank you for your concern. The work group identified some cases in recent years where a faculty member (not an adjunct) had a part-time appointment. In these cases, the faculty member's evaluation, promotion, and tenure considerations remained under Policy 6.1. In the revised draft, the first two sentences of the Purpose Statement state: "This policy applies to Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Non-Tenure Track faculty at Southern Utah University (SUU) with full-time or part-time appointments, on campus or off-campus, as well as to faculty serving as administrators having faculty standing. The policy does not apply to appointees with limited terms, such as adjuncts, visiting faculty, or emeriti." It clearly states that this policy does not apply to adjuncts, etc. Later in the document, definitions are provided for the various ranks of faculty. We think the Purpose Statement is appropriate as it is written. You may be correct that an additional policy is required for adjunct faculty, but that is not the purpose of this policy. We will inform the Provost's Office of the potential need for an additional policy.
Section V. A. 1., relating to the description of the rank. Full Professor. I have noted several comments expressing concern about the clarity of this description. Inclusion of statements like, "Full Professors have exhibited	Thank you for your concerns with the clarity of the Full Professor description. First, the definition of Faculty Engagement is in the current draft on page 4,

continued development in Faculty Engagement" (which was defined in an earlier version of the policy, but is not currently defined) and "They have contributed significantly to SUU's mission, and they have taken advantage of appropriate opportunities to mentor other SUU faculty members." doesn't really add any clarity to the traits a Full Professor would exhibit. Are we really suggesting that the rank of Full Professor would be awarded to someone because they engaged in mentoring? If so, how would that effectiveness be measured? I suggest that both of those statements be removed from the description. It would then read, " . . . of experience at SUU as an Associate Professor. Their teaching, scholarship, and service/leadership . . ."	and it has been in the previous drafts as well. Second, the current draft says: "The rank of Full Professor is an appointment for persons with an earned terminal degree in the field of their appointment and at least five years of experience at SUU as an Associate Professor. Full Professors have exhibited continued development in Faculty Engagement. They have contributed significantly to SUU's mission, and they have taken advantage of appropriate opportunities to mentor other SUU faculty members. Their teaching, scholarship, and service/leadership reflect high professional competence. Departmental evaluation criteria delineate specific standards required for promotion to Full Professor." The inclusion of the sentence, "They have contributed significantly to SUU's mission, and they have taken advantage of appropriate opportunities to mentor other SUU faculty members," is meant to acknowledge and value a full professor's work in guiding newer faculty members' efforts toward SUU's student-centered mission. Our hope is that Full Professors will include mentorship in their Five-Year Plan as a major component of their contributions to the university. The answer to your first question is that mentorship could definitely be part of the evaluation of a tenured faculty member because mentorship could be an important component of that faculty member's contributions. Measuring the effectiveness of the mentorship will be handled at the departmental level. We don't think it is necessary to create a quantitative measurement for every single type of faculty contribution; in fact, most meaningful forms of faculty evaluation are likely qualitative because distilling such complicated contributions to a simple number can be quite problematic. Thank you for the suggestion, but our work group has agreed to retain the current language because we feel it does provide helpful clarity.
I appreciate the value statement. I think it is inline with SUU's strategic plan and work to establish our campus as a leader in experiential and engaged learning. Keep these words: evidence-based pedgagogical practices, teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service. I also appreciate how these approaches can be practiced or played out through scholarship, shared governance, and leadership. Can you add engaged or experiential learning?	Thank you for your comment. As you suggest, we will keep the words "evidence-based pedagogical practices, teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service." Early in the revision process, we received comments about how the word "experiential" was used too much. Our goal was, and still is, to align the policy with SUU's mission and vision. Since this policy will likely last longer than our current mission, our work group decided to simply refer directly to SUU's mission and vision. With this approach, SUU's mission and

I ask for this in the values statement because I think engagement is clearly defined in "Faculty Engagement and want to make sure it's in the values statement. I like the student-centric faculty engagement model. I think a holistic point needs to be made, though, by supporting the faculty and staff to be their best professional selves, the faculty and staff can turn around and support our students to be their best professional selves. I think this is assumed in the language, but would be good to make apparent. Our ultimate goal, I believe is to create a campus culture where individual students, faculty, staff, and community members/partners feel valued for their work and in so doing makes a positive difference for our society. I think this vision can be achieved through the processes in this policy and yes, I know it's idealistic. Intentional training and purpose can help.	vision can change to keep up with national trends in higher education, and we won't have to change the language of Policy 6.1 every time. We agree that faculty and staff must be supported holistically, and that such support will lead to more effective faculty engagement, which will ultimately result in positive changes for our society. We've incorporated your suggestion into the definition of the P&T Mentorship Team. The last sentence of the definition is: "The principal objective of the P&T Mentorship Team is to provide consistent formation, guidance, and support to the faculty member that contributes to a campus culture of growth and improvement." The Provost's Office has committed to providing the necessary resources for intentional training of mentors and faculty.
2. Please provide feedback regarding the appendices. How would you suggest changing them? What suggestions do you have to improve them?	
Can you link the faculty engagement and contribution report to department, college, and SUU strategic goals so faculty can see how they contribute to the larger picture?	The template already refers directly to SUU's mission and departmental evaluation criteria. It has been made clear to our work group by multiple faculty members that specific contributions should tie directly to departmental evaluation criteria. Faculty members' reports will accomplish your suggestion if departments design their departmental evaluation criteria to link to department, college, and university strategic goals.
Appendix B, and other places throughout the document the wording appears to require those going for rank advancement to Full Professor to submit a Report/Plan to a P&T mentorship team. Throughout the policy rank advancement to full Professor needs to be addressed separately from the other cases (tenure/associate professor, NTT promotion).	Thank you for your comment. We have updated the text for clarity.
3. Please provide any other comments regarding the LRT policy revision process.	
Thank you for your inclusive process.	You're welcome!

I like the mentoring approach. How can this be supported through training and building networks of support?	The Provost's Office has committed to providing the necessary resources for intentional training of mentors and faculty. Upon approval of the revision, this training will be carried out during a transition year. Outlining the exact workshops and other resources is beyond the scope of the policy revision, but a plan will be produced after the revision is approved.
I have some major concerns about the P&T mentor team. 1) The tenured faculty in most departments skews male while the junior faculty skews more diverse. Given all of the recent scholarship and studies on the unique trials and tribulations that female faculty face (see the Chronicle of Higher Ed study), many potential mentors will not have had the same experiences that their mentees will experience and therefore may not be able to give good advice. 2) In many departments, the majority of service fall on the junior faculty as the the tenured faculty have "checked out" or claim to have already done their share, it seems hypocritical for these mentors to be advising faculty who are baring the lion share of service work. 3) In many departments, the curriculum innovations are happening at the junior level not the tenured faculty level. How can these P&T mentors be relied on to give good advice on pedagogy and teaching when they have not revised their own courses in decades? 4) How can a mentee replace a mentor without blow back? Everyone will know that they requested a change and that is likely to sour relations between colleagues and within departments.	Thank you for your concerns. They are all legitimate concerns, and although they are all present in the current system, the proposed revision's emphasis on mentors could serve to exacerbate the issues. The first three concerns have to do with the potential for Lecturers and Assistant Professors to receive bad mentorship. In any human endeavor, this is a possible reality that will be difficult to avoid. We've written the revision to allow departments to construct the mentorship teams in whatever way best suits their personnel. This may help to avoid unwise partnerships. More specific responses to each of your concerns are below:

1) Although white male mentors may not be able to provide every type of mentorship for non-white and/or non-male faculty, our hope is that they will be able to provide some positive guidance. Due to our current demographics, we simply can't avoid the fact that our tenured faculty are mostly white males, which will lead to the problems you mentioned in the evaluation of other faculty regardless of what the policy is. Our hope is that increased dialogue and transparency will help the situation in most cases.

2) With the revised policy, junior faculty can include the types of service to which they plan to contribute in their Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan at the beginning of each year. Our hope is that mentors will be able to guide these faculty toward a balanced approach. Then, as the academic year progresses, the faculty member can lean back on their plan when asked to serve on more and more committees. The plan will, in fact, provide more security for faculty to turn down service opportunities. The revision could lead departments to more actively balance service across all faculty members.

3) As with any good mentor-mentee relationship, the mentor has an equal opportunity to learn from the mentee. While most mentors will likely have wisdom to share, some may become reinvigorated by the energy of the mentee. The department should develop a process to construct mentorship teams that avoids utilizing senior faculty who simply won't provide a positive experience. Mentors who do provide positive experiences should be |

| | acknowledged accordingly.

4) Replacing a mentor may have negative implications. It will be up to the faculty member to measure those negative implications against their current situation. Our hope is for this revision to begin to create a culture of communication and transparency. Such communication can be difficult, and it can also be extremely rewarding. |
|---|---|
| I have some concerns about the 5 year report process for tenured faculty. There is already a perceived----and in some cases, very real---belief that some faculty check out once they are tenured: they stop developing new courses, they do not update their pedagogy, they stop taking on service responsibilities, they stop teaching general education/lower level courses, and they monopolize upper division courses for themselves despite the fact that junior faculty have the skill set, specialization, and desire to teach some of these courses. This new system of only submitting 5 year plans for tenured faculty leaves the door wide open for such practices to get even worse, not to improve. | Regardless of the policy, some individuals may abuse the system. Our hope is to foster a culture of collaboration and transparency that leads to intrinsic motivation. Human development research indicates that as people near retirement, they begin to desire to leave a legacy at their place of employment. If we can develop a policy that rewards senior faculty for their mentorship efforts, perhaps they will find value in investing in junior faculty. This will lead to more engagement at all levels. |
| It is unclear what the transition to the new LRT policy will be. Do you go to bed in one system and wake up the next day in another? Can TT faculty familiar with the old system stay in it? | If this proposal is approved, we will spend the 2018-2019 academic year in the current policy while each department prepares to switch to the new policy in Fall 2019. We hope to ask a few departments to pilot the new policy next year so we can identify areas in need of adjustment and so we can provide firsthand advice for navigating the new system. When departmental evaluation criteria change, we will need to trust our peers to evaluate our previous FAARs under previous criteria, and subsequent reports under subsequent criteria. Such effort requires a thoughtful approach to evaluation. |
| How do we ensure that this new policy is not punitive? In many ways, it seems to take power, initiative, and control away from the TT faculty and gives it to the P&T Mentor team. | The intent is very much not to take power, initiative, and control away from the tenure-track faculty. The P&T Mentorship Team is not at all meant to be a controlling body. On the contrary, the P&T Mentorship Team is meant to understand the faculty member's goals and interests in the context of SUU's mission and the departmental evaluation criteria, and then to provide helpful support and guidance to ensure the faculty member meets his/her own goals and interests. Mentorship should be a positive, developmental experience that fosters intrinsic motivation. It should never be a stifling experience. |
| | |

LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback
From February 2 to March 2, 2018

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the right hand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the left hand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Purpose Statement, Value Statement, and Definitions sections. How would you suggest changing the draft? What suggestions do you have to improve it?	
Statement is good, like the statement that ways to contribute can "defy simple classification" as it creates possibilities for flexibility.	Thank you for the comment!
First, I'd like to thank the committee for their professionalism and diligence in revising the SUU LRT criteria. The committee has been exemplary in their transparency and responsiveness to faculty feedback and concerns. Some general and specific thoughts and suggestions on the latest draft (dated Feb 2, 2018) are included below. I apologize that while reviewing the draft and putting together my comments I did not separate them based on the sections, but I have referenced page numbers and sections in my specific comments. * General Thoughts and Suggestions * * The deadlines, steps, and procedures for some of the evaluation processes are a bit hard to follow. Flow-charts or diagrams would be helpful. * There are several sections scattered throughout the policy that refer to required content within the department LRT criteria (e.g., expectations for tenure/promotion, items to be included in the portfolio, etc.). It would be helpful if an appendix listed all required content with references to the pertinent policy sections. * Similar to comments from other faculty, I am a little uneasy with the idea	Thank you for your thorough comments. We'll do our best to respond to each. Deadlines, steps, and procedures: We have provided a chart with deadlines in the appendices. Required content: The Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report has a general template. It is provided in the appendices. The specific requirements for the report will be determined in the departmental evaluation criteria. Mentorship team with evaluation responsibilities: Our committee recognizes the complication of asking mentors to also evaluate. Our thought is two-fold. First, the mentors will be the most knowledgeable about the faculty member's progress, engagement, and contributions, so they will be in the best position to provide a well informed evaluation. Second, asking one group to mentor faculty and another group to evaluate faculty would increase workload substantially, which is not in the best interest of faculty. The proposed draft asks that faculty trust each other to provide effective mentorship and honest evaluations. We should embrace this responsibility and rise to the occasion. Also, a majority of respondents to the faculty poll agree that mentors should also be evaluators.

that the mentoring team also has evaluative responsibilities. It seems that would make it hard to function as a true mentor/advocate for new faculty members.

* Specific Thoughts and Suggestions *

[Page 7; Policy 6.1, VII, B] Based on the guiding principle that "more responsibility will be given to faculty to determine faculty expectations," faculty should have the responsibility to approve department LRT criteria, rather than the deans. If the university LRT committee (and possibly the college LRT committees) were given the responsibility to approve department LRT criteria, this would help to ensure consistency across departments university-wide. It would also (hopefully) lead to more consistent expectations over time. With a single dean approving the policy in each college, there could be significant differences between colleges, and over time (as deans turn over) significant differences within a college depending on which dean approved which departments' policies.

[Page 7; Policy 6.1, VII.D] Faculty evaluations are limited to "acceptable progress" and "development required." Is it expected that a faculty member who makes "acceptable progress" will be eligible for tenure and/or promotion when the time comes? This should be clarified one way or the other within the policy.

[Page 8; Section 6.1.1.II] It's probably obvious that a department chair cannot serve as a P&T mentor, but this should be explicitly stated.

[Page 8; Section 6.1.1.II.D.2)] Based on wording later in the policy, I believe that required items can be stipulated by the department for the appendices in the faculty portfolio. It would be helpful if this were made clear in this section with wording like: "Appendices that include teaching portfolio and other pertinent information as required by the department or deemed important by the faculty member such as student evaluations, …"

[Page 9; Section 6.1.1.II.H] I found the deadline schedule to be vague with respect to the steps that the department chair takes in the evaluation process.

[Page 9; Section 6.1.1.II.H.2.a] Should end of this read "moves to Step

[Page 7; Policy 6.1, VII, B] - Our work group's thought process was that a dean would be responsible for maintaining parity across the college/school. A College LRT Committee could do the same thing, but that significantly decreases the dean's ability to set a course to meet their vision. Also, College LRT Committees' memberships rotate each year, which would create a challenge for consistency. The Provost's Office will have the responsibility to ensure parity across college/schools.

[Page 7; Policy 6.1, VII.D] - A faculty member's set of Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plans should be crafted in such a way as to address any issues and concerns of the mentors, chair, and other evaluative entities. The mentors and chair have the responsibility to ensure the plan includes appropriate language. If this is the case, faculty who consistently make acceptable progress toward their Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan should be on track for tenure/rank advancement. There should be no surprises. However, the decision for tenure/rank advancement can be more complicated than a black-and-white solution. The tenure-track process is a probationary period, and non-renewal of contracts does not require explanation.

[Page 8; Section 6.1.1.II] - We have made the change that department chairs cannot serve on P&T Mentorship Teams.

[Page 8; Section 6.1.1.II.D.2)] - We have added the suggested language.

[Page 9; Section 6.1.1.II.H] - We have provided a chart with deadlines in the appendices.

[Page 9; Section 6.1.1.II.H.2.a] - Nice catch! Yes. Adjustment has been made.

[Page 10; Section 6.1.1.II.I] - Good idea! The adjustment has been made.

[Page 10; Section 6.1.1.III.A] - We have attempted to clarify with this language: "If there is evidence that a tenured faculty member is not fulfilling professional responsibilities (Policy 6.28) and their Five-Year Plan, the Department Chair should collaborate with the faculty member to address the issues. If issues remain unresolved, the Department Chair, in consultation with the College/School Dean, can petition the Provost's Office for a change in the nature and/or frequency of reporting and evaluation. After consulting

Three"?

[Page 10; Section 6.1.1.II.I] Having faculty share their Faculty Contribution Plans is a great idea! The tenured faculty should do this as well (in the next subsection, where the five-year plans are discussed) as it would help tenure-track faculty to better understand what the expectations will be once tenure is achieved.

[Page 10; Section 6.1.1.III.A] It's unclear what is meant by the "petition for change" if a tenured faculty is not performing in a "professionally responsible manner." To whom is the petition made? How is the petition adjudicated? Will the petition process be the vehicle for action against a tenured faculty who is not performing at the expected level?

[Page 12; Section 6.1.1.IV.B.2] This section states, "In addition to the material provided by the faculty member, the Department Chair may consider other information…" Similar language is used in other sections for other processes and evaluative entities (such as the deans). If chairs and deans are bringing in additional information into the evaluation process, faculty should be given a chance to respond to that information.

[Page 14; Section 6.1.1.IV.C.3] "The Dean notifies the appropriate Department Chairs of any aberrant Faculty [Reports/Plans]" This seems to suggest that the Dean has absolute veto power over the plans. What if the P&T Mentorship team and/or the Department chair disagree with the Dean?

[Page 18; Section 6.1.3.II.B.1] Can faculty hired before 1/28/05 switch to this new policy if they desire? How many faculty fall into this situation? Is it in our best interest to have faculty evaluated under differing expectations?

[Page 19; Section 6.1.3.IV.A] Should the first sentence read, "The tenured faculty member prepares an application portfolio consisting of all prior 5-year reviews" (instead of annual reviews)?

[Page 22; Section 6.1.3.VI] Why aren't the provost's responsibilities given?

[Page 22; Section 6.1.3.VII.A] "Any evaluative entity will receive additional information when requested." What does this mean? From whom will the information come? Can the faculty respond to additional information

with the faculty member, Department Chair, and College/School Dean, the Provost's Office will render a final decision that includes an updated plan."

[Page 12; Section 6.1.1.IV.B.2] - The intent is for mentors and chairs to help faculty members address areas of improvement within their Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plans. If a chair brings in additional information, the faculty member should update the plan accordingly.

[Page 14; Section 6.1.1.IV.C.3] - The dean is charged with ensuring parity across the departments within the particular college/school. If the dean notices a lack of parity across the various departments,, the dean addresses the lack of parity with the department chairs. Obviously individual faculty members' plans and reports will contribute to the scenario, but the deans should be looking at the general trends of the department, not the individual faculty members. The chair of each department should ensure parity across the department.

[Page 18; Section 6.1.3.II.B.1] - Yes, faculty can switch to this policy if desired. Most/all faculty hired before 1/28/05 already have the rank of Associate or Full Professor, so they would be allowed to create Five-Year Plans and Reports. The work group assumes they will all choose to switch to the new policy.

[Page 19; Section 6.1.3.IV.A] - Yes. Thank you for the notice. We've changed the language accordingly.

[Page 22; Section 6.1.3.VI] - The current policy does not include the Provost's responsibilities, so we left them out of the draft revision. If faculty wish, we can include them.

[Page 22; Section 6.1.3.VII.A] - This language is in the current policy. If any entity, including the faculty member, submits incomplete or confusing information, following entities can request clarification or additional information.

[Page 22; Section 6.1.3.VII.D] - This is a legal issue. If a faculty member is denied for rank advancement and tenure, the faculty member cannot receive feedback. If a faculty member is denied for rank advancement (and tenure is not considered), it would be beneficial for evaluators to provide some sort of

brought into the evaluative process? (Same wording is used on page 25; Section 6.1.4.IV.2) [Page 22; Section 6.1.3.VII.D] "...If rank advancement is denied, materials submitted by faculty are returned." What about comments/judgements by the evaluative entities? If this is truly to be a developmental process, then the faculty should be provided with the reasons that the rank advancement was denied. [Page 23; Section 6.1.4.II.A] At the end of this section, it refers to "policy 6.1, VII". This reference is a little unclear, but is necessary because the opening of the policy is not given its own subsection. Why not start the policy with Section 6.1.1? [Page 25; Section 6.1.4.III.A] "The applicant is responsible to document performance for each criterion." Please make it more clear to which criteria this refers. Also, why would a candidate retract their application for tenure (last sentence)? Could the policy clarify why this might be necessary/desired?	feedback, but such feedback does not need to include every evaluative comment because some of those comments may be sensitive in nature. Therefore, the policy should not require all materials to be returned. [Page 23; Section 6.1.4.II.A] - This revision attempts to follow the general format of the current policy to make comparison of the two policies easy. [Page 25; Section 6.1.4.III.A] - We have changed the text to: "The applicant is responsible to document performance related to departmental evaluation criteria."
The values statement refers to the strategic plan and incorporates "teaching," "learning," and "engagement," but does not refer to "experiential education". I like the definition of faculty engagement.	Great! Thank you!
Keep engagement and student learning as our core.	The proposed definition of Faculty Engagement attempts to address this point.
I think the statement regarding the rank of Full Professor could be more detailed. I don't think that continued growth in Faculty Engagement or contribution towards SUU's mission is very specific. I understand that departments will need to develop specific criteria, but I don't think the Full Professor statement offers much guidance in that regard.	We would be happy to consider any language that faculty members would like to suggest.
I think what you have produced is just right, and I support it. Thank you for your work on this important revision.	Thank you!
In V.D., is Emeritus Professor given to all retiring faculty? I'm not sure if it should be one way or the other, but reading that part made me ask that question.	The definition of Emeritus Professor was taken from the current policy. If faculty have suggestions to revise this definition, our work group will likely incorporate them.
I like it very much, particular how it ties faculty contributions to student success. I believe our niche is that we provide exemplary education to undergraduates. I also like how we are moving away from traditional	Thank you for your comment.

categories of evaluation. I see this as a productive move forward. We will not be stuck with an outdated model that does not serve students well.	
None, it looks great.	Thank you!
2. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Evaluative Criteria section. How would you suggest changing draft? What suggestions do you have to improve it?	
Very good section, the diagram as well. Creating space wherein activities may be included in more than one section is very important, as some kinds of scholarship involve service and leadership. Current system seems to make us pick which area an activity "counts," making us have to pick and choose between activities sometimes.	We've heard many express the same sentiment.
I really like the idea of having a yearly plan that is approved by the chair - but I think it would be good if the faculty could amend the plan if a new opportunity arises (or is the current plan cannot be implemented) and get the amended plan approved by the mentor team and the department chair - it wouldn't be good if someone was tied to a plan that isn't going to work for them because of one reason or another.	We agree. It is very important for faculty to be able to amend their plans as new opportunities arise. This will definitely be part of the process.
If this passes this spring, will we submit yearly plans in addition to FAARs Fall of 2018 or will we submit yearly plans beginning fall 2019 (in addition to a FAAR)? Obviously the plan has to be submitted prior to the plan being evaluated - so at some point we will have to submit a plan and a FAAR - right?	If the revision passes the Faculty Senate this April, the 2018-2019 academic year will be spent under the current policy as departments work to align their departmental evaluation criteria with the revised policy. The revised policy would likely begin in August 2019. Yes, when the transition takes place, Assistant Professors and Lecturers will need to submit a FAAR to satisfy the old policy and a Faculty Engagement & Contribution Plan to satisfy the new policy. Such plans will follow a template, and they shouldn't be too onerous. We're confident the new process will be less work that is more meaningful.
I like the combination of service/leadership. I appreciate the criteria being left at the department level. I worry about parity across campus if criteria is being developed at the department level and then left up to deans to insure parity through their review.	Our work group feels like the deans are in the best position to review the evaluation criteria of departments within their college/school.
VII.C. "Recommendations regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure are based on each faculty member's progress toward their plan.." and VII.D.1.	The point of the plan is to point a faculty member toward the departmental evaluation criteria, which should be in alignment with SUU's mission.

"Acceptable Progress toward Faculty Engagement & Contribution Plan" (throughout) Both these sentences mistake the means (a plan to support the university mission and satisfy department criteria) with the end(faculty who support the university mission and meet rank advancement/tenure requirements). With these descriptions, the plan can become a 'red herring' that could lead faculty off course. Faculty should be evaluated on supporting the mission of SUU and on progress towards their next rank advancement/tenure, not just on how well they followed their plan.	Therefore, a faculty member who makes progress toward the plan also makes progress toward the evaluation criteria and toward SUU's mission. One might envision a scenario where items in a faculty member's plan do not fulfill the departmental evaluation criteria yet, but they help the faculty member along the way. An evaluation that only considers the departmental evaluation criteria might miss the fact that the faculty member is taking necessary and productive steps.
You need to rework the grammar on Section VI.H Teaching Effectiveness. Shouldn't the "and" between "peer," and "Department Chair..." be removed? The "and/or" near the end of the criteria implies that not all of the 6 things mentioned have to be evaluated, whereas the "and" connecting the first three criteria seems to imply that all three of the first three criteria have to be evaluated. Why has collegiality been taken out of the list of evaluative criteria? Shouldn't there be a way to get rid of "jerks" when a majority of his/her colleagues don't want to have to work with him/her for the rest of their lives?	No, but we should include semicolons between items in the broader list. Thank you for the comment. We've adjust it accordingly. Thank you for the notice. Many faculty members have indicated that collegiality is nebulous. Instead, the revised policy leans on Policy 6.28 Faculty Professional Responsibility.
I'm not fond of having only two choices: Acceptable Progress or Development Required. Even without merit available, indicating that a faculty member did a exceptional work last year is nice. On the other end of the spectrum, is there a category where Development is no longer an option and the individual should not be rehired (like UP)?	The work group's thought process behind this decision is that this policy (called the Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Policy) should consider a faculty member's engagement and contributions as they relate to promotion and tenure. Therefore, superfluous ratings like "exceptional" may add complications to the process. For instance, if "exceptional" ratings begin to become the norm, faculty may feel like they need to be "exceptional" to earn a rank advancement. Also, a major goal of the revised policy is to create a more developmental culture surrounding the evaluation, promotion, and tenure process. Receiving developmental feedback should become the norm because we should all be striving to improve and to help each other improve. This can be a healthy, collaborative process.
I think what you have produced is just right, and I support it. Thank you for your work on this important revision.	Thank you!

I love the idea of a contribution report, plan, and a formative-developmental mentorship team. It also appears to me that the proposed policy values contributions faculty make to the mission and roles of the university. In the past, despite what was professed in writing and in verbal statements made by administration, it seemed like the only thing that mattered was how often and where faculty published their research. I sincerely hope that the new policy changes this. Faculty who contribute to the success of our students, department, college and university may not be the ones who are publishing research in journals. I believe these individuals should be valued equally if not more than faculty publishing work that does not involve students. Simply stating "publishing makes me a better teacher" is a weak argument.	Thank you for your comment.
This model is fantastic. I particularly appreciate how it incorporates the reality that many student-centric models don't cleanly fit into one category or another, and thus faculty are forced into an artificial choice of which category to count a particular activity.	Thank you for your feedback.
3. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Evaluation Process section of the draft. How would you suggest changing the definitions in the draft? What suggestions do you have for additional terms and their definitions?	
The addition of creating a vetted plan that becomes my evaluative criteria is fantastic. It creates a structure within which I know how to progress. It formalizes the process and allows me the opportunity to get feedback about needs to change EARLY enough in the process to make changes. It also allows me to be able to better self-reflect and evaluate where I stand in the system. Major evaluations like LRT shouldn't include surprises, and this system minimizes those. Collaborating with a P&T mentoring team helps create appropriate plans and is the essence of shared governance at the individual faculty development level.	Thank you for the comments!
I think having a P&T mentor team is a good idea but I'm not sure if it is necessary for the full seven years prior to tenure - if things are going well after the 3 year review I think it should be voluntary to continue working with the P&T team.	In an ideal situation, a tenure-track faculty member's need for mentorship will decrease as the tenure decision approaches. Hopefully the P&T Mentorship Team will recognize these scenarios and respond accordingly. There will be other cases, though, when mentorship might be beneficial through the entire tenure-track process.

In II. H. you have a number list, then each entry starts with "Step one" or "Step two". This is also the case in III. D. Because the list is number, you don't need the "Step one". Looks great! Thanks for all your hard work!	Thank you for the notice. We have deleted "Step one," etc.
I believe if we lived in a world where chairs and colleagues were genuinely interested in supporting colleagues, this process would work well. I worry that this process puts junior faculty at risk when potential mentorship team members have different agendas. I also worry there will be surprises if the dean is not involved in all reviews. Finally, a guiding principle is to not increase workload. Being part of a mentorship team will increase workload if done in a way that meets the spirit of being a true mentor. Ultimately, I believe if this could be implemented in a truly developmental and supportive atmosphere, it would be worth the effort and workload.	This revision attempts to guide faculty to change the culture at SUU to one where we are genuinely interested in supporting colleagues. That is the kind of environment the work group members wish have. Risk will be a part of any policy when imperfect humans are involved, but the potential reward of having a healthy, developmental culture is worth the risk. As with any organization, if one level of management (e.g., chairs) recognize problems, those managers (chairs) should notify the next layer of management (deans). The deans won't be out of the loop. The responsibility of annual reviews, however, will fall more directly with faculty. Deans will also still review the Mid-Point Reports and rand advancement proposals. Yes, being part of a mentorship team will require more work, but that increased workload will be balanced by two decreases in workload: (1) mentors will no longer complete annual reports, and (2) faculty members' reports will be limited to 3-page narratives, which will decrease the mentors' review time. All of these changes will likely balance out the workload, and the work has the potential to be more meaningful.
I disagree with the idea that non tenure faculty need to do the annual review process until they reach the rank of Associate Professor. This would mean that non tenure track faculty are filling out annual reviews for a minimum of 10-11 years, while tenure track faculty are doing it for 5-6 years. The only two justifications I can see for the difference in the amount of time that non tenure track faculty spend doing annual reviews are that either a) we need additional hand-holding for 6 more years because we can't figure out how to contribute to SUU's mission or b) we are worse teachers than tenure track faculty and need to have an eye kept on us. I find both insulting. I think a standard 6 or 7 years across the board for both tenure and non tenure track faculty for the annual review process before switching over to the 5 year program would make more sense and still lighten workload.	The work group discussed this at length with each other and with other faculty members. Since NTT faculty are on annual contracts, it makes sense for NTT faculty to be evaluated annually. If a NTT faculty member reaches the rank of Associate Professor NTT, we feel that the likelihood for renewal is high enough that the faculty member can switch to a five-year cycle. One discussion that came up was to create a completely separate policy for NTT faculty, but it would likely result in annual reviews for all NTT faculty, which would negate the benefit being provided with this revision, which includes a provision for Associate Professors NTT to become mentors to Lecturers and Assistant Professors NTT. Also, we felt like the two-policy approach might send the wrong message regarding the value of TT versus NTT faculty. Finally, mentorship shouldn't be seen as a negative process. We should celebrate the opportunity to receive mentorship as we strive for continual improvement.
I'm not a fan of the P&T mentors also providing the formal annual evaluation of the faculty member. Naturally, P&T teams will want to evaluate how well the plan worked to	Our committee recognizes the complication of asking mentors to also evaluate. Our thought is two-fold. First, the mentors will be the most knowledgeable about the faculty member's progress, engagement, and contributions, so they will be in the best position to provide a well informed

move the faculty member towards rank and tenure goals, and they should work with the faculty member to adjust the plan. That makes sense. But that evaluation should be internal to the discussion between the P&T team (including the faculty member) and separate from the evaluation of the faculty members contributions in supporting the mission of the university and progress in meeting their department expectations. The evaluation of progress towards those goals would best be done by an 'independent' panel focusing on the big picture.

The word nuances floats around this discussion, and I think that the 'nuance' needs to show up in the department evaluative criteria if this new LRT policy is going to work. The LRT documentation creates a clear line of authority on how these policies are approved, and strong leadership in these areas can ensure that the new student-centric faculty engagement policy is enforced across campus. Nuance floating somewhere between the faculty member and the P&T team shouldn't be counted on to create the desired changes.

evaluation. Second, asking one group to mentor faculty and another group to evaluate faculty would increase workload substantially, which is not in the best interest of faculty. The proposed draft asks that faculty trust each other to provide effective mentorship and honest evaluations. We should embrace this responsibility and rise to the occasion. Also, a majority of respondents to the faculty poll agree that mentors should also be evaluators.

We agree that departmental evaluation criteria should be clear. Even with clear criteria, faculty engage and contribute to SUU's student-centered mission in myriad ways. Such diverse work will require careful thought and consideration by mentors and evaluators. Clear criteria will help, and evaluations will rarely be black-and-white.

The five-year plan for the associate and full professor should be reviewed by and work with the P&T team and the department chair. Not just reviewed by the department chair. The other option: If the rank of the department chair is lower than the rank of the appointee, one same or higher rank professor should participate in the five-year plan review. In addition, since the revised LRT policy has enhanced the role of the department chair, the policy for the selection of department chair should be reviewed at the same time.

In the current revision, Associate and Full Professors will not have mentors. The work group's thought process for this decision is that these faculty have appropriately contributed to SUU's mission for long enough that the university should approach them with trust. If they begin falling short on their duties, their evaluation process will revert back to a one-year cycle. Consideration of chair selection is not part of this policy. The Faculty Senate is welcome to propose new processes for chair selection through a different venue.

The department chair plays a critical role in the revised LRT policy. Please review the qualification and background of the department chair. I suggest that the P&T team and the department chair should work together for reviewing the five-year plan for the associate/full professor, if the department chair does not have doctoral degree.

In the current revision, Associate and Full Professors will not have mentors. The work group's thought process for this decision is that these faculty have appropriately contributed to SUU's mission for long enough that the university should approach them with trust. If they begin falling short on their duties, their evaluation process will revert back to a one-year cycle. Consideration of chair selection is not part of this policy. The Faculty Senate is welcome to propose new processes for chair selection through a different venue.

I don't feel like Mentorship Teams are necessary. The LRT documents should give faculty guidance. Assuming contribution plans must align with LRT expectations, writing contribution plans seems like busy work. If we want to have mentors, my preference would be that junior faculty would not be evaluated by their mentors. I think that increases the risk of mentors taking

Many individuals benefit from formal mentorship. Also, the work group feels that mentorship teams will help to promote a culture of continuous improvement and to increase dialogue between faculty members and evaluators. This will hopefully reduce the anxiety surrounding the evaluation, promotion, and tenure process. Finally, a majority of respondents to the

advantage of junior faculty.	faculty poll agree that faculty members should receive formal mentorship.
I think what you have produced is just right, and I support it. Thank you for your work on this important revision.	Thank you for your support!
Some editorial type comments here: 6.1.1.I: Are we still calling it the FAAR? I don't think that showed up in the rest of the document. Maybe just change to something like: "To establish guidelines and procedures for annual faculty reports and evaluations." 6.1.1.II.A: In line 7 of this paragraph, Department is capitalized when it probably doesn't need to be. 6.1.1.II.H.2: It seems that Step One/Step Two are mislabeled in a,b. Compare III.D. It might be due to this part having an extra first step, before the corresponding steps in later sections. 6.1.2.I/II: The table seems like it should be below II, not above II. Also, I would change the first block in the table to "Years granted toward tenure (at time of hiring)" or something like that. 6.1.2.III.B.1: misspelling: Revieweview 6.1.3.II.C.1.b(2): number of years don't add up for NTT: (4+6)+1=11, not seven years of employment. 6.1.3.VI: For rank advancement, the evaluations should be something like:"Recommend for rank advancement:__ (Y/N)" instead of "Acceptable Progress/Development Required". See VI.B.2,VI.C.1,VI.D.1,VI.E.3,VI.F.1; and compare with VII.C (or 6.1.4.IV.A.6), where it is a Yes/No decision. 6.1.3.VII.D: This sentence is weird. I think you mean something like 6.1.4.IV.A.4: "If three consecutive evaluations (levels) fail..." 6.1.4: Compare II.C.5 with III.A: Can you just retract your tenure application? Is that just quitting? As I understand it, you basically have to apply for tenure, and then you either receive it, or have a terminal year. So it seems that retracting "without prejudice" is not what we want for the tenure application. Or if you want that you would need to rewrite other parts of the	6.1.1.I: You are correct. We've changed it to: "To establish guidelines and procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure." 6.1.1.II.A: We've changed it to a lower-case letter. 6.1.1.II.H.2: Thank you. We've made the change. 6.1.2.I/II: Thank you. We've made both changes. 6.1.2.III.B.1: Thank you. We've corrected the typo. 6.1.3.II.C.1.b(2): We've changed the text to: "The rank of Associate Professor (NTT) will be granted normally after seven years of employment as an Assistant Professor (NTT)." 6.1.3.VI: Our work group agrees. We've changed the text in each entity's responsibilities to: "...includes a "yes" or "no" vote regarding whether the rank advancement should be granted (see Appendix C)." 6.1.3.VII.D: This sentence seems to convey the appropriate meaning. 6.1.4: We have deleted the sentence about retracting the tenure application.

policy for how that would work. (maybe this was just a cut/paste oversight, using same phrasing from other sections)	
I don't see how the sharing of all faculty plans from the department would work, or why it would be helpful. At best it seems like it would be an awkward experience.	The sharing of all faculty plans from the department would work in whatever way the particular department sees fit. One example might involve each faculty member presenting a 1-minute summary during a department meeting. Benefits would include the promotion of parity across the department, increased communication between colleagues, and the potential for new collaborations. It is likely that some faculty members currently don't know what their colleagues are working on, which can lead to misunderstandings and lost opportunities.
In section 6.1.1, III, F it talks about if a tenured faculty has a bad 5-yr eval then they go onto an annual evaluation plan. Do they get a mentorship team ("...similar to the tenure-track process...") or just them and the chair? I would guess just with the chair, but that's not made clear here. Also, it says that the original 5 year plan must be achieved in the original 5 year schedule. But it seems to me that this would happen at the end of a 5 year cycle, so what plan needs to be achieved in what 5 year cycle? As I understand it, there would only be annual plans at this point, unless you mean for there to be a new 5 year plan, and annual plans to go along inside that.	If the Chair or Dean recognizes a failure in a tenured faculty member's ability to fulfill professional duties, an intervention can happen at any time. We have changed the text to: "If there is evidence that a tenured faculty member is not fulfilling professional responsibilities (Policy 6.28) and their Five-Year Plan, the Department Chair should collaborate with the faculty member to address the issues. If issues remain unresolved, the Department Chair, in consultation with the College/School Dean, can petition the Provost's Office for a change in the nature and/or frequency of reporting and evaluation. After consulting with the faculty member, Department Chair, and College/School Dean, the Provost's Office will render a final decision that includes an updated plan."
In section V B (def for NTT) something's weird in one of the middle sentences: "18 graduate hours in field ..." You should probably have something like "...18 graduate hours in their field..."	We have made the suggested change.
I believe most of us understand and value the importance of team work. I really like how the proposed policy uses this approach to help faculty develop. I am not sure that the policy uses a team approach as much as it could when it comes to evaluation. Why not have all mentors within a department become part of a larger evaluation team? They would essentially replace the college and university LRTs, although you could retain a university-level committee to review cases where disputes might arise. The dean of a college would ensure that there is some equity across departments within his/her college. The department chair and dean would retain their evaluative role and review recommendations made by the department's evaluative team (the one made up of all department mentors). Of course, this would likely be considered a radical change, and the suggestion might come too late in the process to be considered.	Thank you for this suggestion. We have received ample feedback that faculty generally like the current College LRT Committee and University LRT Committee framework. The P&T Mentorship Team concept will already be an increased workload for some faculty members (although the increase will be balanced by a decrease in workload with (1) the elimination of annual reviews for Associate and Full Professors, and (2) the reduction in annual reports to a 3-page maximum narrative).

First, this model provides a great deal of clarity for expectations. Each faculty creates a plan, which is then evaluated to the plan's appropriateness. This allows the faculty to have an accurate conceptualization of expectations and requirements BEFORE acting, thus guiding scholarship, teaching, and service activities appropriately. With clearly defined expectations for the year laid out via the contribution plan, it is much easier for faculty and mentorship teams to identify deficiencies or problems early enough in the process to make meaningful corrections.	Thank you for your feedback.
4. Please provide feedback regarding the appendices. How would you suggest changing them? What suggestions do you have to improve them?	
As I was going through the appendices I had questions about which form was to be completed by whom and when specifically that form was required to be completed - the forms all seem pretty similar which is a good way to streamline the process but I can see individuals choosing the wrong form or filling out the form at the incorrect time. Clarifying somewhere within the header the purpose of the form, who is intended to fill out the form, and at what time in the year and tenure process that specific form should be completed would help to clarify this and likely eliminate mistakes and the need to complete additional forms. Also, are these forms going to be used across departments or will departments have their own forms? Will the forms in the appendices be required in addition to department-specific forms? I also think it would be helpful for new faculty to have some posted examples of completed forms (these can be fictitious examples to demonstrate general content and format). New faculty often ask colleagues for previous evaluative materials (tenure portfolios, FAARs, three-year review materials etc..) however since this is new to everyone, new faculty will be without these comforting resources/examples/templates. This would also be potentially helpful for P&T mentors, LRT committees, chairs, and deans. In the end, the evaluation tools that you have provided are qualitative and could set the stage for ambiguity and disparities and this will likely create a sense of unease among new faculty, un-tenured faculty, and those wising to move from associate to full professors. I know this is not the intent and hopefully additional evaluative criteria can be developed and implemented	Thank you for the comment regarding the clarification of the appendices. We will add language to help faculty and evaluators know which form to use. Similar to the current policy, the forms in the revised policy are meant to be used across the entire university. An individual department can include additional forms if they would like, but the Policy 6.1 forms will be required to maintain consistency at the college and university levels of evaluation. We have heard feedback from faculty on both sides of the issue regarding the quantification of faculty contributions. Our work group sees that faculty contributions are so varied and nuanced that it would be impossible to create a quantifiable university-wide policy. Our hope is for P&T Mentorship Teams and Department Chairs to give face-to-face and written feedback to faculty members to ensure that these varied and nuanced contributions are in alignment with SUU's mission and departmental evaluation criteria. Some departments may still choose to quantify contributions, which is their prerogative.

at the college and departmental levels.	
In the Forms section of the appendix, on the evaluation of the faculty member forms, 3 of those 4 forms have a sentence that starts with "Based on..." I would like to propose adding the phrase "the departmental promotion and tenure policy" so the sentence would read: Based on the department promotion and tenure policy, the review of the Faculty Engagement & Contribution Report... I would also like to suggest that this sentence be added to the Tenure/Rank Advancement form as well (the 4th form). Thanks!	We have added the suggestion to the revision.
In appendix A, the asterisk is missing from the statement at the bottom of the page.	Thank you for the notice. We have updated the revision.
Sorry, but I'm having a hard time understanding Appendix B, the deadline schedule. There seems to be something missing. There is not date for the Dept Chair's feedback to the candidate. There is no row for P&T mentors to provide feedback to the candidate on their progress toward their plan for that year. In other words, when does the faculty member meet with the P&T team to go over their evaluation of the FECR? Also the order of the columns confused me. Could be just me. I'd like to see the FECR stay where it is, but then be followed by Mid-Point, Tenure, Rank Advancement, then the 5 year review. I just figured out what the difference is between 5 year plan and post-tenure review! Sorry, I'm a little slow. I understand why 5 year is where it is, but I think it might work best next to Post-Tenure. I think it's difficult to immediately grasp the meaning of "Initial Feedback to Faculty". Maybe something like "Approval or Suggested Revisions of Plan" would make that step clearer	Perhaps we can clarify the deadline schedule. The work group's thought regarding the deadlines is that the faculty member will need to meet with the P&T Mentorship Team before the FECR/FECP is due to the Chair, and the faculty member will need to meet with the Chair before the FECR/FECP is due to the Dean. The comment about the order of the Five-Year Review makes sense, and we have made the change. Thank you for this suggestion. We will discuss the suggestion regarding the "Initial Feedback to Faculty" language.
I like the timeline associated with the reviews. The forms are broad enough to allow for individual plans for teaching effectiveness, service/leadership, and scholarship.	Thank you for your support!
The wording "Acceptable Progress toward Faculty Engagement &	The point of the plan is to point a faculty member toward the departmental

Contribution Plan" on the Template for Evaluation Forms is problematic. My understanding is that the purpose of the plan is to ensure faculty are intentional about supporting the mission of SUU and satisfying their department criteria. Plans for non-tenured faculty, then, change annually, where rank advancement determinations are made based on department criteria. Annual reports need to tell faculty where they stand in relation to their department criteria for rank and tenure, not where they stand in relation to their plan. Changing the wording of acceptable progress to relate to the mission of SUU and department criteria would help keep the faculty focus where it needs to be, on the department criteria, instead of on the plan (which also has the goal of focusing faculty attention on the department criteria and the mission of SUU.)	evaluation criteria, which should be in alignment with SUU's mission. Therefore, a faculty member who makes progress toward the plan also makes progress toward the evaluation criteria and toward SUU's mission. One might envision a scenario where items in a faculty member's plan do not fulfill the departmental evaluation criteria yet, but they help the faculty member along the way. An evaluation that only considers the departmental evaluation criteria might miss the fact that the faculty member is taking necessary and productive steps.
I think it would be helpful to make it clear that the Contribution Report must address teaching, scholarship, and service (and any overlap between them).	Language in Appendix A refers faculty to the definitions of Faculty Engagement, Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service/Leadership.
I think what you have produced is just right, and I support it. Thank you for your work on this important revision.	Thank you for your support!
Could the faculty deadline for submitting the LRT report be changed to "the Tuesday after Labor Day"? This would avoid confusion (since six out of seven years the first Tuesday in September is after Labor Day) and give the Labor Day holiday for faculty who need it to put final touches on their submissions.	Yes, we've made the change in Appendix B - Deadline Schedule.
On the timeline for things, it seems that the due date for the Plans (and I assume reports) being the Friday before classes seems a bit quick. Being that we are not on contract until Aug 16, and then we have a bunch of meetings that week, not to mention all our syllabi and course preparations to deal with, it seems that this adds an extra undue pressure to faculty at the beginning of the year.	Our hope is to create a culture of preparation and intention. If faculty members can meet with their P&T Mentorship Teams before Fall Semester classes begin, we can benefit from their face-to-face and written feedback and mentorship immediately. This will be an improvement to the current policy in which faculty receive written feedback 4 months after the beginning of the school year.
I might make appendix A to include sections for scholarship, teaching, service, and integrated activities. That might give it a little more structure and uniformity across campus. But open ended is fine too, this is a minor suggestion.	Thank you for your suggestion. We stayed away from listing each of the categories you suggested because some faculty members might interpret it as an addition to our expectations. We want the revised policy to be clear that there are not additional expectations. Instead, the revised policy simply recognizes contributions that meet SUU's mission but don't necessarily fall

With regards to appendix B, it appears the Contribution Plan for assistant professors, etc. is reviewed early and any changes from higher levels would be given back to faculty at the latest by December? That is good, as it provides an opportunity to make course corrections if necessary. I would suggest that it clearly state that evaluation of the faculty member's adherence to the previous year's compliance with said plan happen as early as possible, giving the faculty member a chance to make changes early enough to impact the next year's plan.	neatly within the categories of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service/leadership. Thank you for your comment. We have tried to make this clear.
I don't feel like the "templates" for the Plan/Report are actually templates, but rather to me it just seems like a blank page with a title on the top. When I look at this, I still have no idea what people (P&T, chair, dean, LRT committees, etc.) would expect me to write. Maybe you are just trying to avoid having it more laid out (so that everyone can do their own separate thing?) but that is what I would find more helpful.	Our work group chose to make these templates broad so that faculty members could direct their responses toward their respective departmental evaluation criteria.
5. Please provide any other comments regarding the LRT policy revision process.	
This system gives me hope as a junior faculty member that I CAN make progress. It reduces the chance that I may encounter surprise feedback too late to make changes. I want to engage with applied scholarship, this would let me craft a proposal and find out if the endeavor is considered "worthy" before investing a year of work.	Thank you for your comment!
To the LRT Revision Committee: I believe you are getting "honest" feedback and I believe that you are truly trying to improve the LRT process and represent the faculty of SUU. I also think that the majority of faculty appreciate your efforts and are glad to not be in your shoes - so thanks again for listening to and addressing all of our concerns. To the Faculty: In addition to concerns, I think that those outside of the revision committee need to provide more than criticism - we need to provide potential solutions. In addition to finding flaws in the current and revised policies, we need to provide constructive feedback that can make these revisions better and not just stalemate the issue for another year or three or five....	Thank you for your comments! We agree. This policy revision has already benefited from well over 100 written comments, in addition to countless face-to-face comments. Most of the tangible suggestions have been incorporated into the latest revision, and we hope to receive more.
I like the new T&P Mentorship Teams, and I am happy with the broadening and individuating of the contributions that faculty can make (i.e., the loss of	Thank you for the positive comments regarding the mentorship teams and

the pillars) and refocus on formative rather than summative evaluation. That is, I am happy with the direction of the LRT revisions. My main concern is the possibility that T&P Mentorship Teams might stop meeting over the years. This is because, as I understand it, being a member of such a team seems like extra work without compensation, so there might be an incentive problem there.	the evaluative criteria! Our hope is to decrease workload in some areas (e.g., tenured faculty will no longer need to produce an annual activity report; evaluations of junior faculty will take less time because the reports will follow a 3-page-maximum template; etc.), which will allow space to provide meaningful mentorship. Such mentorship is so important that it will be considered as a valuable component of tenured faculty members' contributions.
6.1.2 III, B Would you do a search for this word and replace it: Revieweview?	Thank you for the notice. We found and corrected one instance of this typo.
I appreciate the new process's spirit of being developmental and supportive. I believe if we could create this culture on campus it would benefit the whole community. I worry about our ability to truly have this type of culture. I also worry that across the board plans will go for the minimum effort so as to "play it safe." I think this could bring us all down.	Thank you for your comment. The P&T Mentorship Teams and the Department Chairs will be responsible for maintaining appropriate standards for the plans. The plans should also reflect departmental evaluation criteria, which will be created by faculty within each department.
Is there any provision for faculty who serve in dual roles. This changes their status and "weight" of contributions. Is it possible to address this within the policy?	Our work group discussed this with each other and with the Provost's Office. A separate policy will be required for evaluating faculty who serve in dual roles. This will not be part of the revised Policy 6.1.
Thank you for your work in making LRT revisions inclusive and responsive. I wanted to take a moment to say thank you for creating the language that is in line with SUU's strategic plan and asks faculty to be engaged educators with student learning and development as the end goal. Please keep this language in the policy if you can. I believe experiential education and engagement lead to a hands-on, up to date, and relevant education for our students and SUU has become a leader by offering this type of education. I think it is great that the language in the proposed LRT policy reflects this spirit of learning. I know you have gotten lots of feedback asking to remove some of this language, so I want to be sure to give an email of support for keeping "engaged learning" at the heart of what we do and acknowledged and rewarded in LRT. It takes a faculty dedicated to teaching effectiveness, scholarship and service/leadership to make this happen. Again, thank you for the work you've done. I am rooting for you all to have the policy approved by faculty senate this year.	Thank you for your comments!!!

What happens if a particular department doesn't have enough Full and Associate Professors to equitably staff the P&T mentor teams. Perhaps there should be some sort of language allowing the department and Dean to arrive at a mutually acceptable substitute approach to literal compliance? Since the college and university LRT committees will not be totally disbanded, would a member of a P&T mentor team be allowed to also participate at a higher level of evaluation on one of those LRT committees? If not, then it will be very difficult to make assignments to mentor teams and LRT committees. Will it effectively require everyone in the college to be on the college LRT committee unless he/she is on the University LRT committee, with recusal mandates when (1) he/she was a mentor to the one being evaluated or (2) his/her own situation is being evaluated?	Departments will be responsible for creating their own mentorship selection process. This might include finding mentors from other departments. It seems reasonable for mentors to also be allowed to serve on CLRT and ULRT committees.
I think it would be helpful to tenured faculty to have them submit an annual report. Maybe that report doesn't need to be followed by an evaluative letter, but having annual reports will make a five-year report much simpler.	Associate and Full Professors will meet with Department Chairs annually for a face-to-face meeting, but one benefit of these ranks should be that the university trusts them to keep track of their own contributions. Requiring a written report does not decrease workload in this area, which might hinder their ability to serve as mentors.
I think the LRT policy badly needed revision, and I think the committee is taking the revision in exactly the right direction. Further, the committee has been very democratic and inclusive in communicating openly and responding respectfully to criticisms (in my opinion as a non-Senator).	Thank you for your comment!
In the Highlights/Guiding Principles box at the top, it says something about more faculty responsibility for this process. Don't we already have that? The departments decide LRT policies, and faculty sit on the various LRT committees.	We hope this revision provides even more responsibility to the faculty. An example is that the current policy allows the Department Chair to "set the tone" for the rest of the evaluations by providing the first evaluation in the process, whereas the revised draft allows Associate and Full Professors serving as P&T Mentorship Team members to provide the first evaluation. This may seem like a subtle change, but it could have important ramifications for some.
I think the team should be applauded for their work. I do worry that a loud vocal minority (who seem to be the ones who support traditional scholarship as a means of evaluating faculty) will threaten progress and keep SUU from reaching its full potential. I suspect that the faculty who	Thank you for your comment. Our hope is that the Faculty Poll will show how non-Senators feel about some of the major proposed changes.

have yet to provide input are the ones who are heavily engaged with students and as such, have precious little time for much else.	
From a career development perspective, this proposed LRT policy can have some tremendously positive impact on faculty career development, and is in line with some of the main concepts found in Social Cognitive Career Theory. In a super nutshell, we make choices to enter and expend effort for high performance in careers based on self efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. Self-Efficacy is the belief that I CAN be capable in a task, while outcome expectations are whether I think my efforts will create results, while goals tell me if those results are something I want. A faculty member here at SUU will need all three to line up if they are going to choose to invest in SUU and persist for the long run (i.e. this is a faculty retention issue). The vast majority of us likely entered into academic careers with a sense of self-efficacy and personal goals that motivate us to teach here at SUU (otherwise we wouldn't have applied or would not have been hired). While some may choose to move on to other jobs if they think their goals are incompatible with long-term employment here, others may choose to move on if their outcome expectations do not coincide with long-term employment. In other words, if I believe I can't succeed here, I'm going to be worried and shift my focus and go somewhere I think I can.

The critical element this LRT policy addresses is the outcome expectations issue. With this LRT policy, by clearly creating contribution plans at the beginning of each year, we are facilitating each faculty member being able to believe in their capability to perform according to expectations, thus increasing persistence. I have been witness to academic environments in which expectations were not clearly delineated, and morale and faculty persistence was negatively impacted. Some faculty were operating on the hope that their performance would meet expectations, but due to uncertainty in the evaluation process, they had low outcome expectations. Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that career development is exactly that, a developmental process of growth over time. This new LRT proposal, with close collaboration between the P&T Mentorship teams and the faculty member, we are providing a formal process of scaffolding faculty development and continued encouragement to grow and keep developing. I apologize for the lengthy comments, but I very much support this LRT proposal and see possibilities for enhancing the faculty development | Thank you for this thorough review of the proposed revision. It is nice to receive feedback that indicates the proposed revision is in alignment with social cognitive career theory. |

process. Thanks for all the hard work to the committee and those who have provided valuable feedback to create this.	

February 2, 2018

LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback - 2nd Draft Definitions and Evaluative Criteria
As of February 2, 2018

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the right hand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the left hand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Purpose section. How would you suggest changing the draft? What suggestions do you have to improve it?	
I feel unprepared to fill out this survey!	Please feel free to take your time as you review these draft policy changes. We would be happy to meet with you individually to discuss the details.
2. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Values Statement section. How would you suggest changing draft? What suggestions do you have to improve it?	
No responses	
3. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Definitions section. How would you suggest changing the definitions in the draft? What suggestions do you have for additional terms and their definitions?	

The fact that we have to define "Shared Governance" indicates that there is a problem with shared governance. Sorry to be snarky.	We are trying to encourage a healthy form of shared governance by explicitly including shared governance activities as valuable contributions in the Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policy.
In the definitions for faculty ranks, for NTT, the third sentence seems to just repeat part of the first sentence (listing various ranks for NTT). Probably just striking the third sentence there. For teaching effectiveness, it specifies that Chairs may not evaluate themselves, but then the next thing on the list is "self-evaluations". This seems awkward at least. And this particular aspect could (and probably should) be dealt with better in a later section of the document. It also seemed that other parts of the various definitions could also fit better in a later sections, say the evaluative process, than in the definitions. The one I remember right now is the P&T teams making goals for scholarly/teaching/service -- that isn't the definition of anything, but how you might evaluate it. Cutting out some of those things from the definitions will simplify them, and make them easier to understand. And the final draft should have any of those important pieces in the other sections and not just in the definitions.	The listing of various NTT ranks is pasted from the current policy. We feel its presence helps to distinguish NTT faculty from adjunct and other temporary faculty. We agree. We've changed the "self evaluation" language to "self reflection," and we've tried to clarify the sentence. We agree that the Evaluation Process section should more clearly describe the responsibilities of the P&T Mentorship Teams, as well as others' responsibilities. We've kept the language in the definitions for now, but we may make the definitions more concise as revisions continue.
4. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Evaluative Criteria section. How would you suggest changing draft? What suggestions do you have to improve it?	
I still have problems with the sentence ""At least some contributions should fall in the overlap areas of the Faculty Engagement Model because SUU values student-centered and traditional work that meets the university mission." I don't understand why any portion of a faculty member's work should be in the overlap. I value overlapping actions, but also value activities with no overlap. Why is one better than the other? As a department chair, I will reiterate my concern about eliminating Collegiality, aka "Professional behavior". When faculty act in unprofessional ways, like cancelling class, that behavior should be documented and faculty should be given constructive feedback to help them address those concerns. The only remedy in Policy 6.28 is some type of reprimand or censure. I would not consider such a severe step in the case of say chronically skipping office	We have heard a number of comments related to this concern. We have revised the text to: "SUU values academic work that supports the student-centered mission of the university in teaching, service/leadership, and scholarship." With regard to Collegiality, we have heard the consistent request from faculty to eliminate the category. We hope that the mentorship process in the revised drafts will allow for meaningful dialogue about professional behavior. Such dialogue will usually result in improvement and development, but when improvement is not seen, Policy 6.28 may need to be invoked. Likewise, Policy 6.28 might need to be revised to ensure Chairs and Deans can address unprofessional behavior in appropriate ways (not all of which require taking

hours, nor would that reprimand be available to LRT committees as part of tenure or post-tenure review.	disciplinary action).
I am confused that the criteria section states "At least some contributions should fall in the overlap areas...". I had been told that the intent was to include value for overlapping contributions, and not de-value traditional contributions. But this seems to make clear that traditional non-overlapping contributions aren't good enough. How is every faculty member supposed to overlap their contributions? If your scholarly research is not centered on education, and is carried out at a post-graduate level, then how can that integrate with teaching at SUU? or service? In some disciplines that may work reasonably well, but in many others high quality research is not going to overlap with undergraduate teaching. And I don't see that any of my service committees in the past could have had any overlap with my scholarly contributions or teaching effectiveness.	We have heard a number of comments related to this concern. We have revised the text to: "SUU values academic work that supports the student-centered mission of the university in teaching, service/leadership, and scholarship." There are many ways to contribute to SUU's mission in the overlapping areas. The definition of Faculty Engagement lists several examples, including, but not limited to, mentoring student projects and creative endeavors, coauthoring student-generated scholarly papers or professional presentations, utilizing High Impact Practices as defined by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (https://www.aacu.org/resources/high-impact-practices), supervising alternative breaks or other formalized community service projects, supervising student clubs and other organizations, providing educational opportunities for the university community, implementing cooperative educational programs with community partners, and participating in programs that enhance students' global perspective. These are only a few examples, and we're confident that SUU's creative and productive faculty members will find many more ways to contribute to SUU's student-centered mission).
A concern that I have had is it is very unclear how much integration is valued. Does a student research paper, for example, count more than a research paper I publish by myself or professional coauthors? There were some previous comments about this, but I am not sure the committee explained well the value of integration. They say traditional artifacts are still worth the same, and that integrated activities are not worth more, but if that were true why even talk about integration at all? If a research paper with a student coauthor is valued the same as a research paper with no coauthor, why even bring it up in the policy? It seems like we are being asked to ignore the man behind the curtain. Some value system needs to be attached to integration if it is worth mentioning. Does a student research paper mean I can mention in my "FAAR" under both research and teaching (thus killing two birds with one stone)? Does it count as a research paper and a half? Also, the model suggests that faculty should move toward integration as they progress but how severe are the consequences if there is no integration? If I publish 50 papers, have the best evaluations in the	The draft university policy is clear that departmental evaluation criteria will define the detailed expectations, and that P&T Mentorship Teams will work with faculty to design appropriate Faculty Contribution Plans. The university policy is not meant to assign weights to specific contributions. It is important to include integrated efforts in the policy revision because many faculty members have reported that some of their contributions don't seem to "count" toward the evaluation process even though those contributions meet SUU's mission quite well. Your idea of a value system, as well as the details of how various contributions are evaluated, should be discussed at the department level. The model no longer suggests that faculty should move toward integration. It now states that both traditional and integrated contributions are valued.

department, and chair five high-value committees each semester, would I be rejected tenure because my achievements are too siloed? Some clarification is necessary. Otherwise, every time I am ready to publish a paper, I will grab my best student and have them sign their name above the abstract, jk.	
5. Please provide feedback regarding the initial ideas for a developmental Evaluation Process. Note: this is not an official draft. The draft will be disseminated in February.	
In regards to post-tenure requirements: "5-Year Plan that includes faculty engagement goals." What is meant by "faculty engagement"?	Faculty Engagement is defined in the Definitions section.
I think eliminating LRT committees and replacing them with individual Mentorship teams is a huge mistake. Even with a fairly clear department policy, I have seen department LRT members have completely different reads on one faculty member's service: one committee member rated it as EP, one as SP, and one as LP. Discussion by those committee members - who were experienced with the Service Policy - eventually led to SP. However, a one or two member Mentorship team - where the mentor may have no LRT experience - will lead to inconsistent ratings and mixed messages. A single LRT committee leads to more consistent ratings and feedback. Further, faculty currently elect LRT committees, giving them at least some say in who is evaluating them. Why take that away?	The hope is that replacing the Department LRT Committee with the P&T Mentorship Team will lead to much more dialogue and professional development. Due to consistent feedback from faculty regarding the elimination of all LRT Committees, the College LRT Committee and the University LRT Committee will retain the same responsibilities as they currently hold.
Organization: I would just describe the basic process (currently year 2), and then describe any variations (i.e. 3yr review, tenure application, etc). This would also make it easier to deal with exceptions such as years granted toward tenure on hiring (as was mentioned in one of the comments).

For NTT, I was under the impression that NTT faculty *could* apply for promotion, but was not required to, where this pre-draft looks like that would be required at the various timeframes. (I was wondering where the numbers 4yrs, 6yrs came from, but one of the previous comment responses mentioned that it is in current policy I think?).

For tenured faculty, do they set goals by themselves? with the chair? I was confused about that. And how does that work for the chair? I assume that most department chairs are tenured (even if sometimes they aren't). | Thank you for the organizational comment. We will do our best to simplify the text while retaining enough detail to reduce confusion.

You are correct that NTT faculty do not have to apply for promotion. The 4-year and 6-year minimum requirements are in existing policy.

Tenured faculty create their Five-Year Plan by themselves, and the Department Chair approves it. In the unusual circumstance where an untenured faculty member is serving as Department Chair, the untenured Department Chair would create a Contribution Plan that is approved by their P&T Mentorship Team.

Our plan is to create a template for the 3-page narrative. The appendices would mainly include existing documents that can simply be attached, such as IDEA forms, course syllabi or assignments, peer evaluation forms, etc. The |

One of the advantages listed in the direction of decreasing workload is the 3 page limit. But then it says you can add on additional info as appendices, like a teaching portfolio. It would seem that you may need to include extra, if you are to have all student and peer evals included (in addition to commenting on them and your goals). Would this be part of the 3-page limit? or extra? It would seem to me that this alone could take up most of the 3 pages if not more, and then we aren't really saving workload, are we?

attached appendices would be separate from the 3-page narrative, and they would ideally take very little time to assemble because they would be existing documents.

Another concern I have is about the goals. If I set easy goals and accomplish them is that valued more than setting challenging goals but only accomplish some of them? It seems like maybe some evaluation of the difficulty of the goals should be considered.

The P&T Mentorship Team will guide faculty to create an appropriate Faculty Contribution Plan that is aligned with the Faculty Engagement definition, SUU's mission, and departmental evaluation criteria. It is important to give this responsibility to faculty members.

Unfortunately I will have to vote no if it comes to a tie vote, if your current draft does not include some changes. Here are my concerns:

The department LRT committee currently serves as a check to the Department Chair. The College LRT committee currently serves as a check to the Dean, and the Unversity LRT committee currently serves as a check to the Provost. Changing that to only having a mentorship team give feedback, then having 3 levels of administration evaluate a faculty member creates an atmosphere where administration's opinions of a faculty member far outway faculty's opinions. I have seen that administrators can have no experience as a faculty member, and thus can have wildly different values for what faculty member should be doing. Administrators can also misunderstand the amount work involved in some of the high value things we as faculty want to encourage. Similarly I have seen situations where the Department Chair, and the Department LRT have been wildly out of sync. Not just minor disagreements about a faculty's abilities, but polar opposite opinions. These 2 groups are closest to the faculty, yet get very different impressions of a faculty member's abilities in some cases. A 2 person mentorship team, in the same department, under the department chair, have little incentive beyond common decency to disagree with their department chair. Even if they set the tone for the first year, the second year's reviews would include the department chairs evaluations from the previous year, and that could cloud faculty opinions. This year in the senate I have also seen that some faculty actually believe that if they disagree with anyone in administration they will be fired, so they never give voice to any of their concerns. Create a different version of this, in your mind, where the

It seems as though you've described three points: (1) LRT Committees are important to serve as checks and balances, (2) not all tenured faculty members should mentor non-tenured faculty members, and (3) the mentorship process should be optional. Our responses are below:

1. The proposal to replace the Department, College, and University LRT Committees with the P&T Mentorship Team was an effort to increase the developmental process while decreasing the workload. We've heard from several faculty members that the College LRT Committee and the University LRT Committee are not especially onerous, and they only require a significant time commitment when legitimate problems arise, which is exactly when the committees are vital. Due to consistent feedback from faculty regarding the elimination of all LRT Committees, the College LRT Committee and the University LRT Committee will retain the same responsibilities as they currently hold. However, we feel that the P&T Mentorship Team serves a more beneficial function than the Department LRT Committee, and we feel the combination of the P&T Mentorship Team and the shortened FAAR will still reduce the overall workload for the individual faculty member and for evaluators.

2. Our work group agrees that a reasonable expectation for tenured faculty members, individuals who have been granted an official stake in SUU's future, is to guide non-tenured faculty members' contributions. Our hope is that this expectation will become part of tenure-track faculty members' development so that they are well prepared to mentor others upon rank advancement. It won't be perfect, but our hope is that the benefits will outweigh the

department chair gives feedback, then the department LRT, the College LRT, and the University LRT give feedback, leaving out the Dean and Provost, and run that version by the Deans and Provost. It would likely cause quite a stir. So if you take out the University LRT, then take out the Provost, and if you take out the College LRT, then take out the Dean. We don't currently seem to have bad Deans, or a bad Provost, but we have in the past, and a College LRT would understand if a Dean is blackballing someone or a University LRT would hopefully be able to read that situation as well. There was a Dean, no longer working here, who told a search committee that they no longer hired people of a certain color. I would hate for SUU to get a new Dean that decided they no longer gave Tenure to people of a certain color and not have some type of check against that as faculty.

My second concern involves the mentorship team. Unfortunately we have faculty who should never be mentors to anyone. We also have faculty who wouldn't want to be mentors. In both of these cases, a new faculty member would be disadvantaged having one of these people as a mentor. Even new faculty in the same department are likely to have widely different experiences and guidance if they have different mentors. This disparity doesn't help as faculty go up for tenure and could open SUU up to more litigation. Changing your mentorship idea into giving everyone in a department a common group of mentors, and possibly a different, but common group of evaluators, gives a similar experience to new faculty in the same department and allows people who should never be mentors to select something else for service that they are actually good at. There are so many types of needed service here at SUU that we don't need to have everyone be mentors. If a mentorship team approach is really warranted, a better choice would be converting the department LRT into this team.

I have heard that faculty want less of a punitive approach to LRT, but a developmental approach isn't the opposite to punitive, or even a better approach. It is just a different approach. Faculty currently seem to be perfectly able to set goals and achieve them without a mentorship team. In fact, in some fast growing fields, having an older faculty as a mentor would be disadvantageous.

However, the idea of allowing faculty to create a plan, then being able to run that plan by a mentorship team for evaluation before the year starts is

challenges.

3. Faculty already have the option to solicit guidance from mentors on an informal basis. Including mentorship in policy, required for everyone, formalizes the developmental approach. The work group feels this requirement is necessary to establish formal working relationships between tenured and non-tenured faculty members. Also, in the current draft the P&T Mentorship Teams will serve as the department-level evaluators. If the mentorship were optional, we would have to keep the Department LRT Committee, thereby maintaining the current workload and adding any additional mentorship workload. Such a decision would likely prevent many tenured faculty members from voluntarily serving as mentors.

You are correct that we have spent many hours creating these drafts, considering every feedback comment, and continually revising the language. Such effort is required to create a document owned by the faculty. We hope that every faculty member who has commented feels like their comments were carefully considered. Such is the case with yours, and the revisions reflect your input, especially regarding your main point about the importance of LRT committees as checks and balances. Thank you again for such input. The draft continues to improve because of engaged faculty members like yourself.

terrific, if it was an opt-in kind of thing. I mean, it is possibly the best idea your committee has come up with this year, if it was an opt-in kind of thing. But, as written, you require faculty to set and achieve goals the mentorship team deems worthy, and that is not academic freedom. We have fought so hard for academic freedom over the centuries, that we shouldn't just give it away. It certainly isn't an improvement over the current process. It is just a different way of doing things with an entirely different set of problems.

I know you spent a long time creating this new process, and thus have a large amount of ownership in it, and are likely to just let me know you decided I was wrong, but those are my thoughts on how we could improve the current LRT policies, and not just change them to different ones with different flaws.

The Faculty Senate President

I am deeply concerned about the proposed direction to disband faculty LRT committees. These were put in place for an important check and balance to each administrative level. The proposal would limit faculty input to only the base level to, "set the tone" of the review. Setting the tone does not provide any checks and balance. This proposal would limit the role of balance and parity across a department to one sole individual, rather than a check by THREE PEER FACULTY members to assess parity across the dept. Then there are FIVE PEER FACULTY to evaluate the parity across each college, to provide a faculty check/balance to the dean of that college. Same thing applies to the university LRT committee and the provost. To eliminate these faculty LRT committees is would to grave damage to the faculty input, and the value of having committees discuss individual cases. To say that this new proposal increases faculty control is sheer nonsense. Taking 14 faculty points of view out, while leaving only three administrative individuals to make the sole judgement calls seems the opposite of faculty control. I have sat on a college LRT committee for several years, and can testify to the fact that department chair evaluations, and dept. LRT committees to not always agree. In fact in some cases they are diametrically opposed. It is then the college LRT committee's responsibility to investigate and make a judgment call on such a case. The dean then has all three, independent, perspectives. Three perspectives that include 8 faculty members from the dept. and college, and one administrator (dept. chair). Under the new system, this would reduce to this single chair, and the	We have heard and read several comments similar to yours. The argument to keep LRT committees makes sense, and our work group has revised the draft to reflect this concern. Due to consistent feedback from faculty regarding the elimination of all LRT Committees, the College LRT Committee and the University LRT Committee will retain the same responsibilities as they currently hold.

review of the two 'faculty mentors' that are not independent, but are immersed in a conflict of interest that reflects on their 'mentorship' success, and since this is done with the faculty member under evaluation, a less-than-open and honest evaluation. This could go either way, perhaps a better review to maintain relationships, or a more negative review where a personal relationship may be suboptimal. I think it is a huge mistake to disband faculty LRT committees. I understand you're trying to reduce the workload that would be imposed by these new mentorship teams. But this is the wrong way to do it.	
I'm very concerned about the elimination of LRT committees. To depend on a sole individual at each level dramatically amplifies the danger of personal bias. I believe it is critical to have input from these faculty committees at each level to maintain fairness and equity in a consistent way across each level (dept, college, and university). Reducing the number of people involved in reviewing faculty from 17 to 3 seems like a bad idea. Committees are very good at talking out issues and seeing things from multiple perspectives.	We have heard and read several comments similar to yours. The argument to keep LRT committees makes sense, and our work group has revised the draft to reflect this concern. Due to consistent feedback from faculty regarding the elimination of all LRT Committees, the College LRT Committee and the University LRT Committee will retain the same responsibilities as they currently hold.
Ideally, mentorship would be informal and VOLUNTARY. I am concerned that faculty independence and personal responsibility are not valued. What happened to the, "We hire qualified professionals and they should be treated with the assumption that they are." line? Faculty should be allowed to grow and thrive with some independence if they desire it. I think most faculty will ask questions and seek guidance of others when they have a need. And provide mentorship opportunities for those who would like this. Having this voluntary would significantly reduce the increased workload as well.	Faculty already have the option to solicit guidance from mentors on an informal basis. Including mentorship in policy, required for everyone, formalizes the developmental approach. The work group feels this requirement is necessary to establish formal working relationships between tenured and non-tenured faculty members. Also, in the current draft the P&T Mentorship Teams will serve as the department-level evaluators. If the mentorship were optional, we would have to keep the Department LRT Committee, thereby maintaining the current workload and adding any additional mentorship workload. Such a decision would likely prevent many tenured faculty members from voluntarily serving as mentors.
Having two 'mentors' replace all the LRT committees seems to me problematic. One possible danger would be senior faculty intimidating/bullying new faculty. Or the opposite where honest criticism is inhibited to maintain good personal relationships within the dept. Coupling mentorship with evaluation seems a recipe for conflicts of interest. Perhaps too intimate for honest, critical analysis? One benefit of LRT committees is a certain level of anonymity that allows an objective and more independent evaluation process. Having LRT committees also provides more balance with multiple points of view at each evaluative level in the process.	We have heard and read several comments similar to yours. The argument to keep LRT committees makes sense, and our work group has revised the draft to reflect this concern. Due to consistent feedback from faculty regarding the elimination of all LRT Committees, the College LRT Committee and the University LRT Committee will retain the same responsibilities as they currently hold.

In response to the point regarding anonymity of the evaluators, our work group believes that face-to-face dialogue will result in a much more open and |

	developmental process that reduces fear and anxiety. We realize that some individuals may bring challenges to this process, but such is true with any process that involves imperfect humans.
6. Please provide any other comments regarding the LRT policy revision process.	
It appears that someone must be signed into their SUU account to leave feedback on this form. You may not be getting honest opinions from faculty, or capturing all the faculty voices.	The only people who have access to this survey are the LRT Revision Work Group members: Steve Barney, Johnny MacLean, Melinda Vaugn, Julie Taylor, Dave Lunt, and Bill Heyborne. We check the survey regularly so we can discuss the comments and revise the document accordingly. We will try to remember to log out regularly, too.

LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback - 2nd Draft Definitions and Evaluative Criteria
As of 12/22/2017

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the right hand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the left hand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Definitions section. How would you suggest changing the definitions in the draft? What suggestions do you have for additional terms and their definitions?	
I am very pleased with the work of the committee, and am in agreement with the definitions they have drafted. Excellent work, committee.	Great! Thank you.
Perhaps the work empirical could also be added to the definition of scholarship. It is a work that can be creative and/or empirical.	We also received feedback that the word empirical could be interpreted in a way that is inappropriate for some disciplines. We decided that by leaving the world empirical out of the definitions completely, the meaning is not diminished, and no discipline is alienated. We have deleted it.
I support the proposed definitions.	Thank you for the support.
In the definition for "Lecturer," the document says that lecturers have a secondary responsibility for "academic unit participation." I have no idea what this means. This is not a phrase I have seen used previously in related documents. Please clarify?	The definition in this draft is identical to the definition in the current policy. We do, however, understand that the phrase "academic unit participation" is unwieldy. We've replaced the phrase with "departmental participation."
I was fine with the term "Scholarship" embracing "Creative Endeavors" until I read the definition. It is written from the perspective of research and doesn't go far enough in understanding and communicating how and why art is created, discovered, or transferred. I would recommend using the phrase "scholarly/creative endeavors". The definition for Full-Professor states: "at least five years of experience at SUU as an associate professor." This does not take into consideration years	We have heard feedback from some who advocate to include creative work within the definition of Scholarship, and we've heard from others who advocate to separate scholarship and creative activity. We will continue to listen to the faculty who are most invested in these terms. In the current draft, we have included this sentence to the definition of scholarship: "Scholarship includes creative work when appropriately defined in departmental evaluation criteria." As this is still a draft, we still have the opportunity to make appropriate modifications.

awarded toward rank at time of hiring (a comprehensive review that requires approval by search committee chair, department LRT chair, department chair, dean, provost, and president). The definition for Associate Professor has the same limitation when "at SUU" is included. Recruitment of quality faculty will be compromised if we do not recognize and reward experience at time of hiring.	The language regarding years of experience is copied and pasted from our current policy. Also in our current policy, section 6.1.3 states: "There may be circumstances where, in addition to the initial rank assignment, an appointee is granted a specified number of years toward the next rank. Any such credit must be determined between the appointee and the responsible Chair, approved by the Dean, and Provost, and specified and clearly stated in the initial contract. A maximum of three years may be credited toward rank advancement. The number of years awarded for rank advancement for a tenure-track assistant professor is the same as the number of year's reduction to the probationary period for tenure." This language will likely be incorporated in the Evaluation Process draft of the revised policy, which will be disseminated for campus review in February.
Faculty Engagement: This paragraph seems so big that any sense of the definition gets bogged down in the multitude of examples. I think listing some of the possible contributions can be helpful (especially to mention some less traditional ones), but the organization could be better. I would suggest having a 2-3 sentence definition, followed by a separate paragraph of examples, for example: "Faculty engagement consists of all faculty activities that relate to their employment: including teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service/leadership, as well as activities that integrate more than one of these categories. The specific types of activities and expected level of faculty engagement are to be outlined in departmental Rank, Promotion, and Tenure policies. Examples of such activities include (but are not limited to): …" Faculty Ranks: 1. The paragraph in this section refers to TT and NTT faculty, which seems odd given the title of the section. I would remove the references to NTT here - possibly with the addition of a brief summary of all the varieties of faculty ranks (i.e. TT,NTT, others) before section 1, if desired. 1.abc: In 1a, it mentions that a terminal degree is required, but not in 1b,c. However, in policy 6.0 (last paragraph in IIIC1) it says assistant professor or higher requires a terminal degree (with possible exceptional cases). Is there a reason for this discrepancy? 4. The first sentence seems superfluous: if the University didn't recognize this, why would there be a definition for it? Also, it doesn't really define the term, although it mentions	Thank you for your suggestion regarding the definition of Faculty Engagement. Our work group has decided to retain the examples (please note that the list is preceded by "...may include, but are not limited to…" We have reworded the list to address some other feedback we've received, and we've rearranged the list to highlight evidence-based teaching practices first. We agree that the reference to NTT faculty is out of place. It was copied and pasted from the current policy. We have removed it. The other comments regarding faculty ranks are quite helpful. We have revised the definitions accordingly. The Evaluation Process first draft is currently being finalized, and it will include details regarding the P&T Mentorship Team. The first draft will be disseminated in February. Currently, we think that a 2-person team for TT faculty, and a 1-person team for NTT Lecturers would be appropriate. Tenured faculty will not have a P&T Mentorship Team. More details are to come. The Teaching Effectiveness definition was only slightly modified from the current policy's definition. We are interested to receive suggestions for improvement. Much of our description for faculty contributions (including teaching effectiveness) is in our definition of Faculty Engagement.

that they may work part time or not at all. (Not everyone that works part-time or not at all is a Professor Emeritus.) 5. Why is this here? It is not a faculty rank, nor is it a definition. At the very least, remove it as a sub-definition in Faculty Ranks. And I wouldn't include it as a definition if you are not going to give any more detail here. P&T Mentorship Team: is it 1 partner together with the faculty member, or multiple people in addition to the faculty member? Calling it a "team" makes me think it should be more than 1, but then it says "…where a partner provides guidance…" (note the singular 'partner'). Service/leadership: "… University, College/school/department/ad hoc …" should be punctuated consistently (commas vs slash) Teaching Effectiveness – this seems less like a definition of the term, and more of how to evaluate it. And why are we talking about scholarship in the definition of Teaching Effectiveness? I don't think this defines TE at all.	
Try to reduce the circular logic (redundancy) and long lists of examples. Defining Engagement... some language that you may want to play with (that doesn't use "engagement" to define it). Engagement with regards to pedagogy refers to the deep, meaningful, connections that are made, by students and faculty, of the course content and the world around us. The ways that the connections may unfold are numerous, but the result will be an increase in critical thinking and a stronger ability to recognize the relevance of the learning experience at SUU. Engagement in service refers to the involvement of community needs and community members in meaningful ways, such as service, programming, research, and development.	Thank you for your suggestions regarding the definition of Faculty Engagement. Our work group has decided to retain the examples (please note that the list is preceded by "...may include, but are not limited to…" We have reworded the list to address this feedback and some other feedback we've received, and we've rearranged the list to highlight evidence-based teaching practices first.
Throughout the document, the word engaged is used about 15 times. I suggest you find a few other words with similar meaning. Full Professor paragraph: the text 'they have mentored other SUU faculty members to become engaged.' It is possible that some departments might not have enough junior faculty to give every faculty member seeking full professor someone to mentor. Perhaps something like: they are an example of what an ideal SUU faculty member should be.	Thank you for your comments. The use of the word engaged is an attempt to align the policy with SUU's mission. We have identified a few places where we can remove the term without changing the meaning. The new draft reflects these changes. While we agree that Full Professors should be examples of what an ideal SUU faculty member should be, we need to be careful with the wording so that we don't have to subsequently define "ideal" or "example." Our solution is to include these statements: "They have contributed significantly to SUU's

Similarly in the Associate Professor paragraph. Also, in both the Full Professor and Associate Professor paragraph the language contributed significantly to SUU's mission in exemplary ways, perhaps just the significant contribution wording is enough to convey the idea. I don't know how one would contribute significantly and have that not be exemplary NTT Some NTT faculty are currently being asked to do scholarly work. Would you think about if that is appropriate and if it is, add something into that section. If it isn't appropriate, add something in that say so. Lecturer: I don't know what academic unit participation means. I see it is in the current policy, but I suggest you perhaps write that to be a bit more clear. Service/Leadership: The text, the Faculty member and P&T Mentorship Team create appropriate service/leadership goals at the beginning of each school year... Instead of the word, 'each' perhaps just use 'the.' I feel the word each implies that this team might meet all the time for everyone. Teaching Effectiveness: There is quite a bit of mention of scholarship in this section, including a definition of what scholarship should be. Perhaps strike that sentence, or change the wording to something like 'teaching contributions can include complementary and/or integrated scholarship efforts'.	mission, and they have taken advantage of appropriate opportunities to mentor other SUU faculty members to become engaged. Their teaching, scholarship, and service/leadership reflect high professional competence." Our committee agrees that associate professors should be prepared to mentor others, even if there are not enough "junior" faculty in their department. After all, the department could hire a new faculty member at any time. We have deleted "in exemplary ways." Thank you for the suggestion. We've received feedback indicating that "currency in their field" is SUU's standard for NTT faculty members' scholarly requirement. Departmental evaluation criteria should describe the types of activities that are expected within specific disciplines to maintain currency in the field. We have changed "unit participation" to "departmental participation." We have changed the word "each" to the word "the" in the Service/Leadership section. We have adopted the suggestion to change the teaching effectiveness sentence to: "Teaching contributions can include complementary and/or integrated scholarship efforts."
There seem to be definitions missing: what is a P&T mentor team? What is a faculty contribution plan? (How strictly will this be enforced?)	The P&T Mentorship Team is a defined term in the draft that was disseminated in November. A faculty contribution plan is the portion of the FAAR that includes the faculty member's goals for the coming years. We will revise for clarity.
The P&T Mentorship Team introduces potential issues. Is this the same group that will be evaluating faculty for tenure & promotion? If not, what happens if the Team steers a faculty member in a direction not supported by the LRT committee or chair? And would this team have access to confidential information (like teaching evaluations) that are currently only	These are very good questions. We will attempt to address these questions in the Evaluation Process section of the revision. We will disseminate this section in February, according to the Blueprint schedule. In general, though, the P&T Mentorship Team will contribute to the faculty member's evaluation for tenure and promotion. This contribution will be part of a developmental

available to the LRT committee and chair? Finally, in terms of adding new roles and responsibilities, aren't we all overworked enough?	approach that helps to guide the faculty member through the early part of their career. In the model we are developing, yes, the P&T Mentorship Team would have access. One of our guiding principles is to avoid adding work. By replacing the 3-person Departmental LRT Committees, the 5-person College LRT Committees, and the University LRT Committee with a 2-person P&T Mentorship Team for tenure-track faculty, a 1-person P&T Mentorship Team for non-tenure-track faculty, and no mentorship team for tenured faculty members, we will actually be decreasing the total workload, and we will be spreading the workload more fairly over a larger number of tenured faculty members. Our hope is that the workload will be decreased, and the meaningfulness of the process will be increased.
2. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Evaluative Criteria section.	
I greatly appreciate that several faculty members have formed a committee to work on these revisions, and am in agreement with the philosophy they have toward revising the evaluative criteria.	Thank you for the feedback.
I appreciate the concept that the goal for faculty is to pursue activities that integrate teaching, scholarship, and service. However, I do think activities that fall within just one of these bounds should not be discounted. While I see the value in ensuring there is some integration, activities that only satisfy only teaching, scholarship, and service should still be of value. For example, in the new model, the hours spent on various committees would rank low because they do not integrate teaching or scholarship. This would lower incentive for faculty to serve on university committees unless they are also linked to teaching or scholarship.	Thank you for your concern. The work group has tried to ensure that both traditional and integrated contributions are valued with this statement: "At SUU, we value both traditional and integrated contributions that align with SUU's mission and vision." Each department will be expected to clearly define what these contributions include within the individual disciplines. It would be inappropriate for the university-wide policy to try to dictate such discipline-specific criteria. However, the university-wide policy should be explicit that both traditional and integrated contributions are valued.
Given that teaching is the primary responsibility we have as faculty at SUU, teaching should be weighted far above and beyond any other evaluative measure put into place.	In the definition of Teaching Effectiveness, we state, "Consistent with SUU's mission as defined in R312, teaching is of primary importance at SUU." The exact weights assigned to the categories will be left up to the department evaluation criteria if departments choose to assign weights. The revised Evaluation Process section, which is still being drafted, will describe how the P&T Mentorship Teams will work with individual faculty members to create appropriate faculty contribution plans that align with SUU's mission and their departmental evaluation criteria.
Evaluations should serve the same function for those who contribute	Thank you for this perspective. We have replaced "Faculty Contribution

through creative endeavors (performance, exhibition, etc.) as with traditional presentations at annual conferences, publications etc. Faculty Contribution Plans are challenging for artistic disciplines that rely on opportunities for commissioned work, collaborative projects, performance gigs, exhibitions etc. It is difficult for annual plans to be dynamic and capture opportunities that are an important part of faculty contribution. Also, some faculty may lower expectations to increase completion of goals.	Plans" with "goals." Goals should be developed by the faculty member and the P&T Mentorship Team, and they should be specific to the departmental evaluation criteria (developed by the faculty in each department). Hopefully the final language in the policy is inclusive enough to allow for the type of contributions best suited for each specific discipline. All P&T Mentorship Teams and other evaluators should recognize that opportunities may come up that change a faculty member's goals. We must trust ourselves and our peers to thoughtfully engage in such important conversations.

It's true that some faculty may lower expectations to increase completion of goals. The P&T Mentorship Teams and the Department Chairs will have the opportunity to help faculty members develop appropriate goals. |
| A: I really appreciate the inclusion of the phrase "… we value both traditional and integrated contributions…" But I am concerned and disappointed that later on (after the diagram) it says "… at least some contributions move toward … overlap…" This says to me that the policy isn't really valuing traditional contributions. I feel that sometimes this policy is using the word "engaged" to mean "integrated" or "overlapping". I feel that faculty can be fully engaged without any overlap/integration of teaching/scholarly/service. In my particular field, I can not see how high quality scholarly research can integrate with the teaching or service available at this university. While I support valuing and accepting contributions that are integrated, I am opposed to, and offended by, the idea that those are the most valuable contributions (or the only valuable ones) – and unfortunately that sentiment is the impression I get from this document.

I approve of the simplified diagrams (compared to the previous draft). I personally don't see any benefit from the figure in addition to the already included phrase "many contributions integrate two or all three categories" but if it helps others understand it then that's fine with me. (I mean, I do think Venn Diagrams are nice. Maybe my familiarity with Venn Diagrams makes it obvious from the sentence.)

C,D(and part of A): I don't really see how this will work (P&T mentorship team, setting/evaluating goals, etc.). At this point it seems like this document gives more questions than answers. I know that the next section or two of the LRT documents will explain this further (February I think I heard?), but at the moment it is hard to make any reasonable comments | Thank you for the comment. We have changed the text to: "At least some contributions should fall in the overlap areas of the Faculty Engagement Model because SUU values student-centered and traditional work that meets the university mission." This statement allows for some contributions to be void of a focus on student, and it encourages faculty to also contribute in ways that directly involve students.

The new diagram may help some see the value in both traditional and integrated contributions.

We agree that it is difficult to see the whole picture. Our hope is to gain feedback as we revise the document section by section. As new sections are presented, we may learn that we need to make adjustments to previous sections. Thank you for your patience as we try to make this the most inclusive revision process possible. |

without seeing the vision of how the evaluation process is supposed to be carried out.	
Two comments: (1) Rather than have the Dean/Provost be the sole approval of Department LRT criteria (above the department level), the LRT committees (at the college and university level) should be involved. In particular, involving the university LRT committee would ensure continuity and consistency across the university in the criteria used by departments for evaluation. Because the university LRT committee has members from all the colleges it would ensure that the perspectives of all colleges would be considered. (2) I know there has been some controversy about not having an "exceptional performance" rating. However, if there is not going to be merit pay tied to "exceptional" performance, there really is no need to burden the LRT committees and academic officers with trying to single out "exceptional" performers during the review process. Promoting awards for such individuals would be more appropriate and a better use of time by those involved in the evaluation process.	Our current plan is to remove the College and University LRT Committees from the process so that workload isn't increased as we increase the developmental approach to the promotion and tenure process. We've heard some feedback about the current process that the University LRT Committee members have a hard time determining what is or isn't appropriate at the disciplinary level. The revised approach would give the most authority of specific types of contributions to the department/disciplinary level. We have heard much feedback regarding the "exceptional performance" rating. We have determined that a strong, developmental approach will simply focus on forming appropriate goals and evaluating whether faculty members make acceptable progress toward those goals. There are several other ways SUU acknowledges exceptional contributions, such as the end-of-year awards at Commencement.

I agree with earlier comments that characterize the "Faculty Contribution Plan" as a "mini-FAAR" due in the fall. Not only will I have to write such a plan, I will have to read, mentor, and evaluate at least two other plans (do the math: at least two faculty per evaluation team means at least two other plans to evaluate). Faculty already have full workloads; adding another 10 or 20 hours of paperwork and meetings per year does not improve the workload situation. Furthermore, what are the objective, measurable outcomes on which to base the assessment of each "Faculty Contribution Plan"? This should not be punted off to individual departments at some future date, all the while lobbying for approval of the vague new LRT process in the present. That's what Washington DC Legislative Branch does: create a huge bill with lots of gray area that can be filled in later at the discretion of the Administrative Branch. At SUU, we need to see the entire picture BEFORE committing to approval. For instance, recent versions of Policy 6.1 spell out what instruments are used to evaluate teaching (student evals, peer evals, dept chair evals, self evals, etc.), scholarship (explicit reference to Boyer model that requires discovery of knowledge or innovation, peer review, dissemination, etc.), service (committee work, professional service to the community, etc.)	Our work group is still developing the details of the draft Evaluation Process section, which will more clearly outline the workload expectations. One of our guiding principles is to avoid adding any workload to faculty members' and evaluators' already busy lives. While the draft is still evolving, our general direction regarding FAAR and evaluation workload is as follows:
	- The FAAR will be limited to a 3-page narrative of progress toward goals (following a template) and a list of future goals (following a template). Workload advantages include:
	  - Faculty who currently write and/or review long FAARs will see a drastic reduction in workload.
	- The Department LRT Committees, College LRT Committees, and University LRT Committees will be replaced by P&T Mentorship Teams. Workload advantages include:
	  - Work will be distributed broadly among more tenured faculty (instead of the few LRT Committee members who currently evaluate all of the FAARs).
	  - P&T Mentorship Teams will provide a developmental approach, which may provide a more meaningful experience for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty than the current process.

	- The ownership of the promotion and tenure process will shift toward the faculty. The Chairs, Deans, and Provost will retain a significant voice, but faculty will set the developmental tone of their peers' evaluations.
I am uncomfortable with the text, 'must include evidence-based best practices.' Although the term best practice is great, I don't know that it is defined and listed for faculty to fully know what that means. Also, using the term 'must' makes the wording a bit strong. Perhaps re-think that into something with the word 'should' to guide faculty into doing it the right way instead of forcing them into it. I am uncomfortable with the text 'including documentation of continued effort to improve.' I know there are always new things to learn and do, but it seems that at some point a great teacher should just be allowed to be great, and not be forced to go get training on things they likely already know just to put it in their documentation. The Faculty Responsibilities paragraph. I don't know that each faculty member has the wiggle room to develop a contribution plan that aligns with SUU's mission, the departmental evaluation critera, and the faculty engagement model. Ideally these three things align, but likely they will conflict in some ways. It is also unclear what that will look like, and then to say that they will be retained and promoted based on their progress towards their plans seems a bit fishy. If I create a weak plan, and achieve it, I get promoted, but if I create a difficult plan and don't achieve it, I don't. I think that wording need a re-think. Also, the paragraph cites Policy 6.28, which it titles 'Faculty Professional Resposibilitiy. Perhaps this paragraph can be reworked to just say 'follow Policy 6.28'	Thank you for the comment regarding the phrase, "must include evidence-based best practices." We hope that our peers will be able to discern what the term "evidence-based best practices" means for each discipline. The term "must" is strong, and if we weaken it, the policy no longer has the same meaning. We have received ample feedback that the LRT policy and process must have a developmental tone. As professors and educators, we should always strive to improve. Given the fact that our students' demographics are constantly changing, as are the best practices in higher education, we feel that it would be inappropriate for anyone to simply stop trying to improve. We agree with you that departmental evaluation criteria and the faculty engagement model should align with SUU's mission. We can't find any misalignment with the draft version of the faculty engagement model. The alignment of the departmental evaluation criteria will be the responsibility of the faculty in each department, and the criteria will be approved by the college/school Dean and the Provost. In this model, the P&T Mentorship Team and the Department Chair will share the responsibility with the faculty member to create an appropriate plan. We must trust ourselves and our peers to evaluate each others' progress toward goals in a reasonable manner. The current Policy 6.28 includes professional responsibilities that are in addition to the teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service/leadership categories. This is included here instead of listing Collegiality as a fourth category because many faculty have requested to delete Collegiality from the policy.
- Why is there no mention of service beyond SUU or the local community? Shouldn't we get credit for serving on editorial boards, regional/national organizations, etc.? I think a key component of being engaged is being engaged in our fields	We agree with you that serving on editorial boards, regional/national organizations, etc., should be valued. The first sentence of the definition of Service/Leadership is: "Academic departments define acceptable service/leadership contributions that contribute to students, department, college/school, university, community, and profession." We hope this sentence addresses your concern.

It is unclear about what happens if you do something that overlaps categories if it will count multiple times. For example if you do SOTL project would that count as both research/scholarship and teaching?	The point of the Faculty Engagement Model is to value contributions that fit solely within one of the categories (for example, a solo-authored piece of scholarship) and contributions that fit in the overlap between categories (for example, a piece of scholarship that is co-authored with a student). A Scholarship of Teaching and Learning project could very well fit in the overlap area between teaching and scholarship, and it should be valued at SUU. Departmental evaluation criteria will vary across the disciplines and will be created by faculty.
What exactly would the format for a teaching portfolio be? (Have you ever made a teaching portfolio? It takes HOURS...much longer than current FAARs.) Will there be training and/or workshops available on how to create a portfolio specific to SUU's LRT policy	The LRT Revision Work Group has not yet constructed a template for a teaching portfolio. (Yes, members of the work group have made teaching portfolios.) The current policy (Policy 6.1) includes the following sentence in its definition of Teaching Excellence: "Thus, a portfolio approach to 'teaching effectiveness' is required for all units, including student evaluations plus one or more of the following: peer evaluations, instructional delivery/design, course management skills, letters from colleagues, or other similar factors." Therefore, faculty are already required to create a teaching portfolio. Yes, the Provost's Office has informed us that there will be trainings and/or workshops to facilitate the transition between the current policy and the revised policy. These will include help with teaching portfolios.
I think that we need to be careful about "traditional contributions" over "integrated contributions." Some fields favor (and actually discourage) student research because they prioritize single authored papers and books. I think that we should be stressing "integrated contributions" IN ADDITION to rather than replacing "traditional contributions."	We agree. We have revised the text to: "At least some contributions should fall in the overlap areas of the Faculty Engagement Model because SUU values student-centered and traditional work that meets the university mission."
How exactly are HIPs going to be evaluated? How much flexibility will there be for subject matter and class size? HSS, for example, has extremely high class sizes and focuses a lot on Gen Ed classes. While it is of course possible to incorporate some HIPs in classes of 96, it is much harder than with a class of 10-30. I don't think we punish faculty for this.	The revised university policy aims to value evidence-based practices, and HIPs are simply examples. It will be up to departmental evaluation criteria, written by faculty within each department, to determine how such practices are evaluated. Departments should recognize differences in teaching loads when considering expectations on faculty. Perhaps some HIPs are appropriate for some large classes, and perhaps some classes are not conducive. However, there are many other evidence-based practices from which a faculty member teaching a large class can choose.
I have two main concerns. First, I am strongly opposed to the the suggestion that as faculty develop "at least some contributions move toward the portion of the Faculty Engagement Model where overlap of the categories	We agree. We have revised the text to: "At least some contributions should fall in the overlap areas of the Faculty Engagement Model because SUU values student-centered and traditional work that meets the university

occurs." It is possible to be fully engaged in Scholarship, Teaching, and Service without having any overlap between those efforts. I disagree with the suggestion that overlapping efforts are somehow more valuable to the faculty member, department, or institution. Second, as a department chair, I see the elimination of the Collegiality category as problematic. As defined in policy, Collegiality refers to professional behavior. Without that category, where is unprofessional behavior addressed? Cancelling lots of classes might lead to positive teaching evaluations, but it is clearly unprofessional behavior. Is that supposed to be addressed under Teaching Effectiveness? That's not clear. Professional behavior is not specifically mentioned under Scholarship or Service either, yet issues can and will arise.	mission." We have received much feedback regarding the Collegiality category. Based on the efforts of the Faculty Senate task force during the previous two school years, we determined that the best way to address unprofessional behavior is to cite Policy 6.28 Faculty Professional Responsibility. This policy clearly describes responsibilities that many departments currently consider collegiality, and the expectations already exist in policy. It makes sense to us to stick with this existing policy about professional responsibility instead of trying to define and measure a term like collegiality.
The pendulum seems to have swung completely with this revision. I interpreted the first version as suggesting that integration among the three pillars would basically be a requirement for faculty to progress through tenure and rank advancement. This version seems to move away from that completely. I guess my concern is that this policy would be wide open to interpretation. Some departments could write departmental policies that require significant integration, and some could require none. This could then lead to very different expectations and workloads across campus. While I understand that each department needs the flexibility to implement policies that best fit the discipline & faculty, I also feel like a university policy should have enough teeth to ensure there is a somewhat level playing field.	We agree. There is a difficult balance to strike when defining university-wide parameters that will drive departmental evaluation criteria. In fact, the problem you describe exists with the current policy, and this draft revision only attempts to align the university-wide parameters with SUU's mission. The vast majority of feedback we've received in Faculty Senate meetings and department meetings suggests that faculty members are generally more comfortable with the idea of allowing departments to define appropriate contributions. Our hope is that much of the power will return to the faculty to (1) define appropriate criteria, and (2) evaluate our peers' effectiveness. The college/school Deans and the Provost's Office will retain the responsibility to ensure parity of departmental evaluation criteria across the departments and colleges/schools.
3. Please provide any other comments regarding the LRT policy revision process.	
I am in agreement with the philosophy and specific changes that the committee has advocated up to this point, and fully support their continuing efforts to revise the LRT policy.	Thank you for your feedback.
However changes are implemented, I hope as a university we maintain high quality work that would be recognizable to those in a broad academic community. That is, I do not want our definition of scholarship to become so narrow and specialized that those outside of the SUU community cannot recognize the value.	The work group agrees with your statement. In fact, our hope is to broaden the definition of scholarship. The departmental evaluation criteria will be responsible for ensuring disciplinary consistency with the rest of the academic community.
The direction of the revision committee, i.e., eliminating a 3 three pillar	Thank you for your feedback.

system, is favorable and should be supported, despite opposition of a vocal minority.	
I know this is a thankless job, but I'll thank you anyway. The efforts of the committee to engage campus in conversations about the new criteria are greatly appreciated.	Thank you for the encouragement!
This should be on your other form, sorry. Possible Sentences for the Value Statement (to make it clearer): There are many ways in which faculty participate in the creation of knowledge and ideas at SUU; the ways in which faculty do so are as numerous as the disciplines and fields represented by our faculty.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have revised the text to the statement to read, "Faculty contribute to SUU's mission in many notable and relevant ways that are as numerous as our disciplines. These contributions can defy simple classification within the traditional categories of evaluation. Departmental evaluation criteria clearly outline contributions appropriate to their disciplines that meet SUU's mission."
- Has the committee looked at LRT criteria from peer and aspirational universities? While SUU has some unique goals and initiatives, I think it is important that our LRT policies are in line with peer and aspirational universities. This will help streamline the process for new faculty coming in who were tenure track elsewhere and will help existing faculty transition to other universities if they chose to leave SUU?	Yes, our work group has looked at LRT criteria from peer and aspirational universities. We agree that our policies should align with other schools. Our goal is to draft such a revised policy.
Why do non-TT faculty get promoted to Associate Professor one year before TT faculty? This seems to give mixed messaging about our priorities as a university and signals that we favor non-TT faculty over TT	The timing of NTT vs TT promotions in the revised policy was adopted from the current policy. We have not proposed a change. It only takes a NTT lecturer 4 years to be promoted to assistant professor, but it takes a NTT assistant professor 6 years to be promoted to NTT associate professor, which is the same amount of time it takes for a TT assistant professor to be promoted to associate professor.
Why is the LRT Committee so small and lacking in diversity? It seems to be primarily white men and the same people who serve on all committees? Where are the non-TT people, people of color, etc. I do not think the committee actually reflects the changing values of our campus and mission statement.	We appreciate this concern. It is vital to emphasize the importance of diversity. As we increase our representation of diverse groups, the creativity of our ideas also increases. This committee may not include the best representation of diversity possible. We acknowledge this. As stated in the Blueprint document: *"Brad Cook, James Sage, Nathan Barker, Bruce Howard, Johnny MacLean, and Steve Barney collaboratively selected Bill Heyborne, Julie Taylor, Melinda Vaughn, and David Lunt to serve as the LRT Revision Work Group. Steve Barney and Johnny MacLean will co-chair the work group.*

	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." It is true that our committee lacks racial diversity. It does, however, include two women. It also includes two untenured (one NTT, one TT) faculty, two recently tenured faculty, and two senior faculty. It also includes two former Faculty Senate Presidents, two current Faculty Senate members, and two faculty who have not served on Faculty Senate. The faculty on the committee represent six departments from four colleges. Our goal was to invite faculty who have demonstrated the dispositions necessary to listen to the rest of the faculty from across campus. It may not be a perfect committee, but we're doing our best.
In the first round of comments for definitions and evaluative criteria, your responses mentioned the term "intrinsic motivation" 3 times. Why is this such a hot button issue for the LRT committee? It seems insulting to faculty to imply that we are NOT already intrinsically motivated or that we stop doing work once we are tenured. All the faculty that I have met at SUU are extremely (and intrinsically) motivated. I recommend a change in terminology.	We don't mean to insult anyone, and we don't mean to imply that faculty stop working once we are tenured. It's true that faculty members at SUU are incredibly motivated. Our goal is simply to construct a policy revision that values SUU's mission in a developmental process. We will make sure, though, that this round of responses, the draft Definitions, and the draft Evaluative Criteria do not explicitly use the term.
Keep up the good fight!	We will! We hope all faculty see this as a collaborative, faculty-driven effort.

LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback - Definitions and Evaluative Criteria

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the right hand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the left hand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Definitions section. How would you suggest changing the definitions in the draft? What suggestions do you have for additional terms and their definitions?	
HIPs are valuable tools, but what can we say to faculty who teach large GE courses of 50-100+ students? Are their traditional, lecture-style courses less valuable than something like JumpStart or Semester in the Parks? If that's the case, then how do we change? (And how could we possibly afford to have classes like that across the board?) Some colleagues have expressed concern about feeling forced to integrate changes into classes that aren't really conducive to HIPs. In other words, we have a number of traditional classroom courses, so how do we encourage & reward innovative practices and new ideas without penalizing or ostracizing more traditional courses or faculty?	We agree that HIPs are valuable tools. HIPs are not the only tools available to effectively engage students in learning. Also, traditional, lecture-style courses are not necessarily less valuable than Jumpstart or Semester in the Parks. We have tried to emphasize the importance of faculty engagement in all of its forms. Faculty at SUU should have a growth mindset, which includes changing pedagogical practices to reflect the evolving needs of our students. Such changes can come in many forms that are not exclusive to HIPs. There are many models in the literature of faculty engaging large classes of 50-100+ students in HIPs, experiential learning, project-based learning, community engaged learning, service learning, undergraduate research, and many other practices. "Traditional" lectures will always have a place in higher education because they are efficient for transferring content. If such "traditional" lectures can be complemented by other engaged teaching strategies, our student body that is continually becoming more diverse will benefit. The point is that we want faculty to use best practices that are based in evidence in the pedagogical literature. We've updated the draft to reflect this point. Thank you for your insight.
The definition of PBL is much longer than the 6 others I looked at. It is too specific, especially that last sentence. It seems you are prescribing one way to do PBL, instead of leaving it up to the faculty. It seems like you're trying to promote undergraduate research through PBL, and that's not the place for it in a definition. However, your definition of Scholarship is the perfect place to	The Project-Based Learning definition comes from SUU's Director of Project-Based Learning. We thought it would be wise to maintain consistency across the university when definitions already exist. There is a robust literature behind Project-Based Learning, and it has been shown to be a valuable pedagogical tool.

integrate the Boyer model. You can replace the second paragraph which is descriptions of Boyer-like scholarship with a blanket statement that the Boyer model is how we define scholarship. That way, every time you refer to scholarship throughout the document, we know you mean the Boyer model.	We tried hard to capture the portions of the Boyer model that best fit SUU's mission. In fact, we think the definition of Scholarship we provided is an accurate reflection of the Boyer model, and it is tailored to meet our needs at SUU.
The definitions you have listed are well thought out and clearly articulated. It is hard to say whether others should be added at this point - I imagine the completed revision will have some additional terms that will warrant inclusion on this list. I would also think the Arts folks might appreciate having Creative Activities added to the list, as they might not agree that what they do falls under your definition of Scholarship.	Thank you! We are still discussing how creative activity should be included. One line of thinking is that including creative activity in the Scholarship definition will reduce confusion by removing the thought that they are different. However, this draft definition will continue to be revised. Thank you for this comment. It will help to guide our conversations.
Service learning is a term that is becoming outdated and replaced by "community engaged learning." Service learning implies that the student is unilaterally deciding that the community needs a particular service. Community engaged learning is more focused on the co-creation of knowledge with a community to solve a problem identified by the community. "Service learning" carries a certain amount of colonialism-style baggage with it. I really like how Stanford defines community engaged learning: https://undergrad.stanford.edu/programs/community-engaged-learning-ce l From a scientist's perspective, the Union of Concerned Scientists has put together a set of guidelines for scientists who are interested in working with communities: http://www.ucsusa.org/center-science-and-democracy/connecting-scientist s-and-communities/scientist-community-partnerships#.Wg0MEVz81E4 Under faculty engagement, I suggest changing this statement: "coauthoring student-conducted scholarly papers or professional presentations," to "coauthoring student-generated scholarly papers or professional presentations," because students don't conduct papers, but they can generate them. Similarly, the grammar here also seems off: "conducting educational opportunities for the university community," might better be "providing educational opportunities for the university community." I would remove the service learning definition in its entirety for the reasons stated above. To facilitate buy-in from across campus, I think you may need more references to how all of these practices tie into academics a little more	Thank you for your comments. We have updated the definition of community engaged learning according to your suggestions, and we have deleted the service learning term/definition from the document. We have also adjusted the grammar according to your suggestions.

tightly than it seems they are in these definitions.	
I think its best to keep the University LRT doc and description less detailed. The burden of definition should fall to the Departments in their articulation of their LRT measures. The detail should come from the departments and be specific to their expertise and deployment of teaching. If everything is defined the University level, we lose the autonomy of our disciplines and are forced to all become one kind of "apple."	Thank you for your comment. We have simplified the diagram. The departmental evaluation criteria will be allowed to specify and articulate their LRT measures within the context of evidence-based practices that can fall solely within one of the three categories and that integrate two or three of the categories.
Suggested revisions: In the definition of "Experiential Learning" it would be helpful if the bullets were in chronological order to the extent possible. For example, it seems like "reflection" should be at the end. Also, it would be helpful if a full citation were provided for the documentation from the National Society for Experiential Education. "Faculty Engagement" - Could service to professional societies also be listed as a valued part of faculty engagement? "Scholarship" - Could more explicit acknowledgement of the Boyer Model be added to this definition? "Shared Governance" - Perhaps add some verbiage to indicate the interplay between faculty and administration. There are a lot of misconceptions about what shared governance really means, and an expanded definition would help to avoid confusion. Additional Terms: "Teaching Effectiveness" - The other components of evaluation ("Scholarship" and "Service/Leadership") are defined. Beyond the advantage of symmetry, a broad statement about what "teaching effectiveness" means at SUU would be helpful. "Mentoring Team" - this "team" is mentioned in the definition of "service/leadership" without any indication of who is involved. Editing note: The opening sentence structure for "High Impact Practices"	We've removed "Experiential Learning" and replaced it (and other terms) with Evidence-Based Practices. Thank you for the comment. We will consider adding "service to professional societies" as part of faculty engagement. However, it seems like such activity would fit in Service/Leadership, which is mentioned toward the end of the definition of faculty engagement. We've considered explicitly naming the Boyer model. We tried hard to capture the portions of the Boyer model that best fit SUU's mission. In fact, we think the definition of Scholarship we provided is an accurate reflection of the Boyer model, and it is tailored to meet our needs at SUU. We will consider adding verbiage to Shared Governance, realizing that concise definitions are much appreciated by faculty. We have added Teaching Effectiveness. Thank you for the suggestion. We have added a definition of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Mentoring Team. Thank you for this editorial note. We have adjusted the sentence structure for consistency.

("High-Impact Practices"?) , "Peer Review," and "Service-Learning" ("Service Learning"?) differs from the other entries, likely because they were authored by a different member of the committee.	
A definition for 'faculty mentorship team' is needed. I question the need to put all faculty on develpmental plans each year by requiring 'goals' to be set with a mentorship team each fall semester. How will this affect workload to require every faculty member to meet with a mentorship team to arrange these goals. How many mentorship teams must be staffed by each faculty member? I think this level of micromanagement violates the idea that, "we hire qualified faculty, let them do their job and be treated as professionals"? I think most faculty will be repulsed by such a micromanaged process. At least I myself feel this is too much. Perhaps an 'opt in' if a faculty member requires more micromanagement, and wants to be part of a 'mentorship team experience'?	Thank you for your comments. We are working on a definition of "Faculty Mentorship Team." Feedback from faculty has clearly shown the desire for a developmental LRT process, as opposed to a simply punitive and/or evaluative process. The process will be described in depth in the following draft section, called Evaluation Process, which will be disseminated for review in early February according to the schedule in the Blueprint document. We look forward to feedback from faculty. We are currently designing the process in a way that promotes intrinsic motivation. Our hope is that the process will be developmental without having a sense of micromanagement. Such developmental feedback should already occur in the current framework, but we have heard that many faculty simply receive evaluative feedback from their Department LRT Committees.
2. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Evaluative Criteria section.	
I like the visual of overlapping criteria, because not all teaching/scholarship/service falls into neat categories. The Venn diagram helps to illustrate that some of our work is truly integrated. Consider recoloring or texturing the circles to avoid colorblindness complications. However, I have heard concerns from colleagues that "traditional" research that may not tie directly into a course appears to be downgraded in this model. Furthermore, some are concerned about the pressure to be "engaging" outside of work/class. Not every faculty member wants to lead experiential learning courses, go on study abroad trips, conduct research with undergrads, mentor others, or have pizza parties with student groups. While these are valuable endeavors that some of us really enjoy, others seem to feel like they will be punished for not engaging in this way. I would recommend removing the ranks from the diagram for three reasons: 1) It looks cluttered and distracts from the traditional-integrated arrows; 2) I know assistant professors who are far more integrated in their approach to	Thank you! We have changed the circles to grayscale to avoid color blindness complications. "Traditional" research still has a place at SUU. The second sentence of the draft Evaluative Criteria states: "At SUU, we value both traditional and integrated contributions that meet SUU's mission and vision." With that said, we have modified the diagram to decrease the amount of overlap, thereby increasing the amount of space allowed for non-integrated, traditional contributions to each category. The draft Evaluative Criteria does make the expectation clear that faculty engagement is vital. It attempts to create a broad umbrella under which many types of faculty engagement are possible and valued. Experiential learning courses, study abroad trips, undergraduate research, and mentoring

teaching & scholarship than some tenured faculty, yet the asst prof ring shows no overlap at all; 3) Are we prepared, as an institution, to enforce "integrated contribution" among our already-tenured faculty? I believe that tenured faculty should be engaged and demonstrate integrated teaching/scholarship/service, but unless we are going to expect such contributions from our current faculty -- and assess it -- then we ought not include it.	are only some of the many ways in which faculty members can be engaged. As long as faculty are utilizing best practices that are evidence-based in the pedagogical literature, their contributions will be valued. The draft has been updated to reflect this change. We have modified the diagram so that the ranks and their associated rings are no longer present. We realize that any policy change will require a transition period. It may be difficult to enforce these changes with every tenured faculty member. However, such challenges should not prevent us from trying to align our LRT policy with our values as faculty at SUU. We should be forward-thinking as we revise this policy with the goal to mentor current and future faculty members to embody what we value. Additionally, Objective 2.3.2 in our strategic plan obligates us to revise the policy in alignment with the strategic plan.
The first part of this document seemed like theory to me, and not a policy. It wasn't until section B, I think, where you talk about the make of the the committee to resolve conflicts about departmental LRT policies did this begin to read like a policy. Sections C and D really bother me. This is only one way to do evaluation, and it is not preferable to what we already have. We tried this for a few years, about 5, in my department. It is more work for the faculty, because you are doing a mini-FAAR at the beginning of the year. Then you need to meet those goals, or explain why you didn't, and not meeting the goals, no matter the circumstances, may lead to poor evaluation. Right now, we are evaluated on what we accomplished, whether we planned to do it or not. It's just better for us this way. Trust me, no one wants to do the extra paperwork! Also, I come up with good and bad ideas throughout the year, and want to act on those good ones.	The LRT Revision Work Group discussed the goal-oriented model at length, and we feel it is the model most likely to foster intrinsic motivation in faculty members. Many other universities utilize such a model successfully. The next draft section (Evaluation Process) will be disseminated for campus review in February. It will describe the process in more depth. We are confident this will actually decrease the amount of paperwork for each faculty member. When this draft section is disseminated, we will look forward to hearing feedback from the faculty.
I like the graphics you have included, as they really help me visualize your idea of faculty engagement. I guess I would like to know more about what this might look like in the trenches. Can you give examples of what a faculty member at each rank would look like? I'm particularly interested in what advancement to Full Professor would look like under this model. It appears that complete integration would be necessary. Would this mean that a faculty member who spends each summer collaborating with R1 colleagues, has a steady record of publication based on this work, and then spends the	Based on faculty feedback, we have modified the diagram so that the ranks and their associated rings are no longer present. With that said, our hope is to recognize all faculty contributions, including those that integrate teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Examples include, but are not limited to, engaging with students in undergraduate research during a class; mentoring a student to write a musical or perform in a musical; or collect, analyze, and report on data to benefit a community partner.

school year focusing on excellence in the classroom would not be adequately integrating scholarship and teaching and would therefore not be recommended for Full Professor? I anticipate this model causing some angst across campus, so some further clarity might be nice here. I'm torn on the binary ratings you propose. On the one hand, I appreciate the current difficulty of differentiating between Exceptional and Standard ratings, and understand that differentiation may often be artificial. On the other hand, this completely removes any recognition that some folks are going above and beyond, while others are doing the minimum that needs to be done. We are already in a situation in which going the extra mile results in little to no recognition, with the only reward being personal satisfaction and the hope that one is making a difference to the students. Lumping everyone together as either "good enough" or "not good enough" further exacerbates this problem. We recognize differences in the quality of our students by assigning different grades. We don't give them either an A or an F. Shouldn't we recognize the same in our faculty? Given how much work you are all doing on this revision, shouldn't you all get a bit more recognition than "Acceptable progress towards goals"?	Details of faculty contributions will be managed at the department level. It must be stated, though, that SUU's mission clearly states our commitment to helping students develop. Therefore, the majority of our efforts should be aimed toward students directly or indirectly.

We have discussed the binary rating system at length. As your comment describes, there are advantages and disadvantages for each approach. Our logic behind the binary approach is to simplify the process and encourage intrinsic motivation. |
These criteria seem very amorphous to me. I don't understand how I would use them to guide my development as a faculty member, but I like the Venn diagrams.	We have adjusted the criteria to according to these and other comments. The goals of the revision are to show value in contributions that integrate the categories and mandate evidence-based approaches. The Provost's Office will be responsible for providing appropriate guidance to departments as they revise departmental evaluation criteria.
I think that it needs to be made clear that more "traditional" activities in scholarship/teaching/service will still be valued and accepted in the LRT process; the addition of "integrated" scholarship/teaching/service is exactly that -- an *addition* to what constitutes acceptable activities. This was mentioned in the senate meeting, but it needs to be made clear in the document, as I was not the only one who got a different understanding from reading the draft. While I like Venn Diagrams in general, I didn't understand what these were supposed to mean; all the meaning that I gathered was from the text of the document. I would recommend removing them, unless their intent can be made much more clear.	Thank you for the feedback. We have simplified the diagram and modified the text in an attempt to clarify that "we value both traditional and integrated contributions that align with SUU's mission and vision" and that "traditional and integrated contributions in Teaching Effectiveness and Scholarship must include evidence-based best practices."
I'm not sure I understand how the evaluation process is supposed to work with this section. In preparing a FAAR, does the faculty have to address all possible overlaps(or non-overlaps) between scholarly/teaching/service? What constitutes acceptable "goals" for the year? Do we need to meet with	The evaluation process will be discussed in detail in a subsequent section called the Evaluation Process section. The first draft will be disseminated to faculty on February 2, according to the schedule outlined in the Blueprint. Our intent is actually to decrease the amount of work while increasing the

the chair to discuss this at the beginning (or end) of each year to set goals, and then in the FAAR review this? Is this just adding to our work?	value of the work. We look forward to receiving feedback about the Evaluation Process in February.
Faculty Senate Concern 1 Instead of just Service, Scholarship, Teaching and perhaps Collegiality, we now have all the intersections between these things. This may give faculty the impression that they need to have scholarship, plus scholarship+service, plus scholarship+teaching, plus scholarship+service+teaching	Thank you for the feedback. We have modified the text accordingly. Departmental evaluation criteria will be developed in each department.
Faculty Senate Concern 2 It seems difficult to measure and then evaluate exactly how these intersections overlap. This may make the LRT process even more prone to disputes.	Considering the fact that faculty contributions are diverse and complicated, it would be inappropriate to attempt to define every potential contribution. This draft attempts to broaden the types of contributions that are valued at SUU, including those that fall solely within one of the categories and those that integrate two or three of the categories.
Faculty Senate Concern 3 The center of the Venn diagram makes the LRT process look like and engagement only model. It doesn't make it clear that traditional teaching/service/scholarship still counts	Thank you for the feedback. We have simplified the diagram and modified the text in an attempt to clarify that "we value both traditional and integrated contributions that align with SUU's mission and vision" and that "traditional and integrated contributions in Teaching Effectiveness and Scholarship must include evidence-based best practices."
Although pictures are nice, I don't know that having a picture for TT faculty and a separate one for NTT faculty is necessary. If you do find it necessary to have 2 pictures, I suggest shrinking the size of the circles in the NTT section instead of moving them outward.	We have modified and simplified the diagram to reduce confusion.
We can strongly encourage engagement at the mission statement and vision statement level. And then strongly encourage the departments to include it as much as is reasonable based on their own criteria as experts in their fields.	Thank you for your comment. We agree, and we have tried to express the point in the revised draft.
In faculty senate it was suggested that the circles should be removed from the engagement model figures. I disagree. As SUU faculty progress in their career, their scholarship and service should become more intentionally aligned with their teaching effectiveness. As is obvious from our mission statement, SUU is a teaching university. I think the evaluative criteria should also acknowledge that faculty at different stages of their career will focus on different aspects of engagement. New assistant professors will need to focus almost exclusively on developing their teaching effectiveness. Later, scholarship might become more important. And full professors should be campus leaders.	We have revised the diagram according to the majority of comments we received. Our hope is that the revised Evaluation Process section, to be disseminated in early spring semester, will address faculty members' changing focuses throughout their career by giving them the opportunity to set annual goals. The revised Evaluation Process section will give faculty more ownership in the tenure and promotion process of their colleagues. We look forward to feedback regarding the revised draft process in February.

This is just one data point, but I came from a different university and was surprised at how much administration control there is in the SUU LRT policies. For example, the dean approves the department evaluation criteria. Approval should be done by the LRT committees at the college and university level. This will put the responsibility on the faculty to ensure evaluation is done at the appropriate rigor. Committees will also have more continuity than a single person--when a dean changes, the expectations could change dramatically. The university LRT committee should be involved to ensure that expectations for tenure and promotion are consistent across colleges. Another example of excessive administrative control is the "dispute" resolution procedure in which two administrators (dean and department chair) are paired with a single faculty member to resolve the issue. I would also mention that at my previous school the department head was only tangentially involved with faculty evaluation. It was felt that a committee would be less biased in evaluating faculty. (I've heard from other faculty that this is also true at their institutions.) Who approves the annual goals that faculty set? This should be spelled out.	The approval of goals is spelled out in the next section (Evaluation Process). We will disseminate the draft of the Evaluation Process section in February.
The 'engaged' model described in the revision would better be called the 'integrated' or 'overlapping' model. I disagree that overlap=engaged. Although the intro states that traditional contributions are valued, the rest of the narrative and images emphasize that traditional contributions are ok only for initial appointments, and that overlapping is expected to increase proportionally with rank advancements. Only teeny corners are allowed in the full professor circle for scholarly, teaching or service activities that don't explicitly overlap. I believe engagement can be deep and meaningful without overlap of areas. This idea that all faculty activities can overlap, is overly confining and doesn't allow a full appreciation for our diverse faculty with wide-ranging interests and passions. It seems that this bulls-eye idea for all faculty is almost opposite of what we should be striving for. Allow faculty to expand their activities into scholarly, or teaching, or service as they develop over their careers. And expand in different ways that may or may not overlap with their teaching and service assignments. For example: a professor can not always choose which classes they teach, and they may not fit well with current passions of scholarly/creative pursuits. These pursuits should not be diminished simply because they don't fit with a current-year's teaching schedule. Perhaps have multiple tracks for faculty to pursue, that can change from year to year. Maybe emphasizing scholarly/creative activity one year,	Thank you for the feedback. We agree with your statement that engagement can be deep and meaningful without overlap of areas. We have simplified the diagram and modified the text in an attempt to clarify that "we value both traditional and integrated contributions that align with SUU's mission and vision" and that "traditional and integrated contributions in Teaching Effectiveness and Scholarship must include evidence-based best practices." Your example sets the stage well for an evaluation process that involves annual goals. Perhaps this faculty member who is assigned to teach a particular set of courses one semester can work with mentors to design goals that are appropriate for the particular teaching load that still allows for thinking, pondering, learning, etc. Then the faculty member can work with the mentors to create a new set of goals for the following year that allows time for scholarship or service/leadership. The point of the goals process, in formed in conjunction with mentors, is to avoid the tendency to require faculty to passionately engage in all activities at all times. We will disseminate the draft Evaluation Process section in February, according to the schedule in the Blueprint document.

teaching innovations another year, and service in another. A fourth track could be the current model of overlapping activities if somone is focusing on service-learning activities in teaching and planning to publish a manuscript about it. To expect faculty to passionately engage in all activities at all times, may not always be possible for faculty with real lives and other obligations on their time and resources. One thing to consider is need to ensure that faculty have some free time to actually think, ponder, learn, and pursue various ideas that can enhance our teaching and scholarly/creative work?	
3. Please provide any other comments regarding the LRT policy revision process.	
I have heard concerns from colleagues that the university is changing LRT policy for change's sake, and they don't understand why we are overhauling it. That said, the way Policy 6.1 stood, as-is, it seemed (seems) to have few teeth to enforce that we value teaching as much (or more so!) than scholarship and service. That message needs to be communicated more clearly. The concern remains that any adjustments we make to Policy 6.1 won't keep certain deans and LRT committees from arbitrarily imposing their personal views on individuals (such as esteeming scholarly output at the expense of quality teaching), rather than abiding by departmental policies. That enforcement has to come from the provost's office.	There are many reasons for this LRT policy revision. One reason is that Objective 2.3.2 in our Strategic Plan calls for this revision, so we are now obligated to pursue the effort. Please see the "Blueprint" for a detailed description of the process and its motivation. We agree that Teaching Effectiveness is of primary importance (as stated in the draft Definitions section). Departmental evaluation criteria will need to be revised to reflect this university policy and to identify how Teaching Effectiveness will be evaluated in a teaching portfolio. One benefit of revising this policy in alignment with SUU's mission is that the Provost's Office can work to ensure that the evaluative process becomes consistent and fair across campus.
I think one of the problems I'm having with this process is it does not feel inclusive, even with the feedback form. Not only do I feel uninvolved, but I feel unrepresented. I know there are many faculty who are upset and disappointed by this process. The language used isn't just strongly biased for engagement, but excludes other options. When Steve spoke to the faculty senate the other day, and this was pointed out, he mentioned that was not the intent, that engagement is not the only thing, but his next sentence went right back to "engagement is everything". This is ironic. We have worked hard to become a more diverse campus in terms of our students, and our faculty, and now, we're saying that we want our faculty to fit into one intellectual model. I'm finding this very depressing. Beyond high impact teaching	Thank you for these comments. We are committed to making this process as inclusive as possible, so it is discouraging to read that many feel upset and disappointed. Thus far, we have undergone 2 years of work in the Faculty Senate, followed by this year's effort that has included an open faculty forum, multiple meetings with the Deans' Council and Faculty Senate, an online feedback survey (to which we respond to every comment), and an open invitation to contact the six LRT Revision Work Group members at any time. We have also invited all department chairs to allow us to meet with faculty in department meetings. We would love to accommodate other suggestions to include more faculty members, so please provide those suggestions as soon as possible.

practices, some classes and some field are much less conducive to engaged learning. It's hard to engage in these practices when you class is online, and the very purpose of the class is that you all don't have to be in the same place at the same time. Literature courses cannot dash off to England to see the Globe Theatre, or to Spain to see Cervantes' birthplace, nor will librarians take students to see George Boole and John Venn sites. Physics classes probably shouldn't drop apples on students' heads, though they do have more fun options than math classes. Next, a lot of us want to know the answer to two questions. First, can you get tenure with only experiential education for scholarship? Second, can you get it with only traditional scholarship? Finally, and I apologize for the length of this feedback, I feel this is 10 years too late. Ten years ago, this would have made so much sense for our university, and it would have differentiated us from the pact. But this path has been abandoned, regardless of what the Provost says. With state funding based on enrollment and STEM graduates, and our leaving COPLAC, we have become a "me, too" university, and our rush to 15,000 students will have a strong, negative impact on engaged learning throughout campus with the exception of that one program favored by administration that reaches less than 1% of freshman. While this process is important and must continue, I encourage you to tone down the engagement rhetoric, and embrace all forms of scholarship that will create a policy that work tomorrow and 5 years from now. Thank you for your time.	Your statement that some classes and fields are "much less conducive to engaged learning" is disheartening. It implies that some fields are only conducive to disengaged learning, which does not fit SUU's mission. The examples of engaged learning that you provided are only some of the ways a faculty member can engage students, but there are many others. In fact, the educational literature contains a multitude of engaged learning practices that can be applied to classes of all sizes in all fields. This draft Definitions section and Evaluative Criteria section is meant to encourage faculty members to think creatively about what they already do to engage students in their learning and what they could do to increase that engagement. If faculty are using best practices that are supported by evidence in the pedagogical literature, their contributions will be valued. We have revised the draft to reflect this statement.

Answers to your questions regarding tenure, experiential education, and scholarship will be answered at the departmental level. The university-level Evaluative Criteria section is meant to "value both traditional and integrated contributions that meet SUU's mission and vision," and it states that faculty in each department will create departmental evaluation criteria. Such departmental evaluation criteria will answer your questions in a way that is appropriate for each discipline.

In response to your last point, the draft policy already values a wide range of scholarship. In fact, the draft Evaluative Criteria section attempts to be more explicit in how it values a wider range of scholarship, including traditional scholarship, than the current policy. We feel that the revised policy's focus on engaged learning is appropriate at our current size, and it will still be appropriate as we grow. The faculty will clearly be challenged to adapt to our growing enrollment, and we believe that no effective faculty members aspire to be disengaged. We have updated the draft to explicitly value faculty contributions that use best practices that are evidenced-based in pedagogical literature. |
| Again, great work everyone. I do truly appreciate the time and energy you are all devoting to this. | Thanks! |
| Would you please number the pages? Thanks, this is Jackie Grant and I'm happy to discuss any of my suggestions. | Thank you for your suggestions, Jackie! We'll start numbering pages. |

Are there going to be any more open forum sessions?	Yes, there will be an open forum early in spring semester.
How much support will there be in implementing the new policy, once finally approved. Will there be training? Sample evaluative criteria provided? I know that there is danger of constraining creativity by providing samples, but the proposed policy looks to be a substantial and innovative change from the current policy. An example would help to better understand the intent.	We hope there will be much support in implementing the new policy once it is approved. The Provost's Office will be responsible for providing training during the transition period. We will pass the suggestion along to the Provost's Office for sample departmental evaluation criteria.
We really need to consider workload. I worry that the LRT revisions are driving toward making sure faculty are so 'engaged' they may simply not have time to be healthy, diverse, human beings that contribute to a vibrant academic atmosphere. They may simply get burned out with all the new duties that will be required under this new system of micromanaged engagement.	We understand the concern regarding workload. Our goal is to avoid adding to faculty workload in any way. Our hope is that the revised policy will create a useful, developmental process that helps faculty live balanced lives and contribute to SUU in a wide array of meaningful ways.

LRT Policy Revision
Responses to Feedback - Purpose and Value Statements

In the interest of transparency, the table below includes all of the comments we have received from faculty about the draft policy revision (in the righthand column) and the LRT Revision Work Group's responses in the lefthand column. We have modified the draft sections based on careful consideration of the comments we've received. Please continue to use the feedback surveys posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas page to submit your feedback.

Comments from Feedback Form	Response from LRT Revision Work Group
1. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Purpose Statement.	
Couple of comments. First, even at our teaching institution the purpose is much broader than just "progress and advance as professional educators." That ties our standing as effective educators to a sequence within the institution. That strikes me as countering what we are actually trying to do. Further, we are expected to participate at an acceptable level as practitioners and contribute to our disciplines as well. We do that within the context of professional education. Saying that policy is intended to "progress and advance" leaves out those who may be content to contribute without jumping the hurdles, and completely leaves out the non-tenure track folks. So, I'd add a qualifying phrase to the second sentence of the purpose statement and reword it slightly: "Because genuine professionalism is a life-long process of exploration and development, this policy is therefore developmental in nature, intended to support . . ." It could reasonably be broken into independent declarative sentences as well, which I could encourage to read: "Genuine professionalism is a life-long process of exploration and development. This policy therefore describes a process that intends to acknowledge and encourage within the institution the faculty's individual development as teachers, mentors, explorers, and contributors within their discipline."	Thank you for the suggestions. We modified the language to address your concerns.
I approve. I like the developmental focus.	Thank you!
The Purpose Statement is helpful in emphasizing policies and procedures as being "developmental" instead of punitive. I also appreciate suggestions about	Great!

"shared responsibility" and "continuous improvement."	
Why does the Purpose Statement only say "professional educators"? Why not include something about scholars? After all, scholarship is a core tenet of the LRT policy. Also, what does "a culture of shared responsibility" actually mean? It is really vague. I really like the final sentence, especially "develops, supports, and celebrates faculty efforts"!	Thank you for your suggestion. We've modified the statement to include: "teacher, mentor, scholar, and contributor within their discipline." "A culture of shared responsibility" refers to a change this policy seeks to make to what some perceive as a culture of fear surrounding the LRT process. We want the faculty to take more ownership of the process, we want it to be developmental, and we want the culture to improve to one that is motivational and even inspirational.
The additional explanation work well	Thank you!
I like this statement a lot.	Great!
The purpose statement reduces faculty to simply professional educators. We need to understand the difference between a professor and a teacher. Historically, professors receive a PhD which is based on research. They find a balance between research and teaching in a way that leads to improved student outcomes. If all we want are professional educators, teachers, what makes us different from a community college?	Thank you for your suggestion. We've modified the statement to include: "teacher, mentor, scholar, and contributor within their discipline."
Right now it feels like the three pillars of Teaching, Research, and Service are being replaced by one pillar: Teaching. The intention, I believe, is that service and research (along with a wider array of activities and ideas) can be evaluated in the context of teaching. Personally, I feel this will result in less value placed on research, specifically and service, potentially. With full recognition that we are a teaching university and that teaching should be weighted appropriately, I believe that the attraction of becoming a university professor is the ability to focus on a multitude of different activities above and beyond teaching. I became a university professor for many reasons: 1) I love research and the creation of new knowledge, 2) I love sharing that knowledge with students, 3) I love the ability to continue to hone and develop my creative skills, and 4) I very much enjoy administration and leadership. In my field, there is no other place that I can work in all of those different areas at once. If I wanted the focus to be solely on teaching, I would have become a high school teacher and thereby avoided 8 years of lost income potential and frankly be making what I make now anyway. My recommendation would be to include language in the purpose statement that reflects a commitment and belief in the importance of research, creative	Our intention is to create space for faculty to (1) continue contributing to SUU in similar ways as they always have, and (2) contribute to SUU in ways that combine teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service. The draft purpose statement leaves ample room for faculty to contribute in the ways described in this comment. The recommendation is noted. We feel that the Purpose Statement and the Value Statement are the appropriate places to make broad statements about SUU's vision and goals for faculty. As we complete subsequent draft sections (e.g., Definitions, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Process, etc.), we will more clearly define the commitment to all areas of contribution, including teaching, scholarly/creative work, service, and the integration of the three.

activity, and service to our development as faculty members. Suggesting it implicitly through broad statements about University vision and goals is not sufficient.	
In either the purpose or value statement, you need to specifically mention the Boyer model. If it is not part of the overall policy, then it will be difficult or impossible for some departments and colleges to get it included in their LRT policy. We are a Boyer institution now, and I do not what to see that change. The Boyer model provides additional categories of evaluation and a broad interpretation of scholarship that works for all departments. Thanks!	The current policy (Policy 6.1) refers to the Boyer model once (page 5 of 44 in section VI.A.1). We agree that the Boyer model is important, and we will strive to include it in the appropriate location within the draft policy.
I find the purpose statement to have a flaw in the last sentence. It states "The tenure and promotion process at SUU develops, supports, and celebrates faculty efforts and contributions in alignment with the values and mission of the institution." A glance at the institution's mission and vision statements are (as you all are well aware) at odds with the promotion and tenure process in its current practice. In a nutshell, we mostly behave and celebrate our status as a teaching institution, then spend a small, but significant amount of time (usually around the period when FAARs are due) fixating on scholarship. If we're really going to fix this (i.e. LRT) it needs to reflect our teaching focus.	Thank you for this comment. This is exactly what we're striving to address with this effort.
Looks good!	Thank you!
The first sentence emphasizes promotion, tenure, and post-tenure processes, but does not mention annual reviews. If the policy revision will include the annual review process, this should be included in that sentence. In the 3rd sentence, what is the rationale for using the term "colleagues" rather than "faculty"? "Colleagues" seems more vague, and the wording may imply that administrators are not colleagues.	We decided it would be wise to include all information regarding the evaluation process in the Evaluation Process section. We'll work on the Evaluation Process section next, according to the "Blueprint" document's schedule that can be found on the Faculty Senate Canvas page.
none- sounds great	Thanks!
after the sentence ending with "professional educators," perhaps add "and contributors to the University and broader community." Though that emphasis is included in the value statement, so doing so here may be redundant.	We have changed the language accordingly.
2. Please provide your suggestions to revise the Value Statement.	

None. I like considering the faculty member in the context of SUU's mission and the focus on experiential learning and high impact practices. I also like the focus on the seeing the faculty member in many different contexts rather than just a focus on scholarship.	Great!
I applaud all efforts to support "engaged" faculty, and this statement serves to expand all the potential ways that faculty might be engaged and rewarded. This is a move in the right direction. But, I would like to see a more explicit reference to scholarship and/or creative endeavors tied to faculty members' professional obligations beyond SUU. That is, faculty are trained and socialized in their disciplines and they are hired, in fact, for their expertise and credentials in those disciplines. As important as it is to reward faculty who "help students," it is also vital that faculty remain current in their fields and active in their own professional development. I appreciate the statement's attempt to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach and its jabs at "simple classification within the traditional categories of evaluation." Clearly, for SUU to fully support its Mission, Vision, and Values, LRT policies need to move beyond "traditional categories" and encourage faculty to be innovative in all endeavors.	We agree. Our intention is to set the stage from a university-wide policy perspective that will guide departmental criteria that define scholarship and/or creative endeavors that are appropriate for their specific disciplines. It would be inappropriate to define such endeavors at the university level because there is so much disparity at the discipline level.
Again - why no mention of scholarship/research/production? Are we no longer going to be evaluated on scholarly output? Isn't being up to date in one's field and contributions to said field an important part of being a teacher? I really like the last sentence, especially about the part the "many notable and relevant ways that faculty contribute to the university often defy simple classification" !	Our intention is to set the stage from a university-wide policy perspective that will guide departmental criteria that define scholarship and/or creative endeavors that are appropriate for their specific disciplines. It would be inappropriate to define such endeavors at the university level because there is so much disparity at the discipline level.
The additional explanation work well.	Thanks!
I would get rid of the word "fully" from "fully engaged" in the first sentence. It feels unnecessary and unmeasurable. Also I think the second sentence should be eliminated all together. It's too specific and belongs elsewhere in the document. For example, it states "inside and outside of the classroom". This sounds prescriptive, and is not necessary to engage students, nor use high-impact pedagogy.	We discussed this comment at length, and we feel that the phrase "fully engaged" accurately describes the aspiration for how faculty should help students. Likewise, the second sentence involving "inside and outside of the classroom" accurately reflects how faculty members' roles on campus include and are not restricted to traditional classroom settings.
Strike "within the traditional categories of evaluation" from the last sentence of the Value statement. You don't really need it there to make the point that we are opening the boundaries of what "counts" as valuable contribution.	We discussed this comment at length, and we feel that it is important to make the point as explicit as possible.
Value statement begins with a focus on student outcomes, which is good. But again it fails to mention the importance of faculty research. Do you not understand how important research is at an institution like SUU? Do you not see how high quality research by faculty leads to improved student outcomes?	We do understand the importance of faculty research. Our intention is to set the stage from a university-wide policy perspective that will guide departmental criteria that define scholarship and/or creative endeavors that

The faculty contributions you mention are simply pedagogies and ignores content. Knowing what content to teach is vitally important to student outcomes. Lastly, it sounds like each faculty should be an administrator. While there should be opportunities for shared governance, it should not be a required for faculty to participate. Yes, there are ways in which they should get involved but to require it will only feed the issues we have with pointless committees. Too often committees are formed with the purpose of rubber stamping what administrators want. It is not shared governance. And that kind of wasteful use of faculty time is not something we should value. There needs to be a clear distinction between faculty and administrators. That is what we should value. The last line is horrible, do we really value evaluating things that defy classification? Really? No, really? We value results that are known and classified int he LRT process. As a faculty of SUU this statement, clearly does not represent the values that i have and that i believe SUU has which makes this an amazing educational experience.	are appropriate for their specific disciplines. It would be inappropriate to define such endeavors at the university level because there is so much disparity at the discipline level. We did, however, modify our language in the Purpose Statement to include: "teacher, mentor, scholar, and contributor within their discipline." The Value Statement also directly refers to scholarship, which we interpret to include research. We will more clearly define terms such as scholarship in the next section of the draft policy (Definitions). We disagree that shared governance should not be required by faculty. In fact, it is already required in the current policy, although it is described as "service." Shared governance can take many forms, including service on committees. If faculty were not required to participate in shared governance, it would be possible for faculty to be left out of shared governance, which would defeat the purpose of shared governance. We believe shared governance sits firmly within what we value as a faculty. The fact that some committees are formed inappropriately is a different problem. As we have listened to faculty from across the university, a common refrain is that their contributions don't "fit" the current categories of evaluation. We have heard numerous examples, and the last line of our draft values important contributions that integrate teaching, scholarly/creative work, and/or service while meeting SUU's mission.
See my comments on the Purpose statement. Specifically, in this document, Research is only mentioned once and it is directly connected to student learning and not faculty development. Additionally, I challenge the notion that there are a multitude of ways that faculty contribute to the university that are not definable under the current system of Teaching, Research, Service, and Collegiality. Semester in the parks is clearly teaching, for example.	As we have listened to faculty from across the university, a common refrain is that their contributions don't "fit" the current categories of evaluation. We have heard numerous examples, and the last line of our draft values important contributions that integrate teaching, scholarly/creative work, and/or service while meeting SUU's mission.
The value statement does not mention the Boyer Model. I understand that discussion at Faculty Senate included suggestions that following the Boyer Model could be an option under the proposed "umbrella." If this proves to be true I believe it will be a big mistake. Boyer is a fantastic model that provides wide latitude as it concerns scholarship. What's more, it's simply the best damn scholarship model known to academia. That being said, why dismiss it? Do you think we can improve upon it? Something else to consider: should we relegate	The current policy ([Policy 6.1](#)) refers to the Boyer model once (page 5 of 44 in section VI.A.1). We agree that the Boyer model is important, and we will strive to include it in the appropriate location within the draft policy.

Boyer to an option, I can absolutely imagine a scenario in which a department tries to adopt Boyer only to have it rejected by that college's dean. Please consider very, very carefully what consequences may occur should you continue to NOT mention the Boyer Model as our guiding principle. Another thing that troubles me is the focus upon trying to jam "engagement" in to the document (I'm guessing this will bring LRT in to alignment with SUU's mission statement?). I know that's become our calling card and provides SUU with national recognition; however, while it's a noble idea, it isn't going to be easy to ensure this occurs throughout the curriculum. So, instead of it being a focus, I feel that it should be yet another option in the area (in the Boyer Model) under the heading of Scholarship of Integration.	
I would like to see how the group plans on defining the section "experiential and other high-impact pedagogical practices, scholarship, creative activity, and community engagement." This seems like a great start but some examples of what is meant by each would be critical. I really like the direction this is going since I already do a bunch of these things and it has been hard to get credit for them.	We appreciate your comment. In the following draft section (Definitions), we will attempt to define several terms, and we look forward to receiving feedback about the draft.
Looks great!	Thanks!
none- sounds great	Thanks!
Really like the statement, particularly the last sentence which acknowledges we need to go beyond "simple classification."	Great!
I don't have a revision suggestion, but I just wanted to note that I strongly support the emphasis on teaching in the value statement. The SUU mission statement clearly identifies this as a teaching university and our focus on teaching should be reflected in the value statement and ultimately in how faculty are evaluated. We are not a research university! While scholarship is important for faculty, the focus of our evaluation processes must be on teaching. The true values and goals of any institution are reflected in how employees are evaluated.	Wonderful!
3. Please provide any other comments regarding the LRT policy revision	

process.	
I am supportive and excited about this new focus on development rather than just evaluation.	Great!
Both the Draft Purpose Statement and Draft Value Statement are solid first steps toward a much-needed overhaul of SUU's antiquated LRT policies and procedures. I worry, however, about the great disparity among departments in their current LRT policies, criteria, and interpretations of what constitutes "good" teaching, scholarship, and service. Departments will need to be encouraged -- or forced -- to conform more directly with any new university LRT policies. Moreover, some deans, department chairs, and tenured faculty who hold the reins of power have shown themselves to be conservative, inflexible, and even disrespectful in their approach toward untenured colleagues. This sentiment stifles innovation and diversity at SUU (and at most other universities, as well). We need a flexible system -- and a better and more transparent appeal process -- so that the "old guard" is forced to relinquish some power if we are to sincerely sustain a "culture of shared responsibility." It is important to note that when faculty are denied tenure it is a failure of the system, not only the individual. SUU should strive to hire faculty at the outset who can fulfill the institution's mission and flourish under flexible LRT policies that promote all forms of "engagement." Finally, I want to reiterate a concern stated above that new LRT policies should not diminish the importance of scholarly and/or creative endeavors. "Helping students" is a noble goal and perhaps the most important one for faculty at SUU, but faculty are also professional scholars and practitioners who must be supported and rewarded for their own professional accomplishments within their areas of expertise. Such efforts by faculty may also help to fulfill SUU's "vision" of being nationally recognized. As you develop the LRT framework, I encourage you to be more explicit about the potential varieties and significance of "engaged scholarship" that could also include more traditional forms of publication and dissemination. Thanks for your efforts!	We agree that there is great disparity among departments in their current LRT policies, criteria, and interpretations. Our hope is for this policy revision to be a catalyst for departments to revise their criteria around a central set of values. We also hope for faculty to regain ownership in the evaluation process.

We agree that we need a flexible, transparent process. We will address the process in the Review Process section.

We plan to be explicit in the draft Definitions section of the policy about terms like engagement and scholarship. |
| The broadest interpretation of scholarly and creative activity is always important. It seems like we have stopped using the term "Boyer Model" but it is essential that we continue to "allow" activity (yes, actual work - not just trying to look good on paper) in all of its forms. | The current policy (Policy 6.1) refers to the Boyer model once (page 5 of 44 in section VI.A.1). We agree that the Boyer model is important, and we will strive to include it in the appropriate location within this policy. |
| I am concerned by the wording in B1c (Faculty Expectations). This makes research read as less important than service to the university. When I was hired, I was promised that research mattered the the university more than service, | This LRT Revision Work Group is focusing on revising Policy 6.1. We are not part of the effort to revise Policy 5.52, to which we think you are referring. The draft revision of Policy 6.1 does not intend to place a lesser value on |

and that our tenure profile should be "portable." While I appreciate the emphasis on excellent teaching, suggesting that balancing our research with the demand of teaching *and* service, I worry that we are deemphasizing the importance of research to teaching. Additionally, I worry that we are opening the door to a more intense teaching load (perhaps a 5/5?). That is unacceptable.	research, especially when the research (or other scholarly/creative activity) engages students.
Good start.....	Thanks!
It would be good for people to have the option of being "Grandfathered in" to the policy that was existing when they were hired. While some will likely prefer an updated policy, depending on the specifics of the individual some people may have already invested their time in preparing to meet the specific criteria in the existing policy.	We agree that a transition plan will need to be developed as we move from the current Policy 6.1 to the revised policy. The Office of Academic Affairs will be responsible for the transition process.
Why don't we raise the standards of LRT? The standards are incredibly low, both in terms of teaching and research. It is laughable. Junior colleagues don't have to work hard to get it and senior colleagues, because they didn't work hard, don't work afterwards. Have the fortitude to apply actual research standards. Have them match the universities mission: conduct research with undergraduates, teach field courses in your expertise, etc. Quite trying to make this all inclusive of faculty efforts, it needs to be inclusive of faculty results.	As we have listened to numerous faculty members from across campus, we have heard a common refrain that the revised policy should not add to faculty members' workloads. Instead, we are striving to write a draft policy that explicitly values the huge efforts and important contributions faculty are making to advance SUU's mission.
My last concern has to do with recognizing the systems in place at most universities across the country. Altering our system could have the potential effect of devaluing tenure at our institution and thereby decreasing employment opportunities at other institutions. It raises the specter of the importance of terminal degrees to receive tenure. If teaching is the focus, why do we require terminal degrees in fields that do not provide any pedagogical training. In my Phd program I received exactly 1 week of pedagogical training in my first semester. Finally, we are a master's granting institution. We teach graduate students and therefore research is of a higher importance than at a community college or BA/BS only institution.	We agree that our standards should be held high. We hope to set the stage at the university level for departments to define the level of scholarly/creative work that is appropriate for their specific disciplines.
Please be careful what you take out, because it will be (nearly) impossible to ever put it back in. Scholarship is an important part of growing the academic reputation and caliber of SUU. If we are perceived as reducing that requirement, we head down a dangerous road of becoming not a "teaching focused" campus, but a "teaching only" campus (i.e., a community college).

Something I would like to consider is the possibility of including an oral defense at the major tenure/promotion evaluations. Could be at the departmental or college level. Once committees have reviewed the submitted portfolio, it would | We do understand the importance of faculty research. Our intention is to set the stage from a university-wide policy perspective that will guide departmental criteria that define scholarship and/or creative endeavors that are appropriate for their specific disciplines. It would be inappropriate to define such endeavors at the university level because there is so much disparity at the discipline level.

While an oral defense, similar to what occurs at the graduate levels, may |

be nice for faculty to have the opportunity to respond directly to their peers regarding any questions or comments that their peers have. Rather than having the entire process "behind closed doors" this gives the candidate to respond, directly, to any major points of concern that the committee has. It also would make the process much more formative by providing feedback during the evaluation.	provide an opportunity for faculty to respond directly to peers, it might also add to what some perceive as a culture of fear surrounding the LRT process. Instead, we hope this draft policy revision creates a developmental process that fosters a healthy environment of formative support.
I want to thank the committee for their work on this difficult task (and for providing a place to submit my feedback). I can only imagine how challenging it is and am hopeful that my comments above serve to assist in helping to make a policy that is equitable to all faculty members.	Thanks!
None	Great!
Thanks for the hard work you all are doing, and for soliciting input from faculty!	Great!
Appreciate the hard work going into this process. Great work!	Thanks!