

P&T Policy - Transition

Welcome Week Presentation

I. Immediate Needs

- A. All faculty will complete a FAAR (or 3-year review, rank advancement application, or tenure application), due September 4. *Forms will follow the same review schedule as they have in the past.*
- B. Most departments will remain on the LRT policy for 2018-2019.
- C. Six (6) "Opt-In" departments will pilot the P&T policy in 2018-2019.
 - 1. Aviation, Biology, IES, KOR, Nursing, Psychology

II. This Year's Transition

- A. The P&T Transition Team will present information to all departments and provide support as faculty prepare for the transition from LRT to P&T.
- B. Departments are responsible for two (2) documents during this academic year:
 - 1. Revised departmental evaluation criteria
 - 2. Process to construct P&T Mentorship Teams

III. Process Schedule (for *non-Opt-In* departments)

- A. 2018-2019 Academic Year
 - 1. Departments will follow the schedule on the next page.
- B. 2019-2020 Academic Year
 - 1. Departments will complete one final FAAR review process (including any faculty member who is up for a 3-Year Review, Rank Advancement, or Tenure Review), which will follow the LRT Policy (the old policy) schedule in its Appendix A.
 - 2. Departments will also complete a Faculty Engagement and Contribution (FEC) Plan or Five-Year Plan, which will follow the P&T Policy (the revised policy) schedule in its Appendix B. There are pertinent templates for the FEC Plan, Five-Year Plan, and reviews in Appendices A and C.
- C. 2020-2021 Academic Year
 - 1. All departments will follow the P&T Policy schedule for all plans, reports, applications, and reviews.

LRT to P&T Transition Schedule (2018-2019)

(with due dates in **bold**)

Date	Activity	Responsible Parties
Summer 2018	Solicit volunteer departments to “opt in” to the revised policy	Provost’s Office
Summer 2018	Construct Transition Team	Provost’s Office, Dean’s Council, Faculty Senate
Fall 2018	Design subcommittee trainings/presentations	Transition Team
Fall 2018	Provide trainings/presentations to departments	Transition Team
Fall 2018	Reflect with volunteer “opt in” departments and propose appropriate minor changes to Policy 6.1	Transition Team
Spring 2019	Consult with departments about departmental evaluation criteria and other concerns	Transition Team
March 1, 2019	DUE: Revised departmental evaluation criteria and mentor selection process to Dean’s Office for review	Each Department
April 1, 2019	DUE: Edits/suggestions to departments from Dean’s Office (if necessary)	Each Dean
May 1, 2019	DUE: Revised departmental evaluation criteria and mentor selection process to Dean’s Office for review (if necessary)	Each Department
May 15, 2019	DUE: Proposed departmental evaluation criteria and mentor selection process to Provost’s Office for review	Each Dean
June 1, 2019	Comments and/or final approval from Provost’s Office due to Deans	Provost’s Office

Departmental Evaluation Criteria

Guiding Questions and Principles

Why should we have a faculty evaluation process?

- Is it simply to separate those who are effective from those who aren't?
- Or can it guide faculty members as they develop throughout their careers?

What should the evaluation process provide to faculty?

- Should it simply provide a measure of a faculty member's performance?
- Or can it help to identify areas where faculty members can devote more attention?

How should the evaluation process incentivize a faculty member's effort?

- Should it simply show us the minimum standard?
- Or can it free faculty to pursue their passions with appropriate guidance from mentors?

Should evaluations be quantitative, qualitative, or both?

- Can a simple number or score on a rubric guide faculty members as they develop, identify areas in need of attention, and free faculty to pursue their passions?
- Can conversations and collaborations with mentors guide faculty, identify areas in need of attention, and free us to pursue our passions?
- Can we put quantitative scores like course/peer/self evaluations of teaching, numbers/types of scholarly efforts, numbers/types of service commitments, and other contributions into context to inform our conversations and collaborations?
- Note: The Provost's Office recommends evaluation processes that are not simply based on numerical scores.
- For example, course evaluations provide student feedback for faculty, but they should be interpreted in context, and other forms of evaluation such as peer evaluation and self evaluation should be considered when evaluating teaching effectiveness.
- Likewise, a simple number of publications or committees may not tell a complete story of a faculty member's contributions, so all contributions should be considered in context.

What contributions would indicate that a faculty member in your department meets the definition of Faculty Engagement?

- The definition of Faculty Engagement is on page 4 of the [revised Policy 6.1](#) (P&T).

How can your department ensure faculty members contribute to SUU's student-centered mission in a manner that addresses Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship?

How can your department allow for and/or encourage contributions that fall in the overlap between Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship?

- Such contributions are not mandatory. The new university-level policy allows departmental evaluation criteria to include such contributions if the faculty choose to do so.

Process to Construct P&T Mentorship Teams

Guiding Questions and Principles

Who will determine the P&T Mentorship Team for each incoming faculty member?

- Will the decision be made randomly, by a committee, by the department chair, or by some other process?

How much input will the incoming faculty member provide during the creation of the P&T Mentorship Team?

- What types of information will inform the process?
- Potential information might include the faculty member's specific interests and goals, the faculty member's strengths and areas of improvement, the potential mentors' interests and strengths, etc.

How many Associate and/or Full Professors will be on each P&T Mentorship Team? Note: The minimum is two for tenure-track faculty, and one for non-tenure-track faculty.

Will a faculty member's P&T Mentorship Team rotate in membership, or will it remain consistent until the faculty member advances to the rank of Associate Professor?

- If the membership rotates, what is the rotation process?
- If the membership remains constant, how will a mentor be replaced if the mentor retires, goes on sabbatical, or leaves the university for another reason?

Will P&T Mentorship Teams in this department be restricted to Associate and Full Professors from within the department, or will they include Associate and Full Professors from other departments?

- If faculty from other departments are eligible, are faculty from other colleges/schools eligible?
- How will invitations be made to faculty from other departments/college/schools?

What will be the process for mentored faculty to request new mentors?

- Note: This, too, must align with the revised Policy 6.1.

If a faculty member requests an ad hoc committee to evaluate the Mid-Point Review and/or Tenure Application, how will the ad hoc committee be selected?

- Will it be restricted to faculty within the department and/or college/school?
- How will invitations be made to faculty from other departments/college/schools?

Policy 6.1 Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Highlights of Revision (P&T Policy)

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