

Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC)
Communication
Southern Utah University

**Required Activities for Alignment and Integration Meetings (AIMs), Faculty
Engagement and Contribution (FEC) Reviews, Mid-Point Reviews, Tenure Reviews,
Rank Advancements, and 5-Year Reviews**

Approved by Department Faculty (September 11, 2024)

Approved by Department Chair (September 11, 2024)

Approved by HSS Dean (September 17, 2024)

Approved by the Provost (October 2, 2024)

Contents

I.	Categories of Evaluation.....	3
	A. Acceptable Progress Toward Faculty Engagement and Contribution.....	3
	B. Meritorious Performance.....	8
II.	Alignment and Integration Meetings and FEC Reports.....	9
III.	Mentors/Mentees.....	10
IV.	Major Reviews.....	11
	A. Mid-Point Review.....	11
	B. Tenure and Associate Professor (Rank Advancement Review).....	11
	C. Full Professor (Rank Advancement Review).....	12
	D. AIMs/FEC Reports.....	12
	E. Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Rank Advancement Review).....	13
	F. Special Appointment Without Eligibility for Tenure.....	13
	G. Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC) Committee.....	14
	H. Department Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Committee.....	14
	I. Access to Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC) Materials.....	14
V.	Special Procedures.....	15
	A. Improvement and Development.....	15
	B. Early Tenure.....	15
	C. Redress/Due Process.....	15
	D. Faculty Professional Responsibilities.....	16
	E. Years Awarded Toward Tenure.....	16
	F. Hiring Dates.....	16

I. Categories of Evaluation

According to Policy 6.1, SUU recognizes three performance standards for the purpose of assessing faculty engagement and contribution toward satisfactory job performance, granting of tenure, and rank advancement.

- Acceptable Progress
- Development Required
- Recommendation for Non-Reappointment

While the Department of Communication recognizes that the university has only one formal rating for faculty in good standing, we believe it is important to identify faculty in our department who are exceeding performance expectations even if this recognition is not received at higher levels of the P&T evaluation process. This meritorious level recognizes and commends the efforts of faculty members who: (1) continually reinvigorate the learning environment, (2) engage in ongoing, high-quality research and other creative activities, and (3) apply their scholarship to the improvement of the various communities to which our faculty members belong. This would be noted as:

- Meritorious Performance (MP): Efforts exceed expectations of acceptable progress standards.

The presence of an additional performance level should in no way diminish from the overall value of reaching the acceptable progress level.

The following document outlines the specific standards required for each level of acceptable and meritorious performance. It also specifies additional standards that might be required for different types of reviews, such as annual, mid-point, tenure, and five-year reviews.

A. Acceptable Progress Toward Faculty Engagement and Contribution (AP)

The following is required for all faculty members (including graduate faculty) in the Department of Communication.

Acceptable Teaching Effectiveness (TE)

The department will use the university's current student teaching evaluation by looking for patterns that reflect the majority of comments. We have selected the following items along with a baseline standard for achieving acceptable performance in each item on the scale. Apart from Questions 1 and 38, this baseline generally consists of the top two response values.

Question 1 - The instructor provided learning activities beyond lecture/content postings (group discussions/chats, projects, presentations, field work, guest speakers,

videos, demonstrations, labs, etc.) that helped me understand course concepts, and/or the world differently. Please provide the instructor feedback about these types of learning activities in your class.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be to reflect on the number of learning activities they provide and work to find a good balance.

Question 2 - For you, how effective were the learning activities?

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “very effective” or “effective.”

Question 5 - In this course, my instructor explained concepts in a way that helped me understand the material.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “all of the time” or “most of the time.”

Question 8 - My instructor helped me see real-world applications of the course content.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “most of the time” or “often.”

Question 11 - By incorporating relevant assignments, projects, activities, and/or exams, etc. into the curriculum, my instructor provided me opportunities to think about what I was learning in this class.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “often” or “sometimes.”

Question 20 - To my knowledge, my instructor was available and accessible to me as outlined in the syllabus.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “always” or “most of the time.”

Question 23 - I received my graded assignments, papers, projects, presentations, exams, and other assigned work in the time specified on the syllabus or discussed in class.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “all of the time” or “most of the time.”

Question 32 - My instructor invited students to ask questions in the course.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with “about the right amount for me.”

Question 35 - To me, my instructor seemed organized and well-prepared to teach.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “always” or “most of the time.”

Question 38 - It is not possible to capture every nuance of effective teaching in a short survey. In the box below, please describe things your instructor did that were especially effective in helping you learn the material.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be to reflect on the open-ended comments and make changes as they see appropriate.

The Department P&T Committee will also consider other elements of effective teaching in its assessment of faculty and encourage faculty members to include them in annual faculty engagement & contribution reports, five-year reports, mid-point reviews, or rank & tenure advancement applications (whichever applies).

- Revision of course syllabi
- Course development (face-to-face and online)
- Curriculum development
- Undergraduate and graduate mentoring
- Integrating engaged learning components into classroom activities
- Peer evaluations of classroom teaching
- Peer review of classroom materials
- Collaborative teaching strategy meetings
- Self-evaluations
- Videos of teaching
- Evidence of substantive assignment feedback
- Program alumni ratings
- Teaching awards and nominations for awards
- Teaching portfolios
- Evidence of innovative approaches in the classroom
- Teaching abroad opportunities
- Online teaching certifications
- Invited guest lecturing
- Attending (or presenting at) teaching conferences or workshops
- Designing and maintaining educational websites
- Meaningful outside of the classroom student correspondence

Faculty members engaged in administrative responsibilities are not exempt from the following measures of teaching effectiveness. As the number of teaching assignments are reduced as a result of assigned administrative duties, the faculty member’s responsibility toward good teaching for whatever load remains is not reduced.

During times of crisis (e.g. natural disasters, pandemics), the department's evaluative entities (the Department P&T Committee and the chair) will strongly consider environmental factors in assessing teaching performance. Additionally, they may also consider upward trends in performance ratings as evidence of faculty effort to improve teaching performance.

Acceptable Scholarship/Creative Activity (SCA)

The following is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members (including graduate faculty) in the Department of Communication:

In an effort to recognize and to quantify the various forms and activities of scholarship within the broad field of communication, the department uses a tiered point system in order to gauge faculty performance. The following activities constitute most, but not all, of the types of scholarship/creative activities that count toward acceptable progress (AP). Although much of the work done in the department falls under the three-tier system, the Department of Communication recognizes that authoring or co-authoring a peer-reviewed academic book from an outside publisher represents a different distinction. These published peer-reviewed books will count for five points toward faculty evaluations of scholarship/creative activity. However, a total of three points is required to fulfill acceptable progress for one academic year (FEC Reports will consider cumulative totals). Above three points constitutes meritorious performance and below three points constitutes that development is required for the faculty member.

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are not expected to engage in scholarly or creative activity, as their primary contributions to the department come through an increased teaching load. However, NTT faculty who are interested in pursuing scholarly or creative endeavors are encouraged to do so and may receive support from the department and college to aid in these efforts.

Additionally, the Department of Communication supports the practice of collaborative research between faculty members, professionals in the field, and students. In an effort to encourage faculty to collaborate in their scholarly activities, the department does not devalue faculty who work on projects as secondary authors/contributors. Because this is a common practice in our discipline nationwide, it is assumed that "collaboration" means the sharing of workload and that each faculty member has contributed substantively to the completion of a given project.

Faculty members engaged in administrative responsibilities inside or outside of the department (such as serving as chair or graduate director) generally have reduced scholarship responsibilities, but the specific expectations for these faculty will be negotiated between the department chair and the faculty member during Alignment and Integration (AIM) meetings.

Upper Tier (3 points each):

Academic article published in a quality international, national, regional or state peer-reviewed journal
Authored chapter in edited peer-reviewed book (outside publisher)
Top Paper award in competitive submissions
Journal editor
Program planner for an international, national, regional, or state conference
Competitive grant awarded by international, national, or state funding agency
Juried, refereed, peer-reviewed, award-winning media work (peers validate high quality)
(Such as, but not limited to: Print, magazine or web articles, radio broadcasts, podcasts, video productions, multi-media or web productions, screenwriting, photography, advertising campaigns, PR campaigns, etc.)
Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their AIMs/FEC reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T committee (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Middle Tier (2 points each):

Academic book review
Encyclopedia or web excerpts (outside publisher)
Paper published in a conference proceeding
Authored academic book (self-published)
APEX lecture with library archived paper
Conference paper presentation at international, national, regional, or state conference
Panelist with paper at international, national, regional, or state conference
Serve on the editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal
Media work for hire determined to be of professional quality
(Professionally peer-reviewed by editors, news directors, producers, clients, and others who validate their quality before publication, presentation or broadcast, such as, but not limited to, print, magazine or web articles, radio broadcasts, podcasts, video productions, multi-media or web productions, screenwriting, photography, advertising campaigns, PR campaigns, etc.)
Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their AIMs/FEC Reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T committee (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Lower Tier (1 point each-3 points maximum per year from lower tier):

Panel respondent (no written paper)
Conference attendee (no written paper)
Paper/Production reviewer for conference
Paper reviewer for journal
Invited research lecture outside of the department
Consulting (minimum of 20 hours, each client only counts once per year. Maximum of two clients per year toward scholarship calculations)
Review faculty scholarship prior to conference/journal submission

Reviewing student work for conference submission beyond regular classroom feedback
(Maximum of one paper per year)

Department colloquium presentation of current research

Self-initiated, self-reviewed, and self-distributed media work

(Such as, but not limited to: Radio broadcasts, podcasts, video productions, multi-media or web productions, screenwriting, photography, advertising campaigns, PR campaigns, etc.)

Self-initiated, self-reviewed, self-published/distributed books and articles (print or web)

Chair of capstone committee (cannot be counted in scholarship and service/leadership simultaneously)

Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their AIMs/FEC Reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T committee (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Acceptable Service/Leadership (SL)

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members must serve on a minimum of two committees during each academic school year, while NTT faculty must serve on a minimum of one committee. These committees can function at the department, college, university, or discipline levels. Additionally, graduate faculty members may count chairing capstones, serving on the MAPC graduate council, and mentoring junior faculty as part of their overall service requirement. Other activities may be factored in as presented/justified by faculty and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T committee (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty). Faculty, both TT and NTT, may receive a reduction in committee expectations during their first year or if they encounter situations where they have several new course preparations.

Faculty members engaged in administrative responsibilities inside or outside of the department (such as serving as chair or graduate director) generally have reduced service responsibilities (outside of the primary administrative responsibilities), but the specific expectations for these faculty will be negotiated between the department chair and the faculty member during the AIM meeting and discussed during the five-year review.

B. Meritorious Performance (MP)

The following criteria will be used by the department only internally to assess whether faculty have achieved a performance level beyond Acceptable Progress (AP). The same expectations serve as the baseline of performance outlined for tenured, tenure-track and NTT faculty apply to this performance level (e.g., NTT faculty have no scholarship expectations).

C. Meritorious Teaching

Faculty members designated as meritorious in teaching will demonstrate involvement in three or more of the following pedagogical activities: revision of course syllabi, course development (face-to-face and online), curriculum development, undergraduate and

graduate mentoring, integrating engaged learning components into classroom activities, peer evaluations of classroom teaching, peer review of classroom materials (collaborative teaching strategy meetings), self-evaluations, videos of teaching, evidence of substantive assignment feedback, program alumni ratings, teaching awards and nominations for awards, teaching portfolios, evidence of innovative approaches in the classroom, teaching abroad opportunities, online teaching certifications, invited guest lecturing, attending (or presenting at) teaching conferences or workshops, designing and maintaining educational websites, and meaningful outside of the classroom student correspondence.

If in a given year, a faculty member is awarded the distinction of Outstanding Educator, Distinguished Educator, or is a finalist for one of these honors, they will automatically be classified as “meritorious” for that year.

D. Meritorious Scholarship

In an effort to recognize faculty members who achieve a Meritorious Performance level (MP), the department uses the tiered point system illustrated within Acceptable Progress (AP) requirements. In order to achieve a meritorious level of scholarship, tenured and tenure-track faculty members are required to achieve a minimum of 5 points, using a combination of activities within the three tiers.

E. Meritorious Service

Beyond the minimum of two committees that faculty members must serve on (one for NTT faculty) to achieve Acceptable Progress (AP), faculty members can reach the Meritorious Performance Level (MP), by serving on two additional committees (one additional committee for NTT faculty). These committees can function at the department, college, university, or discipline levels. Again, faculty members may count chairing graduate capstones once as part of their overall service requirement. Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their AIMS/ FEC reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T committee (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

II. Alignment and Integration Meetings and FEC Reports

Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty, lecturers, special-appointment faculty, and tenure-track faculty will meet annually with the Department chair in an Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM) to discuss and agree upon the expected Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship/Creative Activities (as applicable) for the upcoming academic year. The goal is to ensure that the discussions and determinations made by the faculty member and the Department Chair align with the Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC).

The Department of Communication will conduct annual evaluations of all full-time faculty as stipulated by university policy 6.1. The evaluations are intended to: 1) encourage faculty development and excellence; 2) ensure that the department is meeting

its strategic objectives; 3) determine whether a faculty member needs assistance from their mentor, the P&T committee, or chair to improve or attain an “Acceptable Progress” level of performance; and 4) ascertain salary enhancement, i.e. merit pay (when available).

As part of this review process, faculty will complete a Faculty Engagement and Contribution (FEC) Report, wherein, they are required to provide a narrative of their performance utilizing the form provided in “Appendix A” of the university Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policy (#6.1). The narrative portion of the report provides the faculty member an opportunity to address outliers in their overall performance, such as lower student evaluations or dips in scholarly production. The faculty member will also provide a current and dated curriculum vitae, copies of student evaluation forms, and other samples relevant to recent performance as outlined in the DEC sections on “Acceptable Teaching Effectiveness” and “Acceptable Scholarship/Creative Activity” (sample syllabi, conference papers, publications, etc.). Although a current vitae and teaching evaluations are required of all faculty up for annual review or a five-year review, each faculty member will use their own discretion with regard to other materials that might provide evidence of acceptable progress. Faculty will also be given the opportunity to submit additional support if/when asked by a committee, provided the committee can show the relevance/necessity of such a request. When assembling materials for the report, faculty members are strongly encouraged to keep their reports as brief as possible, while still providing evidence of effective performance in each of the three areas of evaluation.

The Department of Communication operates on the premise that striving for and achieving equal levels of activity across each of the three performance areas is ideal, but should not be required or expected because it likely fosters lower overall performance. While it is commendable for faculty members to achieve acceptable progress in all areas, they may provide a justification for lower performance in one area by showing meritorious work in other areas. Because the department supports the university’s focus on the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement model, Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative activities overlap and mutually reinforce each other. In this way, faculty should receive some latitude when performing better in one area over the others, since the higher performing area is likely having a positive impact on the others, such as using a robust program of research to illustrate concepts in the classroom.

III. Mentors/Mentees

The department will support each junior faculty during their first three years by assigning them an advanced faculty member who provides non-evaluative guidance and encouragement during the Promotion and Tenure process. The department chair will discuss potential mentor choices with the mentee and solicit feedback, but the ultimate decision regarding mentorship assignments rests with the department chair. Once a junior faculty member successfully completes their Mid-Point review, they are no longer

required to have a mentor, but may choose to continue the relationship if both parties are willing. The chair may also determine that a continued mentor/mentee relationship beyond the Mid-Point Review is needed for ensuring acceptable progress toward tenure. Mentors are also permitted to attend AIM meetings between the chair and junior faculty members when requested by the mentee.

IV. Major Reviews

A. Mid-Point Review

The Mid-Point Review represents a major review of Junior Faculty contributions to determine whether Junior Faculty are making sufficient progress to receive Promotion and Tenure, as applicable. Mid-point reviews are optional for Non-Tenure Track Junior Faculty if they choose not to pursue Promotion. In order to achieve the university's designation of Acceptable Progress (AP) for the Mid-Point Review, the faculty member should demonstrate that, on balance, their performance meets acceptable performance across the following areas:

- **Teaching Effectiveness (TE):** The faculty member will meet the acceptable progress standard during his/her first three years as outlined previously in the acceptable teaching section of this document.
- **Scholarship/Creative Activity (SCA):** The faculty member should show that they have achieved 9 points during the first three years utilizing the department's tiered point system.
- **Service/Leadership (SL):** The faculty member should show that they have served on six committees during the first three years. These committees can function at the department, college, university, or discipline level. Additionally, the faculty member should have received an "acceptable progress" evaluation on previous reports during the first three years of employment.

The department DEC Committee and the chair may factor upward trends in performance or faculty efforts to improve upon lower areas of performance.

B. Tenure and Associate Professor (Rank Advancement Review)

In order to receive the university rating of Acceptable Progress (AP) for tenure and advancement to the rank of associate professor, the faculty member should demonstrate that on balance, their performance meets acceptable progress across the following areas:

- **Teaching Effectiveness (TE):** The faculty member should show that they have received an "acceptable progress" rating for teaching on previous reports during the three years following the mid-point review.
- **Scholarship/Creative Activity (SCA):** The faculty member should show that they have earned an "acceptable progress" rating for scholarship on previous reports during the three years following the mid-point review.

- **Service/Leadership (SL):** The faculty member should show that they have earned an “acceptable progress” rating for service on previous reports during the three years following the mid-point review.

In addition to achieving acceptable progress in the years leading up to tenure and promotion, the faculty member should also publish two quality peer-reviewed journal articles or produce comparable peer-reviewed media work from the upper tier of scholarship/creative activities. If this scholarly work is collaborative, the faculty member should be the lead author/contributor on at least one of the projects.

The department P&T committee and the chair may factor upward trends in performance or faculty efforts to improve upon lower areas of performance.

C. Full Professor (Rank Advancement Review)

In order to qualify for advancement to the rank of full professor, the faculty member should be recognized as a highly competent teacher, scholar, and institutional leader and demonstrate continued development in student-centric faculty engagement (Policy 6.1). The faculty member can demonstrate that their professional performance justifies this distinction by reaching the department’s meritorious level or above in teaching and scholarship and the acceptable progress level in service/leadership:

- **Teaching Effectiveness (TE):** The faculty member should show that they have received a “meritorious performance” average rating for teaching during at least one academic year since advancement to rank of associate professor.
- **Scholarship/Creative Activities (SCA):** The faculty member should show they have earned a “meritorious performance” rating for scholarship during at least one academic year since advancement to rank of associate professor. The faculty member should also have published during that time two quality peer-reviewed journal articles or produced comparable peer-reviewed media work from the upper tier of scholarship/creative activities. If this scholarly work is collaborative, the faculty member should be the lead author/contributor on at least one of the projects.
- **Service:** The faculty member should show that they have earned an “acceptable progress” rating for service during all years following advancement to associate professor.

The department P&T committee and the chair may factor upward trends in performance or faculty efforts to improve upon lower areas of performance.

D. AIMs/FEC Reports

The Department of Communication requires all full-time faculty to have an Alignment and Integration (AIM) meeting with the department chair annually. The primary goal of the AIM meetings is to discuss and agree upon the expected Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship/Creative Activities (as applicable) for the upcoming

academic year. The goal is to ensure that the discussions and determinations made by the faculty member and the Department Chair align with the Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC).

Every year, the faculty member will submit an FEC Report describing contributions made during the time frame that fit with the university and department's expectations for faculty engagement. These reports will be uploaded to the faculty dashboard for review.

For post-tenure faculty, an annual AIM meeting with the department chair is mandatory to discuss and agree on the expected contributions in Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship/Creative Activities for the upcoming academic year, ensuring alignment with the Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC). Each year, post-tenure faculty members must submit an FEC Report detailing their contributions, which is reviewed sequentially by the department chair, the dean, and the provost to ensure adherence to university and departmental expectations.

E. Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Rank Advancement Review)

Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT) Faculty with term appointments who are not eligible for Tenure as set out in Policy 6.1. NTT Faculty may hold the following ranks in order of rank progression.

- **Lecturer:** The title of Lecturer is an entry-level (NTT) Faculty position. Lecturers have the primary responsibility for effective teaching while maintaining currency in their field and a secondary responsibility for Departmental participation. There are no specific scholarship expectations for NTT Faculty due to their higher teaching load.
- **Assistant Professor (NTT):** This rank is an appointment for those with at least five (5) years of experience at the University as a Lecturer or those who have been directly hired into the rank of Assistant Professor. Assistant Professors (NTT) have demonstrated ability in the areas of teaching and professional services. They have maintained currency in their field and are capable of undertaking college-wide responsibilities consistent with the college's mission and goals. Application for advancement to Assistant Professor (NTT) may be submitted at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year as a full-time Lecturer.
- **Associate Professor (NTT):** This rank is an appointment for those with at least seven (7) years of experience at the University as an Assistant Professor (NTT). Associate Professors (NTT) have exhibited continued growth in Faculty Engagement. They have contributed significantly to the University's mission in exemplary ways, especially with regard to Teaching Effectiveness. Their teaching, service, and engagement with students must reflect high professional competence and currency in their field. Applications for advancement to Associate Professor (NTT) may be submitted at the conclusion of the sixth complete academic year as a full-time Assistant Professor (NTT).

F. Special Appointment Without Eligibility for Tenure

Special appointments without eligibility for tenure include Professional-in-Residence, who must have prominence and experience in their field or specialized certification, Visiting Faculty, who hold intermittent or honorary positions based on experience and meet departmental degree requirements; both types bypass the typical vetting process and have distinct expectations set by their departments.

- **Professional-in-Residence:** A professional-in-residence or artist-in-residence requires prominence and experience in the field the appointee will be teaching, or a specialized certification in the discipline. Indicators/attributes for prominence and experience are articulated at the time of hiring by the Department Chair, and are subject to action by the Dean and Provost.
- **Visiting Faculty:** An employment status of intermittent or limited duration in a department. The appointment may be honorary, distinguished or made on the basis of extensive experience in a discipline. Visiting Faculty receive and are accorded full benefits and may be listed among departmental Faculty in University publications. Degree requirements are those demanded by the appropriate department, but a minimum of a master's degree is required in the teaching field or a master's degree and 18 credit hours in the field. The department specifies expectations of instruction, scholarship, and service.

Faculty hired as emergency appointments do not go through the vetting process outlined in SUU Policy 6.38. As such, faculty hired as emergency appointments are "at will" employees. Due to this classification, they are not entitled to any due process rights as afforded to some faculty in other policy(ies), regardless of title.

G. Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC) Committee

The responsibility of the Communication Department DEC Committee is to create and maintain the DEC, with feedback on drafts of DEC revisions solicited from all faculty in the department. The DEC Committee consists of three department faculty members, including a committee chair (who must be tenured). Committee members serve for three years on a rotating basis. At least one member should be replaced each year.

H. Department Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Committee

The department's P&T committee provides detailed and thorough evaluations of FEC Reports and applications for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, and Five-Year Review. The department will typically have three members serving on the committee, but may have as many as five members in order to accommodate mentors who must recuse themselves from evaluating their own mentees. The department strives to maintain a democratic process where members of the faculty vote on which of their peers will serve on the P&T committee. However, a vote will sometimes be unnecessary due to the limited number of faculty who are eligible to serve per SUU Policy #6.1. In most cases, the department chair will form the committee by inviting faculty who are willing and able

to serve. Members of the committee will serve a three-year term are not eligible to serve on other P&T committees at the college or university level.

I. Access to Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC) Materials

A document containing the Department of Communication's most recent evaluative criteria for the Promotion and Tenure process can be found in the shared department Google Drive folder titled "Comm Dept." All faculty in the department should have access to this folder and can request an invitation if they have trouble accessing it.

V. Special Procedures

A. Improvement and Development

If there is evidence that the faculty member is not fulfilling professional responsibilities (Policy 6.28) or the goals outlined in their AIM meeting, the department chair will collaborate with the faculty member to address the issue via a development plan that may involve the Dean's office. If the issues remain unresolved after a reasonable amount of time (as deemed appropriate by the chair and the dean), a change in the nature and/or frequency of evaluation and reporting may be required. Should there be evidence that a faculty member is not meeting professional responsibilities or AIM goals, the department chair will work with them to address the issues; persistent unresolved issues may lead to adjustments in the evaluation and reporting process. Failure to adequately improve job performance after development plans may result in recommendation of non-reappointment (see Policy 6.22).

B. Early Tenure

As per SUU Policy 6.1, early tenure procedures involve a faculty member applying for a one-year reduction in their probationary period under specific conditions. To qualify, faculty must have completed three full academic years of service at SUU, been granted fewer than three years towards tenure at hiring, and exceed all departmental evaluation criteria (DEC) for tenure. The faculty member must discuss the potential reduction with the Department Chair and Dean, securing their support by April 1 of the year they intend to apply. These support letters are included in the tenure application, though they do not guarantee tenure will be awarded. Only complete academic years at SUU count towards this reduced probationary period, and unless granted a reduction, faculty must apply for tenure in the final year of their probationary period.

To qualify for early tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate that they have exceeded the departmental expectations in key areas. Specifically, faculty members should show they have consistently exceeded expectations in Scholarship/Creative Activity (SCA) and Service/Leadership (SL) for each of their first five years, while maintaining acceptable progress in Teaching Effectiveness (TE).

Extensions to the probationary period can be requested for situations like family medical leave or military duty, and any reduction or waiver in the probationary period requires detailed documentation and approval from multiple administrative levels.

C. Redress/Due Process

The department follows SUU Policy 6.22, which outlines the procedures and guidelines for ensuring due process for faculty members at Southern Utah University. The policy aims to provide fair and reasonable resolutions to disputes involving faculty members. It includes both formal and informal resolution approaches and addresses issues related to tenure, rank, professional misconduct, and other violations of university policies and procedures. The policy details the rights of participants, including the right to due process, representation, and access to relevant documents. It defines key roles, such as the Administrative Officer, Responsible Administrator, and the Faculty Review Board, which oversees formal hearings and makes recommendations. The policy also specifies the steps for initiating a petition, conducting informal conciliatory meetings, mediation, pre-formal hearing procedures, formal hearings, and the appeals process. Additionally, it addresses disciplinary actions, termination procedures due to medical or mental incapacity, and dismissal for reasons other than cause. The policy ensures that all parties involved receive a fair opportunity to present their case and that decisions are based on the evidence gathered during the proceedings.

D. Faculty Professional Responsibilities

The purpose of Policy 6.28 is to describe the professional responsibilities of faculty members toward students and colleagues, and to provide a mechanism for discipline of faculty members when responsibilities are breached. This code of professional responsibility provides that persons having a formal association with the institution shall not violate the academic freedom or constitutional rights of others, or the rules, regulations, policies or procedures of Southern Utah University (SUU) or the State Board of Higher Education. Failure to meet professional responsibilities shall constitute serious misconduct and result in appropriate disciplinary action as set forth in SUU Policy 6.28.

Faculty must ensure rigorous and consistent course content, maintain regular office hours, evaluate students fairly, and maintain confidentiality. They must also stay informed in their field, avoid misuse of authority, and uphold professional integrity. Responsibilities to the institution include exercising academic freedom responsibly and contributing to teaching, scholarship, and community service. Disciplinary actions for failing to meet these responsibilities range from verbal censure to dismissal, following a structured review process involving the department chair, dean, and provost.

E. Years Awarded Toward Tenure

Currently, the HSS Dean extends all employment offers. Consequently, decisions about years granted toward tenure or promotion (NTT) at time of hiring as well as level of rank are determined during the contract negotiation with the Dean.

F. Hiring Dates

In accordance with SUU Policy 6.38 (section H, subpoint 3), “The Dean and Department Chair, coordinating as needed with the Human Resources Office, set the contract starting date.” Faculty can access their hiring date through their faculty dashboard.

The Department defines an evaluative year as encompassing the Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters, with faculty reporting on activity during this academic cycle (Fall, Spring, Summer). This ensures consistent evaluation periods for all faculty members. If a faculty member is hired in January, their P&T clock will start the following Fall.