

Southern Utah University
College of Engineering and Computational Sciences

Department of
Computer Science and Cybersecurity
Evaluation Criteria (DEC)

Department Faculty

Hire Date	Name	Tenure Status	Rank
August 2007	Nathan Barker	Tenured	Professor
August 2023	Prosenjit Chatterjee	TT	Assistant Professor
August 2010	Laurie Harris	NTT	Associate Professor
August 2007	Shalini Kesar	Tenured	Professor
August 2022	R. Alexander Nichols	TT	Assistant Professor
August 2019	Glen Sagers	TT	Associate Professor
August 2019	Gary Wallace	TT	Associate Professor
August 2024	Sree Malladi	TT	

Promotion and Tenure Committee

Type	Name	Starting or assigned year (to inform the rotating basis)
Chair	Nathan Barker	2023
Member	Gary Wallace	2024
Member	Seth Armstrong	2022

Type	Name	Starting or assigned year (to inform the rotating basis)
Alternate		

Date of DEC Approval: _____

Policy 6.1 states that the Department Chair ensures that the DEC is reviewed at least every three years. If this does not occur, the P&T Committee Chair will remind the Department Chair, and if still not reviewed, the P&T Committee Chair will notify the Dean.

Date of last Review: _____

Table of Contents

Introduction	6
Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee.....	6
1. 5	
2. 5	
3. 6	
4. 6	
5. 6	
6. 7	
Evaluation Criteria System	8
1. 7	
2. 13	
Review and Advancements.....	14
Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements.....	14
Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Review and Advancements	15
1. 14	
2. 15	
3. 16	
4. 17	
5. 18	
Tenured and Tenure Track (TT) Review and Advancements	20
1. 19	
2. 19	
3. 21	
4. 21	
5. 23	
6. 23	
7. 25	
8. 26	
Special Appointments	27
Sabbaticals or other leaves of absences.....	28

Additional Guidelines	29
Pre-approval of Undefined Contribution Activities	29
Development Plans	29
Redress Procedures	31
DEC Revisions.....	32
Changes that do not require approval.....	32
Proposals for Revision.....	32
Voting Procedures	32
DEC Archival Procedures	33
Appendices	34
Additional Requirements Substitution or Waiver Form (ARSWF).....	34
Development Plan Form (DPF).....	34
Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report (FEC Report)	34
Promotion and Tenure Scoring Sheet (PTS Sheet)	34

Introduction

SUU Policy 6.1 states that each Department at Southern Utah University will create and maintain a document containing Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC). The DEC should describe “standards and expectations for Promotion and Tenure and Good Standing for Non-Tenure-Track, Tenure-Track, Tenured Faculty, and Academic Administrators.” This document contains the DEC for the Department of Computer Science and Cybersecurity.

The Definitions section of SUU Policy 6.1 defines other terms, articles, components, ratings, participants, and bodies related to this DEC.

Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

SUU Policy 6.1 requires Departments, in consultation with the Dean, to determine specific rules regarding the length of committee service, the percentage of Faculty votes required to be on to the P&T Committee, and procedures for circumstances in which there is an insufficient number of eligible Faculty to serve on the P&T Committee.

1. Committee Membership

SUU Policy 6.1 outlines the composition, criteria, and member eligibility of the P&T Committee. In summary: there are a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 5 members, members must either be tenured or promoted NTT. To evaluate an NTT faculty member there must be at least one NTT member on the committee.

2. Committee Election Procedures

The Department Chair will solicit names for committee membership, and alternate committee membership, from faculty in the department. Department Chairs may also add names for potential membership. Note that the Department Chair may not serve on their own department's P&T committee. Committee names ideally come from within the department but can be selected from outside the department (see the section titled Insufficient Number of Eligible Committee Members below). Solicitation of names occurs formally in a department meeting, and also allows for faculty, or the dean, to talk with the Department Chair directly. The solicitation continues until sufficient names to fill the roster are available, and faculty have been given at least a week after the formal solicitation to contact the Department Chair directly with their suggestions.

All names of faculty who are willing to serve, that are provided to the chair, will be put to a vote. Each faculty member within the Department, excluding the Department Chair, will have one 'yes' or 'no' vote for each proposed name. Should a tie exist, the Department Chair will cast a vote to break the tie. The election of each Committee member will require a simple majority

(51%) affirmative vote. In the case where more members are selected than there are positions, the faculty will be asked to provide individualized rankings and the person(s) with the largest collective ranking(s) will be selected, and the other(s) will be automatically included as alternate committee member(s) for that year.

Voting for an alternate committee member, for cases where there may be a Conflict of Interest, occurs after the voting for committee members if no alternates were automatically added.

Voting happens in the same manner as voting for committee members. If individualized rankings are necessary, then only those selected will be included as alternates.

If multiple positions are being filled, then the faculty selected for the committee will decide amongst themselves which committee member gets which length of service. This can be done in consultation with the Department Chair as needed. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, the Department Chair will assign the length of service.

3. Committee Chair Selection

After Committee Membership has been finalized, The Committee Members select a chair from the Committee Members. As stated in SUU Policy 6.1, the chair shall be a Tenured Faculty Member whenever possible. This shall be done in consultation with the Department Chair. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, the Department Chair will assign the Committee Chair.

4. Length of Service

SUU Policy 6.1 states: each Committee Member serves for three years on a rotating basis, at least one member is replaced each year, and the DEC includes information regarding the length of committee service.

To help support that policy, committee member's three years of service are offset from one another. Note that there may be more than three committee members. Each year, at least one committee member will have three years left, at least one member will have two years left, and at least one member will have a single year left on their length of service.

Committee Membership may terminate early if such action is in the best interest of the Committee Member or the Department. Ideally, each vacating Committee Member refrains from membership in the Department Committee for a minimum period of one year whenever adequate faculty are available.

The length of service as an alternate Committee Member, or as the Committee Chair, is one year.

5. Committee Voting Procedures

The Committee Chair handles all voting procedures, ensuring that there is ample discussion among the committee members, and that all members are allowed a voice. Each Committee Member, including the Committee Chair, is allowed one vote per action. In cases of a tie, the

Committee Chair's vote will break the tie.

The Committee will vote on actions as described in SUU Policy 6.1, including, but not limited to, annual Faculty Engagement and Contribution Reports (FEC), applications for Mid-Point Review, applications for Promotion and/or Tenure, applications for Five-Year Review, and other promotion and tenure matters within the purview of the Committee.

6. Insufficient Number of Eligible Committee Members

In the case of insufficient qualified candidates to complete the committee from within the department, names may be added for voting from qualified faculty outside the department. Ideally these names come first from qualified colleagues within the College, and then from the University at large as needed. Faculty may submit names of qualified colleagues to the Department Chair, and the Department Chair may consult other Department Chairs and the Dean as needed.

Evaluation Criteria System

This section of the document outlines how faculty members will be evaluated.

1. Objective Criteria

The CSCY department uses points as its objective criteria for faculty evaluations. In general, Faculty are expected to earn at least 100 points per year to be considered in Good Standing. The 100-point benchmark is broken into three main categories, Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Contributions, and Service/Leadership Contributions.

a. Teaching Effectiveness

A faculty member's teaching abilities and practices are the primary way faculty at SUU are evaluated (see Regent's Policy R312). SUU Policy 6.1 requires student feedback to be used in this evaluation, and in addition, lists several other ways in which a faculty member's teaching effectiveness could be measured. Faculty are expected to include items from this additional list so that evaluators will not have to solely rely on student feedback which may be subject to bias as explained in SUU Policy 6.1. The following list contains example contributions and their potential point values.

16-20 Point Contributions (Outstanding)

- Department Chair Evaluation and/or Peer Evaluations
These evaluations can come from faculty outside of Department faculty. Faculty may include a maximum of two evaluations per year. Each evaluation is typically awarded 20 points. As stated in SUU Policy 6.1, Department Chairs may only evaluate their own Teaching Effectiveness as a self-reflection.

- Creating curriculum for a new course

11-15 Point Contributions (High)

- **Student Evaluations**
Inclusion of student evaluations in a faculty members report is required according to Policy 6.1. If a faculty member would like to use student evaluations for points, the faculty member will list that on their report. Evaluators are then expected to review student evaluations. Average student evaluations are typically awarded 15 points.
- **Faculty Self-Evaluation.** If the faculty member chooses to submit a self-reflection for points in the annual FEC report, the faculty member shall produce and provide a written document reflecting on their teaching effectiveness and/or course content, obtained from their student evaluations and/or peer and chair reviews. To the extent that there are concerns in the reviews and evaluations, the lesser of all concerns, or three concerns shall be addressed, with concrete plans for how to rectify these concerns. Faculty shall then follow the steps they listed and include observations on the effectiveness of these steps in their next self-evaluation.
- Documented consultation with educational specialists such as SUU's Center for Teaching Innovation.
- Evidence of major course development/revision to improve course content. This shall include comments or narrative about what worked and did not work and thoughts of why the adjustments will improve course content. Adding high-impact teaching strategies to your course would be an example of this.

6-10 Point Contributions (Medium)

- Evidence of keeping current with high-impact teaching strategies
- Participation in independent study courses outside of regular faculty load
- Evidence of medium course development/revision to improve course content. This shall include comments or narrative about what worked and didn't work and thoughts of why the adjustments will improve course content.
- Participation in a team-taught course
- Receiving an institutional teaching award. Awards at higher levels than the institution can be considered for higher point values.

0-5 Point Contributions (Low)

- Creating creative, innovative, thoughtful, and thorough methods and materials (electronic media, unique field experiences, lab experiences, classroom

activities, projects, etc.). Faculty must include evidence for evaluators to evaluate.

- Evidence of minor course development/revision to improve course content.

b. Service/Leadership

Although teaching is the primary way in which faculty are evaluated at SUU, Service/Leadership that complements the teaching role is a secondary measure (see Regent's Policy R312 and SUU Policy 6.1). This Service/Leadership shall contribute to the University, Profession, and Community in ways that fulfill and support SUU's Mission/Vision/Core Values Statements. The following list contains example contributions and their potential point values.

16-20 Point Contributions (Outstanding)

- At least ½ time special appointment at the University, College, or Department level such as serving as
 - the Department Chair
 - the Faculty Senate President
- Serving as president of a professional organization with at least a regional/state-level impact
- Principal or Co-organizer of a large, national or international professional development event

11-15 Point Contributions (High)

- At least ¼ time special appointment at the University, College, or Department level such as serving as
 - a Master's Program Director
- Chair of a University/College/Department level committee with high workload requirements. Such as
 - Graduate committee chair
 - Promotion and Tenure committee chair
 - Department Search committee chair
- Official mentor of a Junior Faculty member. Evaluators may seek evidence of time spent with the mentee for a proper evaluation
- Serving as board member or council member of a professional organization with at least a regional/state impact

- Principal or co-organizer of a regional/state-level event
- Holding an office in a professional society at a regional/state level
- Principal or Co-organizer of an on-campus professional development event
- Lead writer on an accreditation self-study in your discipline

6-10 Point Contributions (Medium)

- Chair/Member of a University/College level committee with medium workload. Such as
 - Faculty Senator
 - Search committee member
 - Promotion and Tenure committee member
 - FSSF/FDSF committee chair
 - Curriculum committee chair
- Chair of a department-level committee. Such as
 - Promotion and Tenure committee chair
 - Curriculum committee chair
 - An accreditation committee chair
- Official advisor to a STEM related student organization/club
- Serve as a reviewer/referee of an article in a journal, book, conference, curricula, etc. (can be placed in either the Service/Leadership or Scholarly/Creative category)
- Receiving an institutional service award. Awards at higher levels than the institution can be considered for higher point values.

0-5 Point Contributions (Low)

- Member of any College or Department-level Committee with low workload
 - FSSF/FDSF committee member
 - Curriculum committee member
- STEM-related involvement in a community service activity
- Overseeing a student internship/honors project (maximum of 2 contributions per year)
- Principal or Co-organizer of a student/faculty centric educational or recruitment event (maximum of 2 contributions per year) such as

- Managing a booth
- Taking students to visit industry partners
- Bringing in a guest speaker
- Accompanying students to a national, regional, or state competition such as
 - Utah Conference on Undergraduate Research
 - Cybersecurity competition
 - E-Sports competition
- STEM related service for a(n) national, regional, state, or SUU community
- Serving as a judge in a regional or state level event such as
 - Sterling Scholar etc.
- Membership in a professional/accreditation organization such as
 - AIS, ACM, IEEE, WBEA, UACTE, ABET, ATMAE, CAE, etc.

c. Scholarly/Creative Activity

Although teaching is the primary way in which faculty are evaluated at SUU, Scholarly/Creative activity that complements the teaching role is a secondary measure (see Regent's Policy R312, SUU Policy 6.1, and the Boyer model). In accordance with SUU Policy 6.1 this activity shall be Student-Centric, but might not directly relate to students. The following list contains example contributions and their potential point values.

16-20-Point Contributions (Outstanding)

- Peer-reviewed publication
 - Journal
 - Conference proceeding
 - Book/Book Chapter
 - Lab manual
 - Dissertation/Thesis for an advanced degree
- A grant award or fellowship external to SUU
- Creation/invention of equipment/software for application in the field
- Student mentoring (using the undergraduate/graduate research course) which results in the student presenting their research at a conference such as SUU's Festival of Excellence.

11-15-Point Contributions (High)

- Non-peer reviewed publication
 - Journal
 - Conference
- A grant award or fellowship internal to SUU
- Research presentation at a scholarly/professional/teaching conference/venue external to SUU
- Professional Development to advance professional knowledge in the discipline such as
 - Obtaining new industry certifications
 - Taking a training course
 - Formal education at a University/College

6-10-Point Contributions (Medium)

- Documented participation in a grant writing effort
- Serve as a reviewer/referee of an article in a journal, book, conference, curricula, etc. (can be placed in either the Service/Leadership or Scholarly/Creative category)
- Professional Development to advance professional knowledge in the discipline such as
 - Workshop
 - (Consultation with educational specialists such as SUU's Center for Teaching Innovation belong in the teaching section)
- Research presentation internal to SUU such as
 - Symposium
 - Festival of Excellence
- Receiving an institutional scholarship award. Awards at higher levels than the institution can be considered for higher point values.

0-5 Point Contributions (Low)

- Attendance at a scholarly/professional/teaching conference
- Citation of one's scholarly work (one occurrence per year)

2. Subjective Interpretation of Criteria

Faculty coming up for review are tasked with placing contributions into the appropriate categories on their evaluation forms. Evaluators are tasked with determining actual point values for these contributions. In addition, evaluators are tasked with evaluating the more subjective criteria in the Additional Requirements section of the appropriate review or advancement.

Review and Advancements

This section lists the requirements for faculty members at various review cycles and rank advancements.

Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements

The department has certain expectations and tasks they require of faculty members each year. Faculty seeking rank advancements and/or Tenure have additional required tasks they must meet. These required tasks are listed in the appropriate areas in this document. Failure to meet these requirements may result in disciplinary action and must be mentioned in evaluators reviews.

- a. Faculty are expected to earn at least 100 points per year to be considered in Good Standing.
- b. Faculty are expected to meet their professional responsibilities as outlined in SUU Policy 6.28
- c. Faculty are responsible for items in SUU Policy 6.1. Special attention should be given to the Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations section of that document.
- d. A faculty member's teaching effectiveness will be assessed by both the Department Chair and a Departmental Peer each year. Peer reviews will be assigned and coordinated by the Department Chair. A faculty member is encouraged to discuss assignment issues with the department chair, such as a conflict of interest. If a faculty member (repeatedly) schedules the Chair/Peer for an agreed upon time, but the Chair/Peer fails to attend or provide feedback, no penalty shall be assessed against the instructor.
- e. Faculty will include all University-driven student feedback in their report as per SUU Policy 6.1.
- f. Additional requirement to help maintain accreditation

- i. Faculty will test students using the approved accreditation question(s) during the semester and provide their completed assessments report(s) for accreditation to the department by the time course grades are due.
- ii. Faculty will develop and implement a teaching change for any accreditation assessment below 80% (in the acceptable range).
- iii. To meet accreditation requirements, the instructor will teach the topics in the master syllabus for the course. Suspected failure to cover the topics will result in a Department Curriculum Committee review of the LMS (Canvas) course at a minimum.

Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Review and Advancements

NTT faculty members are faculty with term appointments without eligibility for tenure (SUU Policy 6.1)

1. Yearly Review

This section is used for NTT faculty who are not on any special review cycle, or applying for rank advancement. NTT faculty have a primary responsibility for effective teaching while maintaining currency in their field and a secondary responsibility for departmental participation (SUU Policy 6.1). As per SUU Policy 6.1, even advanced NTT faculty submit yearly reports.

These faculty have the following yearly expectations:

Points

- As stated earlier, there is a 100-point minimum expectation
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 70 points in this area
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 5 points in this area
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member is encouraged to have contributions in this area, but this is not a requirement.

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for All Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document

- Attend the alignment and integration meeting (AIM) with the department chair.
- Meet with your faculty mentor (if applicable).
- Be aware of the requirements of their next major review.

2. Mid-Point Review

The Mid-Point Review represents a major review of a Junior Faculty's contributions. This review typically occurs after three full years of service, but midpoint reviews are optional for Non-Tenure Track Junior Faculty if they choose not to pursue Promotion (SUU Policy 6.1). Faculty undergoing a mid-point review have the following expectations:

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 300 points in the last three years
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 210 points in this area in the last three years
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 15 points in this area in the last three years
- Scholarly/Creative
 - Faculty are not required to have any points in this area

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - Student concerns with course content and lectures shall be minimal.
 - Concerns may be expressed by students through student evaluations, and/or directly to the department chair. Any such concerns must have been documented in an AIM. Faculty have demonstrated satisfactory progress on any such concerns.
 - The faculty member is proficient with the University LMS (Canvas)
 - Student achievement on accreditation metrics shall be generally above 80% (in the acceptable range).

- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member served on at least two SUU committees (at any level)
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member attended at least one conference at the university/state/national level.

3. Promotion to 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 (SUU Policy 6.1). Faculty applying for this promotion are expected to have met the following criteria:

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 600 points in the last six years
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 420 points in this area in the last six years
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 30 points in this area in the last six years

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways:

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document
- The faculty member is in Good Standing
- The faculty member has not had any disciplinary actions in the past three years.
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - Student concerns with course content and lectures shall be minimal.
 - Concerns may be expressed by students through student evaluations, and/or directly to the department chair. Any such concerns must have been documented in an AIM. Faculty have demonstrated satisfactory progress on any such concerns.

- Student achievement on accreditation metrics is generally above 80% (in the acceptable range).
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has served on at least four committees, at least one of which must be at the College/University level, within the last three years
 - The committee work done by a faculty member is perceived as beneficial by their peers
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has applied for and received an FDSF grant to attend a conference or has attended an in-person/online conference i.e. from a book publisher.
 - The faculty member has attended at least three trainings sponsored by SUU's center for teaching innovation in the past three years

4. Promotion to Associate Professor

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 (SUU Policy 6.1). Faculty applying for this promotion are expected to have met the following criteria

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 600 points in the last six years
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 420 points in this area in the last six years
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 30 points in this area in the last six years

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways:

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document

- The faculty member is in Good Standing
- The faculty member has not had any disciplinary actions originated in the past three years.
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has contributed significantly to the University's mission in exemplary ways
 - Student concerns with course content and lectures shall be minimal.
 - Concerns may be expressed by students through student evaluations, and/or directly to the department chair. Any such concerns must have been documented in an AIM. Faculty have demonstrated satisfactory progress on any such concerns.
 - The faculty member is providing beneficial reviews to their peers
 - The faculty member is maintaining the LMS (Canvas) course shells they use
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has served on at least three committees at the Department level and at least one committee at the College/University level within the last three years
 - The faculty member has served as the Chair of a committee
 - The committee work done by a faculty member is perceived as beneficial by their peers
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has attended at least one conference at the university/state/national level within the past three years
 - The faculty member has attended at least three events sponsored by SUU's center for teaching innovation in the past three years

5. NTT Hires with Time Toward Promotion

NTT faculty hired with years granted towards promotion are awarded 100 points per year granted as follows. 70 points in Teaching Effectiveness, 5 points in Service/Leadership, and 25 general points that are applied to the total points, but not to any specific category. NTT faculty are also considered to have served on one committee at the Department level per year granted.

Tenured and Tenure Track (TT) Review and Advancements

As per SUU Policy 6.0, Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty are an employment status in a budgeted and full-time (nine [9] months or more) instructional position in a department

1. Yearly Review

This section is used for Tenured and TT faculty who are not on any special review cycle, or applying for rank advancement. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty are expected to engage in teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service. They also have the responsibility for approved University curriculum and the learning quality of courses (SUU Policy 6.0 and 6.1). These faculty have the following yearly expectations:

Points

- As stated earlier, there is a 100-point minimum expectation
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 60 points in this area
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 10 points in this area
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least 10 points in this area

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways:

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for All Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document.
- Attend the alignment and integration meeting (AIM) with the department chair.
- Meet with your faculty mentor (if applicable).
- Be aware of and working toward the requirements of their next major review.

2. Assistant/Associate Professor Mid-Point Review

This section is used for TT faculty who have not received Tenure and who are mid-way through the Tenure process.

Assistant Professors exhibit potential for effective Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities. They are engaged in their academic discipline and in continuing study that will permit them to increase their competence in their fields which will qualify them for Promotion to a higher rank (SUU Policy 6.1).

Associate Professors have exhibited continued growth in Faculty Engagement. They have contributed significantly to the University Mission, and they are prepared to mentor other Faculty members. Their Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities reflect high professional competence (SUU Policy 6.1).

The Mid-Point Review represents a major review of a Junior Faculty's contributions. This review typically occurs after three full years of service (SUU Policy 6.1). Faculty undergoing a mid-point review have the following expectations:

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 300 points
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 180 points in this area
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 30 points in this area
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least 30 points in this area

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for All Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - Student concerns with course content and lectures shall be minimal.
 - Concerns may be expressed by students through student evaluations, and/or directly to the department chair. Any such concerns must have been documented in an AIM. Faculty have demonstrated satisfactory progress on any such concerns.
 - The faculty member is proficient with the University LMS (Canvas).
 - Student achievement on accreditation metrics shall be generally above 80% (in the acceptable range).
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has served on at least three SUU committees (at any level)
- Scholarly/Creative

- The faculty member has at least one peer reviewed publication during their employment at SUU.
- The faculty member has presented their scholarly/creative work at one conference at the state/national/international level at a minimum during their employment at SUU.
- The faculty member has attended at least one conference at the University/State/National level, in addition to the conference they presented at during their employment at SUU.

3. Tenure

Although the University allows faculty to separate Tenure from Promotion, the Department has decided to couple these requirements for simplicity.

Faculty hired at the Assistant Professor level are expected to come up for Tenure at the same time they come up for promotion to Associate Professor. The same requirements used for Promotion to Associate Professor are used to determine if a faculty member receives Tenure.

Faculty hired at the Associate Professor level, and who were not awarded tenure, have the following two options. They can stay at their same rank, but receive Tenure using the requirements for the Promotion to Associate Professor section, or they can be promoted to Professor and receive tenure using the more difficult requirements in the Promotion to Professor section. Evaluative entities not awarding Promotion to Professor will use the requirements in the Promotion to Associate Professor section to determine if Tenure should still be awarded.

4. Promotion to Associate Professor

Associate Professors have exhibited continued growth in Faculty Engagement. They have contributed significantly to the University Mission, and they are prepared to mentor other Faculty members. Their Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities reflect high professional competence (SUU Policy 6.1).

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 600 points during their employment at SUU.
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 360 points in this area during their employment at SUU.
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 60 points in this area during their employment at SUU.

- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least 60 points in this area during their employment at SUU.

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for All Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document.
- The faculty member is in Good Standing
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - Student concerns with course content and lectures shall be minimal.
 - Concerns may be expressed by students through student evaluations, and/or directly to the department chair. Any such concerns must have been documented in an AIM. Faculty have demonstrated satisfactory progress on any such concerns.
 - The faculty member is providing beneficial peer teaching evaluations to their peers
 - The faculty member is maintaining the LMS (Canvas) course shells they use
 - The faculty member has completed at least one item from the high category in the teaching effectiveness section
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has served on at least six committees, at least two of which must be at the College/University level during their employment at SUU.
 - The faculty member has served as the Chair of a committee during their employment at SUU.
 - The committee work done by a faculty member is perceived as beneficial by their peers.
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least two peer reviewed publications during their employment at SUU.
 - The faculty member has presented their scholarly/creative work at two conferences at the state/national/international level at a minimum during their

employment at SUU.

- The faculty member has attended at least two conferences at the University/State/National level, in addition to the conferences they presented at during their employment at SUU.
- Faculty should have applied for a grant working with a university grant office during their employment at SUU.

5. Early Promotion to Associate Professor

A Faculty Member may apply to have the probationary period reduced by one (1) year (SUU Policy 6.1).

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 1.5 times the points needed for Promotion to Associate Professor in each section.

Additional Requirements:

- Faculty are required to complete the conditions listed in SUU Policy 6.1 in the Probationary Period for Tenure section.
- Faculty are expected to have exceeded all requirements listed in the Promotion to Associate Professor where numbers are used.

6. Promotion to Professor

A Professor is a Faculty member who has demonstrated excellence in Teaching, Service/Leadership and Scholarly/Creative Activities over a sustained period, typically at least five years after being granted Tenure. Professors are recognized as leaders in their field and have achieved a high level of professional achievement and recognition, as evidenced by a strong record of publications, presentations, grants, awards, and other Scholarly/Creative Activities. Professors are expected to contribute to the academic community by mentoring Junior Faculty, serving on committees, and providing leadership in Departmental and institutional governance (SUU Policy 6.1).

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 500 points in the last five years
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 300 points in this area in the last five years
- Service/Leadership

- The faculty member has at least 50 points in this area in the last five years
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least 50 points in this area in the last five years

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for All Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document.
- The faculty member is in Good Standing
- At least three years of the last five years have been without a developmental plan or disciplinary action.
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - Student concerns with course content and lectures shall be minimal.
 - Concerns may be expressed by students through student evaluations, and/or directly to the department chair. Any such concerns must have been documented in an AIM. Faculty have demonstrated satisfactory progress on any such concerns.
 - The faculty member is providing beneficial peer teaching evaluations to their peers
 - The faculty member is maintaining the LMS (Canvas) course shells they use
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has served on at least eight committees, at least two of which must be at the College/University level within the last five years
 - The faculty member has served as the Chair of at least three committees within the last five years
 - The committee work done by a faculty member is perceived as beneficial by their peers
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least one peer reviewed publication within the last five years.
 - The faculty member has presented their research at one conference within the last five years.
 - The faculty member has attended at least one conference at the state/national level, in addition to the conference they presented at within the last five years.

Early Promotion to Professor

An Associate Professor without Tenure may apply to have the probationary period reduced by one (1) year (SUU Policy 6.1).

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 1.5 times the points needed for Promotion to Professor in each section.

Additional Requirements:

- Faculty are required to complete the conditions listed in SUU Policy 6.1 in the Probationary Period for Tenure section
- Faculty are expected to have exceeded all requirements listed in the Promotion to Professor section where numbers are used.

7. Post-Tenure Five-Year Reviews

Five-Year Review Faculty are expected to conscientiously discharge their duties (SUU Policy 6.1).

Points

- Faculty are expected to have obtained at least 500 points in the last five years
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - The faculty member has at least 300 points in this area in the last five years
- Service/Leadership
 - The faculty member has at least 50 points in this area in the last five years
- Scholarly/Creative
 - The faculty member has at least 50 points in this area in the last five years

Additional Requirements:

In addition to the point expectations, faculty at this review cycle are expected to have contributed in the following ways:

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document.
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- A faculty member's Teaching Effectiveness is consistent with departmental faculty.

- A faculty member's Service/Leadership contributions are consistent with departmental faculty.
- A faculty member's Scholarly/Creative contributions are consistent with departmental faculty.

8. TT Hires with Time Toward Promotion

There are specific requirements for awarding time toward promotion, see SUU Policy 6.1. TT faculty hired with years granted towards promotion are awarded 100 points per year granted as follows. 60 points in Teaching Effectiveness, 10 points in Service/Leadership, 10 points in Scholarly/Creative and 20 general points that cannot be applied to any category. TT faculty are also considered to have served on one committee at the Department level per year granted.

Special Appointments

Faculty are often asked to fill roles that reduce their teaching load and/or reduce time for other standard activities. Reductions in a faculty's yearly expectations are only applicable during the years they served in the reassigned role. These roles may include:

- Academic Administrators
- Faculty with Partial Reassignments
- Faculty with Special Assignments

Points

- Faculty point expectations remain the same at 100 points per year
- Teaching Effectiveness
 - Faculty are held to the same minimum point values as their peers.
 - If the faculty is a department chair, a department chair review for their teaching effectiveness is not appropriate and is removed from their requirements. They may include an additional peer review in place of the department chair review if they would like to retain the same number of points for reviews as other faculty.
- Service/Leadership
 - Faculty are held to the same minimum point values as their peers in this category. These reassignments are expected to increase the point totals of this category allowing faculty to achieve 100 points per year.
- Scholarly/Creative
 - Point values in this category are reduced by the amount of the reassignment. For example, if 10 points were needed at a minimum, and the faculty was on ½ time reassignment, they would only need 5 points per year.

Additional Requirements:

- Complete the Yearly Departmental Requirements for all Reviews and Advancements as listed in this document
- There is satisfactory progress on any potential development plan and/or disciplinary action
- Other assignments with a numeric value in this section are reduced by the amount of the reassignment. For example, if there was a requirement to publish two papers in a specific time period, and the faculty member was on ½ time reassignment, the faculty member would only be expected to publish one paper.

Sabbaticals or other leaves of absences

There are various reasons why a faculty member may not be able to fulfill their regular duties. This may include a sabbatical or a leave of absence due to an unforeseen circumstance like a medical emergency or FMLA leave. Reduction in faculty expectations is usually appropriate in these situations. In these situations, a faculty member is expected to work with the department chair to create a plan on how they will be evaluated during this time. This evaluation may be based on the work they produce during their sabbatical or may include skipping an evaluation process altogether. A faculty member is expected to document the expectations and include that in their yearly report.

Additional Guidelines

This section contains information on activities that are not covered in this document, as well as topics relating to noncompliance.

Pre-approval of Undefined Contribution Activities

Wherever possible, faculty members who are contributing in ways not listed in this document are encouraged to suggest changes to this document so their contributions can be easily classified. However, for activities that may only occur once, or are otherwise non-standard, faculty members are expected to discuss potential point values with the department chair and they require written approval from the P&T Committee. This is especially important if a faculty member is on the lower end of the point spectrum. The P&T Committee and the Department Chair are expected to evaluate these contributions using this discussion as input. Final documentation of this conversation should occur via email so that there is a record of it. This documentation is not included in a faculty member's review paperwork.

If a faculty member would like to substitute or waive a requirement in the Additional Requirements section of a review and/or advancement, the faculty member must fill out and have both the Department Chair and P&T Committee approve the Additional Requirements

Substitution or Waiver Form found in the appendix of this document. This form is included in the faculty member's review paperwork.

Development Plans

Policy 6.28 contains information on a faculty member's responsibilities and the procedures to follow if a faculty member is suspected of a violation. A faculty member who receives a sanction following this policy is considered to be on a development plan for the purposes of this document.

A faculty member is placed on a development plan if they do not meet the requirements in their review and/or advancement section. The following table lists information about this process

Development Plan Table

Entity claiming a deficiency	Form filled out by	Approved by	Implemented by
Department P&T Committee	Department P&T Committee	Department Chair	Department Chair
Department Chair	Department Chair	Department P&T Committee	Department Chair
College/School P&T Committee	College/School P&T Committee	Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair	Department Chair
Dean	Dean	College/School P&T Committee	Department Chair
University P&T Committee	Department Chair	Both the Department P&T Committee and the Department Chair	Department Chair
Provost	Department Chair	Both the Department P&T Committee and the Department Chair	Department Chair

Redress Procedures

Although every effort has been made to create an evaluation system that is clear and functional, issues may arise in the evaluation process. These issues should be contained to either a disagreement in the point value of a contribution or a faculty member meeting a requirement in the additional requirements section. The following table lists the process for a faculty member to follow if they disagree with a decision of an evaluative entity.

A faculty may appeal an entity's final decision (as listed in the chart below) by escalating it to the next higher-level entity. A redress escalation can only occur once per issue.

Redress Procedures

Entity	Faculty discusses issue with	Final decision
Department P&T Committee	Department Chair	Department Chair
Department Chair	Department P&T Committee	Department P&T Committee
College/School P&T Committee	Dean	Dean
Dean	College/School P&T Committee	College/School P&T Committee
University P&T Committee	Provost	Provost
Provost	Provost	Provost

DEC Revisions

This section outlines the process for revisions to the DEC

Changes that do not require approval

The Department Chair should make every effort to keep the information about the current faculty members and the current P&T Committee members and their dates of service updated. In addition, they are tasked with recording the date of the last revision. Changes to these areas do not require a vote from the department faculty, but are required to follow the archival procedures for this document.

Proposals for Revision

Faculty wishing to make changes to this document should take the following steps:

- Discuss their proposed changes with other faculty members in the department
- Download the current version of the document
- Enable Track Changes so that other faculty will be made aware of all the changes being suggested
- Make their proposed changes
- Provide their revised document to the Department Chair and the P&T Committee Chair

The Department Chair will then:

- Send the document to the faculty for review
- Schedule a time for discussion during an upcoming department meeting
- Hold a vote
- Regardless of the outcome of the vote, the department chair will count this as a review of this document and record the date of the vote in this document
- If the vote was successful, the Department Chair will follow guidelines in Policy 6.1 which requires approval from the Dean, University Legal Affairs, and the Provost before changes can be officially implemented
- Upon successful completion of the process outlined in Policy 6.1, DEC archival procedures can be started.

Voting Procedures

SUU Policy 6.1 suggests that consensus at all levels of this process is best. If consensus cannot be reached at the Department Level, at least a super majority in the department is

required to proceed with the revisions. Each faculty in the department is allowed one vote, including the Department Chair. As improper DEC changes could cost a faculty member their job, an abstaining vote or a missing vote is counted as a no. The procedures in Policy 6.1 will then be followed where consensus is not reached at all levels.

DEC Archival Procedures

To ensure that no improper changes are made to the DEC, each revision of the DEC should be archived. This should be done as follows

- Each DEC file should have a date listed in its filename
- The current DEC is moved into the folder containing past revisions
- The new DEC is copied into the proper shared folder and the current date replaces the previous date in its filename
- Archived DEC files that are over seven years old should be deleted

Appendices

To make it easier for committee members and faculty members to fill out these forms, each of the following is in its own file located in the same location as this document

Additional Requirements Substitution or Waiver Form (ARSWF)

Development Plan Form (DPF)

Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report (FEC Report)

Promotion and Tenure Scoring Sheet (PTS Sheet)