

Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology: LRT Policy

(approved “by department” 08.31.2005; latest revision 12.02.13; revised and approved by department 02/26/2016; approved by Provost September 1, 2017)

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology has devised an LRT policy to assess and document a faculty member’s performance and productivity according to the categories of: Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, Service, and Collegiality, specified in university LRT policy 6.1, approved 11.02.90, amended 12.04.09. The second and third sections of this document stipulate the required levels of performance and productivity for annual and major reviews.

I. LRT Categories of Evaluation

Per SUU Policies and Procedures #6.1, VI, B “Ratings,” the university recognizes four performance standards for assessing faculty for leave, rank, tenure, and merit purposes:

Exceptional Professional Performance (EP)

“Exceeds expectations of professional performance. In addition to the entitled rank advancement base salary adjustments, merit money will also be allocated to exceptional performance.”

Standard Professional Performance (SP)

“Meets expectations of professional performance. This is the accepted standard for tenure and rank considerations.”

Low Performance (LP)

“Does not consistently meet expectations of professional performance. In the case of low performance a development plan is required.”

Unacceptable Performance (UP)

“Does not meet minimum expectations of professional performance. If the faculty member is retained, a development plan is required.”

A. Teaching Effectiveness:

For faculty annual activity reports (FAAR) and for applications for major reviews, i.e., third-year review, tenure and rank advancement to associate professor, rank advancement to full professor, and post tenure review, the Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology accepts data from IDEA student evaluations. In addition to that information, the department chair and the department LRT committee will evaluate teaching effectiveness using peer evaluations at the request of the faculty member.

When using IDEA student evaluation data the Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology will abide by the scientific guidelines established by IDEA Center in relation to their “criterion-referenced” approach to evaluation (5-point scale). The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology will make every effort to evaluate this statistical data in a manner that does not betray basic statistical theory and practice.

No faculty currently employed will need to use Online Evaluations prior to 2010-2011 for major reviews or rank advancement.

For all Faculty (Teaching Effectiveness Averages)

The ratings earned in Teaching Effectiveness are based primarily on the “Summary Evaluation” adjusted score received on the IDEA form.¹ Adjusted scores for each course per semester will be totaled and an average obtained per semester.² These semester averages will then be combined and averaged for the total teaching effectiveness average for each academic year.

Since IDEA Center explicitly suggests that only a representative sample of IDEA evaluations are necessary when making important administrative decisions,³ the Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology permits each faculty to exclude one IDEA evaluation each academic year when compiling teaching effectiveness averages for FAARs, third-year review, tenure and rank advancement to associate professor, rank advancement to full professor, and post tenure review. Because they are voluntary and not administered in class as with face to face classes, IDEA evaluations for online courses historically have had very low response rates deemed “unreliable” and “not representative” by the IDEA center. All evaluations for online courses must be included, however, these will not be computed in overall teaching effectiveness averages.

The following summarizes university and department expectations for teaching duties related to expectations for teaching effectiveness:

Meet scheduled classes; post and maintain regular office hours; evaluate student work promptly; conscientiously, and without favoritism; provide a respectful classroom atmosphere; maintain confidentiality with regards to student records; and avoid relationships with students that might create a conflict of interest or violate SUU policies (see Policy 6.28 section IV).

The teaching effectiveness average may be adjusted upward (in 0.1 increments) in light of evidence from the following indicators of innovative teaching strategies or pedagogical commitment (the maximum incremental advancement is 0.3 in any one academic year):

¹ These scores are provided in the table box, titled “Your Average Scores” on the left, bottom half of p. 1 on the IDEA form.

² By obtaining separate average scores per semester, an evaluator can see improvement over the course of an academic year or to the next year.

³ See <http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Administrative%20DecisionMaking.pdf>

- a) the development and implementation of new course(s),
- b) the development and implementation of a new program -- the program must have required completion of a R401 form (0.3 points),
- b) peer-recognition of teaching performance (e.g., SUU “Distinguished Educator” award),
- c) publication of a peer-reviewed article, peer-reviewed or editor-reviewed book, or book chapter devoted to pedagogy,
- d) reception of grant for pedagogical purposes,
- e) significant improvement (10% or more) on teaching effectiveness average score from fall to spring semester or spring (previous FAAR) to fall (current FAAR)
- f) participation in educational seminar, workshop, and/or conference,
- g) conducting field school (non-overload) or study abroad event
- h) faculty achieves a rating of “Excellent” on 6 of 10 components on classroom evaluations from the chair and from two tenured or tenure track department faculty in a semester. If peer reviews are included for both semesters, a maximum of 0.3 points may be added to the teaching effectiveness average.
- i) faculty incorporates community engagement, global engagement, leadership engagement, outdoor engagement, and/or creative or innovative engagement as major components of her/his pedagogy.

If a faculty member thinks that a pedagogically-relevant activity ought to be recognized, she/he may request (in the FAAR) that 0.1 points be added to the teaching effectiveness average – the maximum incremental adjustment cannot exceed 0.3 per academic year. The chair will then decide if the request is merited. This request must be approved or denied by the chair of the department and the teaching effectiveness average adjusted accordingly prior to forwarding the FAAR to the department LRT committee.

B. Scholarly/Creative Activity:

Consistent with university policy #6.1, the Department of History and Sociology with Anthropology follows the Boyer model for scholarship. In an effort to recognize and to quantify various forms and activities of scholarship, the department uses the following point system.

Tier I.⁴

⁴ The peer-review standard as applied to books is effective 5/01/2013. Books published prior to this date fall under the previous LRT Policy amended and approved 9/01/2011. No points for scholarship will be awarded for works published by “vanity presses” or that otherwise fit the following descriptions. If a book, edited book, and/or book chapter is published or distributed by a publisher that prints family histories, prints for specific purposes related to a professor’s career advancement (the individual contacts the publisher to print her/his work), the printer contacts the professor to print his/her work for a fee, or prints works directed toward specific classes, the author has paid for the book, edited book, or chapter to be bound, published, and/or distributed; no peer-review is conducted; the press does not meet the professional standards of academic publishing; or the edited book is simply a collection of readings or other material (or part of a collection of readings or other materials) that have been bound and sold as a “course pack” – no points for scholarship will be awarded for that book, edited book and/or chapter. A faculty member can make a case that his/her work falls under the “quality press” category. The burden is upon the faculty member to prove her/his work qualifies under this standard, i.e. is published by a nationally-recognized, respected commercial press that conducts some form of peer-review and quality review.

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Authored peer-reviewed academic book with a university or other quality press | 45 points |
| Edited academic peer-reviewed book with a university or other quality press | 20 points |
| Primary author of a peer-reviewed textbook with a university or other quality press | 20 points |
| Academic article in a peer-reviewed journal | 15 points |
| Chapter in an academic peer-reviewed book with a university or other quality press | 15 points |
| Chapter in a peer-reviewed textbook with a university or other quality press | 15 points |
| Awarded <u>competitive</u> , external grant for academic or pedagogical research, ⁵ or awarded <u>competitive</u> , external research or pedagogical fellowship | 6 to 15 points |

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 6 points | \$30,000-\$34,999 | 11 points |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 7 points | \$35,000-\$39,999 | 12 points |
| \$15,000-\$19,999 | 8 points | \$40,000-\$44,999 | 13 points |
| \$20,000-\$24,999 | 9 points | \$45,000-\$49,999 | 14 points |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 10 points | \$50,000 + | 15 points |

Tier II.

| | |
|--|----------|
| SUU Distinguished faculty lecture and paper | 4 points |
| Invited lecture or keynote address ⁶ | 3 points |
| Encyclopedia article | 3 points |
| Peer-reviewed newsletter article | 3 points |
| Paper presented at an academic conference ⁷ | 2 points |
| Academic book review | 2 points |
| Academic field work requiring significant reporting to an external agency and lasting four weeks or more | 2 points |
| Academic field work requiring significant reporting to an external agency and lasting 2 or 3 weeks | 1 point |
| Commenter, panel/session at an academic conference | 1 point |

⁵ The burden is on the faculty member to show the external grant was competitive, including evidence there was an external call for applications, the number of submissions garnered, the competitive nature of the review process, and other documents showing the grant was not given to the faculty member because he/she is employed by SUU. This category does not apply to ongoing grants internally awarded to faculty as part of a grant administered through SUU per its contractual obligations to an external reporting authority. This would include grants contracted and/or secured by SUU for which a professor is needed to undertake the work even if the faculty member writes grants or completes other documents for renewal or continuation each year. For external grants for research or pedagogical development below \$5,000 faculty may make a written request to the chair of the department that points be awarded. If the chair agrees that points should be awarded, she/he may not award more than 5 points and is expected to follow the pattern of point allotment above (e.g., 5 points may be awarded for grants valuing \$4,500 to \$4,999, etc.).

⁶ Points will not be awarded if a guest lecture or keynote address is associated with a university course or class. Points will only be awarded for invited presentations for conferences, research centers, university-wide audiences, etc.

⁷ If the same paper is presented at multiple conferences, points will only be awarded for the first presentation.

C. Service

The department recognizes service to the university (including student organizations and clubs), college, department, and one's profession. Active service in the following will be considered relevant for evaluative purposes:

- a) university committee(s)
- b) college committee(s)
- c) department committee(s)
- d) faculty senate
- e) editorial board of a university press or peer reviewed academic journal
- f) service in a national or international professional organization
- g) advisor to student organization(s) or club(s)
- h) reviewer of journal manuscript(s) for an academic journal
- i) reviewer of book manuscript(s) for an academic press
- j) reviewer of grant application(s) for an external agency

Since no list of relevant service can be exhaustive, a faculty member may petition the chair of the department to recognize service-related activities. This petition must be presented in writing and the chair's written confirmation of service relevance must be included in the faculty member's FAAR.

During the first year of a new hire's employment, there is no expectation of service; a rating of "Satisfactory" will be given for that first year.

D. Collegiality

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology follows the Southern Utah University's policies and procedures on collegiality (as outlined in Policies #6.1 and #6.28). A faculty member who engages in collaborative, cooperative, and/or constructive activities with colleagues, administrators and students fulfills the department's definition of "collegiality." Such behavior and attitude should be demonstrated in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity and service.

In keeping with SUU Policies 6.1 and 6.28, which outline faculty responsibilities towards students, colleagues, and the institution, members of the Department will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

Regularly attend department meetings and other required meetings; work effectively and efficiently with colleagues on both special and ongoing projects; meet the reasonable requests of department officers; and comply with the administrative assistant's requests for required information and the completion of paperwork (for example office hours, absences, requests for updated curriculum vitae, syllabi, FIFs, completion of travel authorization paperwork and related matters).

Faculty members must notify the Department Chair of any matter that will require an absence from a scheduled class, including conference, research travel, or illness. Faculty

members are not to take leave from class for personal matters or trips without the consent of the Department Chair.

Represent the Department in a professional manner when serving on college and university committees, as well as when providing outreach to the local community.

Treat colleagues and students and staff with respect and dignity at all times.

II. Annual Reviews (FAAR)

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology will conduct annual reviews as stipulated by university policy 6.1. The reviews are intended to: 1) encourage faculty development and excellence; 2) insure that the department is meeting strategic objectives; 3) determine whether a developmental plan is needed in order to assist a professor to improve and attain at least a "SP" level of performance/productivity; and 4) ascertain salary enhancement, i.e., merit pay.

For tenure-track faculty, one's FAAR with the chair's evaluative letter is forwarded to the chair of the department LRT committee to be evaluated by that committee; once that committee's evaluation is completed, all materials are forwarded to the dean. For tenured faculty, one's FAAR with the chair's evaluative letter is forwarded directly to the dean.

The faculty is required to: 1) prepare a narrative of his/her performance according to the above-mentioned categories using the form in "Appendix A" in the university LRT policy document; 2) provide an up-to-date C. V.; 3) furnish a copy of the title page of each recently published monograph or edited book and/or the title page and Table of Contents of each journal in which the faculty has recently published; and, 4) at his/her discretion, a faculty member may provide any other materials to support and document his/her performance in any specified category.

Point values and weighting have been assigned to the categories of: Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service (see chart below).

As stipulated in the chart below, a faculty member's category rating is based on his/her teaching effectiveness average (see above), **In keeping with the primary emphasis on teaching at this institution, faculty members' rating in Teaching Effectiveness will be weighted by 0.45.**

The point values for scholarly activity are listed above in I. B. Scholarly/Creative Activity, and the corresponding meritorious ratings are stipulated in the following chart. **Faculty members' points earned in Scholarly/Creative Activity will be weighted by 0.35.**

Ratings in Service have been determined by the level of the SUU committee and by the various venues or professional organizations in which faculty have participated. **Faculty members' points earned in Service will be weighted by 0.20.**

A faculty member will receive an overall rating of "EP" for an accumulation of points between and including the scores of 1.0 to 1.3. For an overall rating of "SP 1" one must earn between 1.4 and 2.0 points; for a "SP 2" rating, a score of 2.1 to 3.0; for "Low Performance," a combined point total between 3.1 and 4.0; and for an "Unacceptable Performance" rating, a score exceeding 4.0. Thus, a score between 1.0 and 3.0 is deemed by the university policy #6.1 to be

“standard performance”; a score between 3.1 and 4.0 is deemed to be “low performance”; and a score exceeding 4.0 is deemed as “unacceptable performance” (see University Policy 6.1, Appendix E).

The following is the rating system based in part on university policy 6.1. and expanded for use in the Department of History and Sociology with Anthropology’s evaluation of FAAR reports. Activities and items included in the FAAR will be limited to publications, presentations, and awards that occurred, took place, or were given during the academic year under review (that is, July 1st through June 30th of the academic year under review).

| Category | Rating/Point Value | Specifications ⁸ |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Teaching Effectiveness | Exceptional/1 | Faculty member achieves a teaching effectiveness average score of 4.50 or higher (after incremental adjustments). |
| | | |
| | Standard/ 2 or 3 / (“Standard Professional Performance” in university policy 6.1.) | For evaluation and merit purposes the department recognizes two levels of performance within this category. Standard Performance 1 (SP 1) Faculty member achieves a teaching effectiveness average score of 4.1 to 4.4 (after incremental adjustments) 2 points. Standard Performance 2 (SP 2) Faculty member achieves a teaching effectiveness average score of 3.7 to 4.0 (after incremental adjustments) 3 points. Faculty members also can achieve SP by having their adjusted scores situated within the grey area of the IDEA form, which represents the “middle 45-55,” “similar,” or “middle40%” group in the broader IDEA database. |
| | Low Performance/4 | Faculty member achieves a teaching effectiveness average score of 3.0 to 3.64. If a faculty member’s average score falls in this range for two consecutive years a development plan will be implemented. |
| | Unacceptable Performance/5 | Faculty member achieves a teaching effectiveness average score below 3.0 (after incremental adjustments). A score within this range requires that a developmental plan be implemented. |

⁸ As outlined in section I.A. (above), a faculty member may disregard one IDEA course evaluation per academic year when calculating her/his teaching effectiveness average. See section I.A above for instructions and rules on calculating teaching effectiveness averages and incremental adjustments.

| | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Scholarly/ Creative Activity | Exceptional /1 | Faculty member achieves 15 or more Tier I points (see I.B above). When a faculty member publishes a peer-reviewed monograph with an academic press, the faculty member will receive the rating of “EP” for four years total in scholarly activity on his/her Faculty Annual Activity Reports. When a faculty member publishes an edited book, peer-reviewed article, or chapter in an academic book, s/he will automatically receive an “EP” rating for one year per publication. ⁹ |
| | | Standard Performance 1 (SP 1): Faculty member achieves at least 6 points according to the point values listed in I. B. (above). |
| | Standard /2 or 3 | Standard Performance 2 (SP 2): Based on the high teaching load at SUU, faculty are not expected to produce peer-reviewed scholarly work each academic year. If a faculty member shows evidence of ongoing research, such as presenting a paper at an academic conference or conducting academic research or field work, s/he will receive a “Satisfactory” rating. |
| | Low/4 | Faculty member fails to present evidence of ongoing academic research, presenting a paper at an academic conference, or other work to award a “SP” rating. |
| | Unacceptable Performance/5 | Faculty member achieves no points nor demonstrates any scholarly/research activity for two straight years. |
| Service | Exceptional /1 | Active service in <u>three or more</u> relevant activities (as defined in I.C.). *Any faculty member who serves on the faculty senate, chairs a major committee, or who serves on the university’s LRT committee will receive an “Exceptional” rating for service. |
| | | Standard Performance 1 (SP 1): Active service in <u>two</u> relevant activities (as defined in I.C.). |
| | Standard /2 or 3 | Standard Performance 2 (SP 2): Active service in <u>one</u> relevant service activities (as defined in I.C.). |
| | Low/4 | No active service in a relevant activity (as defined in I.C.). |
| | Unacceptable Performance/5 | No active service in a relevant activity (as defined in I.C.) for two consecutive years. |
| Collegiality | Collegial/Satisfactory | A faculty member meets the expectation of collegiality as outlined in university policies #6.1 and 6.28 and determined by the chair and Department LRT committee. |

⁹ For example, if a faculty member publishes an article X in spring 2017 and a book chapter Y in spring 2017, in order to reward she/he for both works, she/he will receive an “Exceptional Performance” rating for article X on FAAR 2016-2017, and “Exceptional Performance” for chapter Y the next year, FAAR 2017-2018.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | Unacceptable Performance/+3 | When a faculty member behaves in a manner seriously below the standard of collegiality as outlined in university policies #6.1 and 6.28 and as determined by the chair and Department LRT committee. |
|--|-----------------------------|--|

III. Major Reviews

A. Three-Year Review. In order to receive the university rating of "Standard Professional Performance" for this review, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member must have achieved a “SP” rating on all FAARs since the beginning of tenure track employment. If teaching is rated below “Satisfactory” on any FAAR since the beginning of tenure track employment, the faculty member must achieve a teaching effectiveness average of at least 3.7 (after incremental adjustments) for the previous three years of teaching. This average is to be compiled using applicable IDEA course evaluations. . As noted above (section I.A.), the faculty is permitted to disregard one Banner course evaluation and one IDEA evaluation per academic year.

Scholarly/Creative Activity: The faculty member must achieve at least 15 points from Tier I (above) by the end of the semester in which the application is submitted. Tier I points earned prior to employment at Southern Utah University will count for the third year review but no more than 15 Tier I points will be considered for subsequent promotion and advancement.

Service: The faculty member must have received a rating of “SP” or better on any previous two FAARs submitted.

Collegiality: The faculty member should have received a “Collegial/SP” rating on any previous two FAARs submitted.

B. Tenure and Associate Professor (Rank Advancement Review). In order to receive the university rating of "Standard Professional Performance" for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member must have achieved a “SP” rating on all FAARs since the third-year review. If teaching is rated below “SP” on any FAAR since the third-year review, the faculty member must achieve a teaching effectiveness average of at least 3.7 (after incremental adjustments) on all applicable teaching evaluations since the beginning of tenure track employment at the university. This average is to be compiled using applicable IDEA course evaluations. As noted above (section I.A.), the faculty is permitted to disregard one IDEA evaluation per academic year.

Scholarly/Creative Activity: The faculty member must have earned at least 30 Tier I points. At least 15 Tier I points must be earned since tenure track employment at the university began. For all faculty hired after August 15, 2016, 30 Tier I points must be earned since tenure track employment began at SUU.

Service: The faculty member must have received at least a “SP” rating on all FAARs since the third-year review.

Collegiality: The faculty member should have received a “Collegial/SP” rating on the majority of FAARs since tenure track employment began.

C. Full Professor (Rank Advancement Review). In order to receive the university rating of "Standard Professional Performance" for full professorship, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member must have received a “SP” or higher rating on all FAARs with an overall teaching effectiveness average of at least 4.0 since the application for tenure or an overall teaching effectiveness average of at least 4.0 in the past five years of applicable course evaluations. As noted above (section I.A.), the faculty is permitted to disregard one IDEA evaluation per academic year.

Scholarly/Creative Activity: The faculty member must have earned at least an additional 30 points drawn from Tier I since tenure was granted.

Service: The faculty member must have received at least a “SP” rating on all FAARs since tenure was granted.

Collegiality: The faculty member should have received a “Collegial/SP” rating on the majority of FAARs in the previous five years.

D. Post-Tenure Review. In order to receive the university rating of "Standard Professional Performance" for post tenure review, an applicant must demonstrate the following:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member must have received a “SP” or higher rating on all FAARs since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review. If teaching is rated below “SP” on any FAAR since tenure was granted or since the last post-tenure review, the faculty member must achieve a teaching effectiveness average of at least 3.7 (after incremental adjustments) on applicable teaching evaluations since tenure was granted or since the last post-tenure review. As noted above (section I.A.), the faculty is permitted to disregard one IDEA evaluation per academic year.

Scholarly/Creative Activity: The faculty member must have earned at least an additional 4 points since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review.

Service: The faculty member must have received at least a “SP” rating on all FAARs since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review.

Collegiality: The faculty member should have received a “Collegial/SP” rating on the majority of FAARs since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review.