

**Department of Languages & Philosophy
Southern Utah University**

Leave, Rank, and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

(approved: Fall 2014)

Purpose

The Department of Foreign Languages & Philosophy will conduct annual Leave, Rank, and Tenure (LRT) evaluations for all faculty to fulfill requirements at Southern Utah University (Policy 6.1), to encourage faculty improvement, to foster communication about faculty activities, and to ensure that the Department is meeting strategic objectives. Comprehensive evaluations are conducted after a faculty member's third year and during tenure review.

This LRT document describes procedures for the evaluation of performance in terms of the categories of exceptional, standard, low, and unacceptable professional performance. To achieve either standard or exceptional professional performance, faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to being an active member of the University community. This commitment should be expressed in a variety of ways, including a willingness to share in the responsibilities of teaching, service, and research. Professional respect for colleagues, a willingness to work collaboratively with them, and treating students with respect and attention to their needs is expected of all faculty members. Documented efforts in fulfillment of these fundamental responsibilities will affect decisions regarding each faculty member's LRT evaluation.

Procedure

The Department Chair is responsible for performing the first phase of each faculty member's LRT evaluations and forwarding these evaluations and recommendations to the Department LRT Committee. Department members should be evaluated in relationship to all other department members, as well as to the standards established in this document.

The Department LRT Committee will then conduct its own review. Each committee member will review materials of all faculty members subject to review and will do so in relation to other department members and to the evaluation standards outlined below. The Department LRT Committee will present a collective report and forward the LRT files, as appropriate, to the Dean.

Each faculty member must submit the following materials for an annual activity report (FAAR)¹:

- Syllabi for all courses
- Unabridged copies of all teaching evaluations
- Copies of IDEA summary reports of teaching evaluations
- An analysis and response to the contents of the student evaluations
- A “creativity report” detailing ongoing scholarly work
- Copies of all publications
- Documentation pertaining to service to the University and to the Profession

Optional materials that may be included in the FAAR:

- Other indicators of instructional efforts, e.g., documentation of new course offerings, new uses of technology, or other engaged teaching efforts.
- Documentation of scholarly works in progress

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated in terms of their teaching, their scholarship, their service to the University and the Profession, and their collegiality. As stated in SUU Policy 6.1.VI.A.1, “Decisions regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty members will use the following criteria... Teaching is of primary importance. Scholarly and creative achievement should be complementary to the teaching role.” Accordingly the evaluation of teaching performance contributes most to the overall evaluation, but scholarship and service are highly important as well. Collegiality is a basic expectation of all faculty, and is foundational to shared governance.

Teaching

The faculty is bound by all SUU policies governing their professional responsibilities, such as those that mandate the posting and holding of office hours and the preparation and posting of syllabi for all courses. They are additionally responsible for advising students and are expected to develop and improve curriculum.

Each faculty member’s FAAR should include the following materials pertaining to their teaching during the academic year under review:

1. The IDEA summary reports for each class taught
2. Unabridged student evaluations [Note: Faculty members submitting a Third Year Review, Tenure and Rank Advancement Review, or a Post-Tenure (five-year) Review must present unabridged student evaluations for the most recent academic year, as well as the summary IDEA reports for all years

¹ These items are discussed in greater detail below.

- under review. Unabridged student evaluations that have been submitted in previous years need not be resubmitted.]
3. A narrative describing the faculty member's teaching and efforts to make improvements. The narrative should also address any repeated negative comments from student evaluations on the faculty member's teaching.
 4. Faculty members may also choose to include other materials pertinent to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as peer reviews of course materials, a narrative describing efforts made to improve specific classes or teaching effectiveness generally. The presentation of additional materials such as those described here could offset low teaching evaluation scores.

Unless additional materials pertaining to teaching effectiveness (as described above) indicate otherwise, the overall student evaluation (IDEA) scores determine the performance evaluation **during annual reviews**. Faculty members may choose to use either their "raw" or "adjusted" IDEA scores, provided that the raw scores are 45 or higher (otherwise adjusted scores must be used).

A faculty member has attained a rating of **exceptional performance** when the criteria above have been met and when the scores on the IDEA evaluations for the four overall measures of effectiveness average 56 or higher, or when additional materials pertaining to teaching effectiveness (as described above) justify such a rating.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **standard performance** when the criteria above have been met and when the scores on the IDEA evaluations for the four overall measures of effectiveness average 45-55, or when additional materials pertaining to teaching effectiveness (as described above) justify such a rating.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **low performance** when the criteria above have not fully been met or when the scores on the IDEA evaluations for the four overall measures of effectiveness average 37-44.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **unacceptable performance** when the criteria above have not been met or when the scores on the IDEA evaluations for the four overall measures of effectiveness average 36 or below.

Minimum expectations for tenure and promotion for teaching effectiveness include an average score of 45 or above on IDEA scores and other documentation of efforts to enhance teaching performance.

Scholarship

The Department of Foreign Languages and Philosophy expects faculty members to demonstrate active engagement in scholarship.² The Department acknowledges that the scholarship conducted during one academic year often marks the beginning, middle, or end of a longer project. Hence, the absence of any completed projects during one year will not be considered inadequate performance, provided that sufficient documentation of progress on ongoing projects is provided.

Each faculty member's FAAR should include the following materials pertaining to their scholarly activities during the academic year under review:

1. Copies of all publications
2. A narrative describing completed and ongoing scholarly projects as well as activities conducted in pursuit of completing ongoing scholarly projects
3. Faculty may also provide additional documentation as evidence of work in progress (e.g., a copy of an article under review)

In evaluating scholarship **during annual reviews**, department members should be evaluated in relationship to the standards established in this document. Whether an article, book, or presentation counts as "peer-reviewed" should be based on the professional standards of the discipline.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **exceptional performance** when the faculty member has published a peer-reviewed article or book during the year under review.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **standard performance** when the faculty member has demonstrated substantial progress made on research projects, has given presentations at peer-reviewed conferences, or has published or edited quality scholarly work in non-peer-reviewed venues.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **low performance** when there is insufficient evidence that the faculty member has met the standards of scholarly performance described above.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **unacceptable performance** when there is no evidence that the faculty member has met the standards of scholarly performance described above.

² The Department acknowledges that scholarly projects are various, as are the resulting products. The Department accepts Boyer's four features of scholarship (the scholarships of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching) as one model describing different types of scholarly projects and products. For more information, see, Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate*, Princeton: Jossey Bass Publishing (1990), Ch. 4, pp. 43-51.

During multi-year reviews (Third Year Review, Tenure and Rank Advancement Review, Post-Tenure Review), the faculty member will report the results of his/her scholarly projects from the period under review. Possibilities include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Peer-reviewed publications (whether print or electronic) such as books or journal articles.
2. Peer-reviewed or invited conference presentations, research reports, book reviews
3. Other publications
4. Grants and contracts awarded
5. Proof of works which have been accepted for publication
6. Evidence of work in progress (e.g., an article under review)

At the **Third Year Review**, one peer-reviewed publication (whether print or electronic) is considered **exceptional**. Proof that a paper has been submitted for review or has been accepted for publication is considered **standard**.

Minimal scholarly expectations for **tenure and promotion** to associate professor include one peer-reviewed book or two peer-reviewed publications.

Service

SUU Policy 6.1.VI.A.3 asserts that “service” generally denotes service to the University and to the profession, and that service to the community may also be considered. Faculty members are expected to perform service to the University at the University, College, and Department levels. Service takes many forms; examples include:

- Serving on or chairing University, College, and Department committees
- Advising student clubs or honor societies
- Organizing film festivals or other cultural events
- Creating and participating in student activities related to the department member’s area of expertise
- Observing student teachers
- Applying expertise to intellectual or social concerns of the campus or local community
- Providing service to disciplinary organizations (e.g., organizing conferences or panel discussions or peer-reviewing books or articles)
- Leading study abroad trips

During annual reviews, department members should be evaluated in relationship to all others, as well as to the standards established in this document. Although service does take many forms, all faculty members are expected to serve on committees as the need arises. The Department acknowledges that some of the

above examples of service are much more time-consuming than others, and that this should be taken into account during the evaluation process. For instance, organizing a conference, directing a study abroad program, or serving on an especially time-consuming committee will count double in the evaluation.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **exceptional performance** when the faculty member has participated in 6 or more of the above.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **standard performance** when the faculty member has participated in 4-5 of the above.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **low performance** when the faculty member has participated in 2-3 of the above.

A faculty member has attained a rating of **unacceptable performance** when the faculty member has participated in 1 or none of the above.

During multi-year reviews (Third Year Review, Tenure and Rank Advancement Review, Post-Tenure Review), minimum service expectations include quality committee participation at the department, college, or university levels.

Collegiality

Collegiality is defined in terms of faculty responsibilities toward students, peers, and administration as addressed in SUU Policy 6.28. Collegiality indicates cooperative relationships among colleagues. The Department accepts a synonymous definition: collegiality is professionalism. Professionalism involves fulfilling the professional standards of behavior toward colleagues, students, staff, and administrators as indicated by the general standards of the professorate and the specific standards of associations representing the faculty member's academic specialization.

Collegiality is a basic expectation of all faculty members; accordingly a faculty member's collegiality will be assessed as either acceptable or unacceptable.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Applicants for tenure and promotion are expected to be active and productive members of the departmental and university community. The Department of Foreign Languages & Philosophy is a dynamic unit dedicated to excellence in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. Collegiality is a basic expectation and is foundational to shared governance.

Minimum expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor include:

1. Teaching effectiveness: an average of 45 or above on IDEA course evaluations during the faculty member's employment at SUU and other proof of efforts to enhance teaching performance. (Faculty members may choose to use either their "raw" or "adjusted" IDEA scores, provided that the raw scores are 45 or higher; otherwise adjusted scores must be used.)
2. Scholarly excellence: One peer-reviewed book or two peer-reviewed publications.
3. Quality service: Consistent quality committee participation and other forms of service to the university and the profession as outlined in the service activities listed previously
4. Collegiality is a basic expectation of all who receive tenure and promotion.

Promotion to Full Professor and Subsequent Post-Tenure Review

The rank of full professor should be conferred on faculty who have demonstrated commitment to the institution and the mission of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service.

University Policy 6.1.V.A.1, describes full professors in the following way: "Their teaching, scholarly/artistic activities, service, and engagement with students should reflect high professional competence." At each post-tenure review, faculty members will be considered to have high professional competence if they have: 1) regularly performed service at the department, college, or university levels (as described in this document); 2) received an average score of 45 or higher on the IDEA student evaluations (raw or adjusted scores may be used, provided raw scores are above 45); and 3) been active in research and scholarship, evidenced by peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, or other ongoing scholarly projects (as described by Boyer's taxonomy of types of scholarship, cited above).