

Southern Utah University
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE
COVER SHEET

Evaluation for
Three-Year Review, Rank Advancement, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review
(to be Completed by Applicant)

EVALUATION FOR
(check as many as applicable)

_____ THREE-YEAR REVIEW
_____ RANK ADVANCEMENT to _____
_____ TENURE
_____ POST-TENURE REVIEW

Date: _____

Name: _____

Department: _____ College: _____

Tenure-track _____ Non-tenure track _____

Highest degree earned _____ Primary teaching field _____
Degree Date Institution

Complete the following information only if you are applying for tenure or advancement in rank.

Number of years of credit granted at time of hiring towards tenure/rank being applied for:

An agreement to grant years towards tenure/rank advancement must be in writing within the initial terms of appointment. Check one of the following:

- ___ Copy of the agreement enclosed.
- ___ Not applicable (no credit was granted).

Complete the following information only if you are applying for advancement in rank.

The total of the nominee's number of years of service at SUU at current rank plus years granted at time of hiring:

Date present rank obtained at this institution: _____. (Put actual date present rank was granted at this institution, do not include credit granted towards rank advancement at time of hiring.)

Instructions

In several places in this document reference is to preparing a faculty portfolio. That portfolio consists of:

For the Three-Year Review:

All annual activity reports and evaluative letters written by the department chair, the department LRT committee and, where applicable, the dean. All documentation supporting the annual activity reports are included as part of this portfolio.

For Rank Advancement and Tenure:

All annual activity reports and any evaluative letters written by the department chair, the department LRT committee and the dean. All documentation supporting the annual activity reports are included as part of this portfolio. Also, include the Three-Year review, including the evaluations by the department chair, department and college LRT committees, and the dean.

For Post-tenure Review:

All annual activity reports and all documentation supporting the annual activity reports.

**PEHP DEPARTMENT
FACULTY EVALUATION**

Approved by the PEHP Department April 2006

Name: _____
Evaluation Period: August 15, _____ through August 14, _____

I. Declaration of Weights for Computing Overall Composite Rating

The faculty member should complete this form and submit it to the Department Chair (DC) prior to the evaluation period. This completed form will be included in the faculty portfolio. All selected percentages should be within the indicated ranges and must total 100%.

1. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (Choose from 30-50%)	_____ %
2. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (Choose from 20-50%)	_____ %
3. SERVICE (Choose from 10-30%)	_____ %
4. COLLEGIALITY:	_10_ %
TOTAL	100 %

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member

Date

Department Chair

Date

**PEHP DEPARTMENT
FACULTY EVALUATION**

Summary of Required Faculty Evaluation Submissions

1. The Faculty Annual Activity Report (FAAR) will be submitted at the end of each academic year to the Department Chair by the first Tuesday in September.
2. A Self-Evaluation Rating Form will also be submitted with the FAAR each year.
3. An annual report with scoring sheet on each faculty will be completed by the Department Chair and delivered to the College Dean by the second Monday of October.
4. Three Year Review, Rank Advancement, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Reviews require the PEHP Department Leave, Rank and Tenure Committee to submit an evaluation. The LRT document will be delivered to the committee by the third Monday of September and must be forwarded to the College LRT Committee by the second Monday of October.

Criteria for Self-Evaluation, DC Evaluation of Faculty, and the PEHP Department LRT Committee

1. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:

Teaching Effectiveness: Consistent with SUU’s mission as defined in R312, teaching is of primary importance. Scholarly and creative achievements should be complementary to the teaching role. Teaching effectiveness can be evaluated through the use of student, peer, department chair, (except the department chair may not evaluate his/her own teaching effectiveness), and self evaluations, or other pertinent information. Student evaluations will be conducted in all classes taught every semester, with the faculty member deciding when in the semester the evaluation will be given. The responses to all teaching-related questions on the student-evaluation instrument will be considered in assessing teaching ability. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness includes instructional delivery/design, and course management skills.

**TABLE 1
100 Point Scoring Rubric for Teaching Effectiveness:**

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 High Performance	<p>Minimum Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 85% or greater of all responses to the 10 questions in the evaluations by students AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE. 2. Positive Ratings by DC and Peers. <p>Meets all of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Course syllabi demonstrate content expertise, strong instructional design and sound evaluation procedures. 4. Faculty narrative indicates a focused and sincere disposition to improving teaching and responding to students’ concerns. 5. Uses technology when appropriate. 6. Teaches new courses or develops new course material or implements new instructional approaches. 7. Attends workshops/conferences or reads materials appropriate for improving teaching.

80-89 Good Performance	Minimum Criteria: 1. 80-84% of all responses to the 10 questions in the evaluations by students AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE. 2. Positive Ratings by DC and Peers. Meets at least 4 of the following 5 criteria: 3. Course syllabi demonstrate content expertise, strong instructional design and sound evaluation procedures. 4. Faculty narrative indicates a focused and sincere disposition to improving teaching and responding to students' concerns. 5. Uses technology when appropriate. 6. Teaches new courses or develops new course material or implements new instructional approaches. 7. Attends workshops/conferences or reads materials appropriate for improving teaching.
70-79 Satisfactory Performance	Minimum Criteria: 1. 75-79% or greater of all responses to the 10 questions in the evaluations by students AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE. 2. Satisfactory Ratings or higher by DC and Peers. Meets 3 of the following 5 criteria: 3. Course syllabi demonstrate content expertise, strong instructional design and sound evaluation procedures. 4. Faculty narrative indicates a focused and sincere disposition to improving teaching and responding to students' concerns. 5. Uses technology when appropriate. 6. Teaches new courses or develops new course material or implements new instructional approaches. 7. Attends workshops/conferences or reads materials appropriate for improving teaching.
< 70 Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating:

$$\frac{\text{Score out of 100}}{\text{Score out of 100}} \times \frac{\text{Weighted \%}}{\text{Weighted \%}} = \frac{\text{Teaching Effectiveness Rating}}{\text{Teaching Effectiveness Rating}}$$

2. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

Scholarly /Creative Activity: The University has adopted the Boyer model for scholarship, as outlined in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Ernest L. Boyer, 1990, Jossey Bass Publishing, ISBN: 0787940690). As approved by the department chair and reviewed for written comment by the dean of the college/school, the faculty of each department develops guidelines stipulating the required amount and kind of scholarly/creative activity expected for tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty members. In the case of a dispute over criteria for scholarly/creative activity, the question will be resolved by a committee of a representative faculty member, department chair, and Dean.

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Scholarly/Creative Activity:

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 High Performance	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 6 credits of approved scholarly activities. <i>See Scholarly/Creative Activities Scoring Guide.</i>
80-89 Good Performance	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 4 credits of approved scholarly activities.
70-79 Satisfactory Performance	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 3 credits of approved scholarly activities.
< 70 Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Scholarly/Creative Activity Rating:

$\frac{\text{Score out of 100}}{\text{Score out of 100}} \times \frac{\text{Weighted \%}}{\text{Weighted \%}} = \frac{\text{Teaching Effectiveness Rating}}{\text{Teaching Effectiveness Rating}}$

Scholarly/Creative Activity Credit Guide

Check those that apply and cite evidence for each one selected. Multiple credits in each area are allowed.

6 credits

- Publication of a book/lab manual/workbook etc. in appropriate academic area
- Funded External Grant over \$25,000.00 (Principal Writer)
- Project Director of external funded grant
- New academic program development (R401 for Board of Regents)
- Principal writer for national accreditation or accreditation review
- Other with justification

2 credits

- Published article in a refereed journal
- Submitted grant (Principal Writer)
- Publication of a book chapter
- Published article in a non-refereed journal or other print or electronic medium
- Assistant Project Director of funded grant
- Presentation at a national or international professional meeting or conference
- Scholarly paper presented at a national or international professional meeting or conference
- Book review for publishing company
- Contributor to new program development (R401)
- Contributor for national accreditation or accreditation review
- Other with justification

1 credit

- Presentation at a state, local or regional professional meeting or conference
- Scholarly paper presented at a local or regional professional meeting or conference
- Development and integration of knowledge into a course that requires learning and applying new methods or technology
- Professional consultation which is submitted in writing to a client
- Funded faculty development grant
- Workshops presentations
- Other with justification

Total Credits

3. SERVICE:

Academic departments define acceptable professional service. Generally, it means service to the University and profession. Professional service to the community may also be considered.

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Service Activity:

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 High Performance	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 6 credits of approved service activities. <i>See Examples of Service Activities.</i>
80-89 Good Performance	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 4 credits of approved service activities.
70-79 Satisfactory Performance	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 3 credits of approved service activities.
< 70 Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Service Activity Rating:

$$\frac{\text{Score out of 100}}{\text{Score out of 100}} \times \frac{\text{Weighted \%}}{\text{Weighted \%}} = \frac{\text{Service Rating}}{\text{Service Rating}}$$

Service Activity Credit Guide:

Check those that apply and briefly cite evidence. Multiple credits in each area are allowed.

6 credits

Serving as president of a national professional organization, board or council

Other with justification

2 credits

Service in the faculty senate

Administrative responsibilities at the university, college, or departmental level

Hold office in a professional society

Serving on a professional organization, board or council

Serving as a member of a campus committee

Serving as an advisor to a student organization

Serving as a graduate committee chair

Hosting off-campus groups, colleagues or other professionals at a formal venue

Student academic advising

LRT Committees

Development of scholarships

Other with justification

1 credit

Service on graduate committee

Participation in a community service activity

Serving as a member of a college or departmental committee

Hosting off-campus groups, colleagues or other professionals at an informal venue

Involvement in organization or direction of a community service activity

Presentations at departmental or interdepartmental seminars or meetings

Recognized accomplishment in professionally related activity

Professional consulting

Writing letters of recommendation for students (maximum 2 credits)

Other with justification

Total credits

4. COLLEGIALITY:

SUU Policy 6.28 defines collegiality

Each faculty member will write a description of contributions to collegiality which is recorded in the FAAR document. This narrative should include information on how the faculty's efforts and activities satisfy the rank or tenure requirement of attitude toward work, students, and colleagues. This narrative may include letters of support from department colleagues or administrators within or without the department/college and letters of support from students.

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Collegiality:

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 High Performance	Minimum Criteria: Meets all of the defined professional responsibilities as defined in <i>Policy # 6.28</i> with consistency.
70-89 Satisfactory to Good Performance	Minimum Criteria: Practices the defined professional responsibilities as defined in <i>Policy # 6.28</i> with non-frequent minor violations.
< 70 Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Collegiality Rating:

$$\frac{\text{Score out of 100}}{\text{Score out of 100}} \times \frac{\text{Weighted \%}}{\text{Weighted \%}} = \text{Collegiality Rating:}$$

**PEHP DEPARTMENT
FACULTY EVALUATION
SUMMARY RATING FORM**

- 1. Teaching Effectiveness Rating _____
 - 2. Scholarly/Creative Activity Rating _____
 - 3. Service Rating _____
 - 4. Collegiality Rating* _____
(*A minimum Collegiality Rating of 7 is required to be eligible for tenure or rank advancement.)
- Total Combined Rating** _____

Minimum combined ratings for tenure, rank advancement and tenure review:

- 1. For advancement to Assistant Professor 70
- 2. For advancement to Associate Professor and Tenure 80
- 3. For advancement to Full Professor 85
- 4. For post tenure review 75

Formal application for tenure, rank and tenure review will be submitted on approved SUU forms available on Provost's Web-page. Time-line for evaluation submittals are as follows:

Deadline Schedule
Activity Report, Three-Year Review, Promotion and Tenure

To:	Annual Activity Report (6.1A)	Three-Year Review (6.1B)	Rank Advancement (6.1C)	Tenure (6.1D)	Post-Tenure Review (6.1D)
Department Chair	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September
Department LRT	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September
College/School LRT	NA	Second Monday of October	Second Monday of October	Second Monday of October	Second Monday of October
Dean	Second Monday of October	First Monday of November	First Monday of November	First Monday of November	First Monday of November
University LRT	NA	NA	First Monday of December	First Monday of December	NA
Provost	NA	November 22	January 31	January 31	NA
Review by Chair with Faculty	December 15	December 15	NA	NA	NA