

**Southern Utah University
Beverley Taylor Sorenson College of Education and Human Development
Department of Teacher Education and Family Development**

COVER SHEET

**Application 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
 - Lecturer to Assistant Professor
 - Assistant to Associate Professor
 - Associate to Full Professor
- Tenure
- Post-Tenure Review
- Merit Pay (In order to qualify for Merit Pay, if available, the Total Combined Effectiveness Rating must be at least 90 points or greater. Department and College LRT Committees must concur.)

Date: _____

Name: _____

Department: _____

College: _____

Primary teaching field _____

Tenure Track _____ Non-tenure Track _____

Highest Degree Earned: _____ Date: _____ Institution: _____

Date Hired at SUU: _____

Faculty Evaluation Process

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.)

Three-Year Review	Tenure	Rank Advancement	Post-tenure Review	
NA	NA	NA	NA	Current FAAR
X	X	X	X	Prior Annual Reviews (FAARS and evaluative letters)
	X			Three year Review
X				Work done that resulted in years granted toward tenure and/or rank advancement.
X	X	X	X	Supporting Documentation as determined by Department

Faculty Evaluation Process

Name: _____

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

I. Declaration of Weights for Computing Overall Composite Rating

It is encouraged that each faculty member develop a balanced portfolio that highlights their strengths as well as areas of professional growth and accomplishments. It is advised that the faculty member meet with their Department Chair prior to the end of each academic year to discuss items and activities to be included in their portfolio. The faculty member should complete this form and submit it to the Department Chair following University guidelines. 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 40-60%) _____ %
- 2. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (Choose from 20-50%) _____ %
- 3. SERVICE (Choose from 10-30%) _____ %
- 4. COLLEGIALLY: 10% %

- TOTAL **100 %**

(Non-Tenure track faculty may count up to 75% of Teaching Effectiveness towards the annual review upon approval of the Department Chair)

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member

Date

Department Chair

Date

Faculty Evaluation Process

Instructions

In this document reference is made in several places to the preparation a faculty portfolio. That portfolio may consists of:

For the Three-Year Review:

All annual FAAR activity reports and evaluative letters written by the department chair, the department LRT committee and, where applicable, the dean. (All documentation supporting the annual FAAR activity report should be available upon request.)

For Rank Advancement and Tenure:

All annual FAAR activity reports and any evaluative letters written by the department chair, the department LRT committee and the dean, as well as, the Three-Year review, including the evaluations by the department chair, department and college LRT committees, and the dean. (All documentation supporting the annual FAAR activity report should be available upon request.)

For Post-tenure Review:

All annual FAAR activity reports and any evaluative letters written by the department chair, the department LRT committee, the college LRT committee, and the dean . (All documentation supporting the annual FAAR activity report should be available upon request.)

Summary of Required Faculty Evaluation Submissions

1. The Faculty Annual Activity Report (FAAR) will be submitted at the beginning of each academic year to the Department Chair by the first Tuesday in September. See Appendix A.
2. A Self-Evaluation Rating Form will also be submitted with the FAAR each year as identified in this policy.
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 Department of Teacher Education and Family Development 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, Department Chair Evaluation of Faculty, and the TED 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. Check those that apply and cite evidence for each one selected. Multiple credits in each area are allowed, except where noted.

Activity	Points
3 - 6 points	
• Cumulative response on student evaluations above 85% positive	3
• Receipt of University, state, or national teaching award	1 - 3
• Attending at least three workshops/seminars that focus on teaching effectiveness	3
• Any teaching strategy or methodology communicated to Department Chair or Dean that contributes to the University/College/Department's Strategic Goals.	
• Development of a new course with documentation	3
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
2 Points	
• Cumulative response on student evaluations between 80% - 85% positive	2
• Attending at least two workshops/seminars that focus on teaching effectiveness	2
• Peer evaluation with response, conducted by a member of the department	2
• Peer evaluation with response, conducted by a member outside of the department	2
• Substantial Redesign of course content with documentation	2
• Unique utilization of technological applications embedded in course with documentation	2
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
1 Point	
• Cumulative response on student evaluations between 75% - 79% positive	1
• Documented evidence of an appropriate response to student evaluation data	1
• Attending at least one workshop/seminar that focuses on teaching effectiveness	1
• Guest lecture in another faculty member's course	1
• Informal feedback requested by professor during semester for mid-course changes (What should I stop? What should I start, what should I do more of?)	1
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
Total Points	_____

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Teaching Effectiveness:

Faculty Evaluation Process

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 Exceptional Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participation in no less than 6 credits of approved Teaching Effectiveness Activities in Scoring Guide.
80-89 Standard Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participation in no less than 4 credits of approved Teaching Effectiveness Activities in the Scoring Guide.
70-79 Low Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participation in no less than 3 credits of approved Teaching Effectiveness Activities in the Scoring Guide.
< 70 Unacceptable Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating:

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

Faculty Evaluation Process

2. Scholarly/Creative Activity

Scholarly/Creative Contribution: 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. Check those that apply and cite evidence for each one selected. Multiple credits in each area are allowed, except where noted.

Activity	Points
3-6 Points	
• Funded Grant totaling over \$25,000	6
• Funded Grant totaling over \$5,000	4
• Paper published in a Refereed National Print or Online journal	3
• Refereed Presentation at a National Conference or Meeting	3
• Presentation at a Refereed State or Regional Conference or Meeting with students	4
• Presentation at a Refereed State or Regional Conference or Meeting	3
• Principal Investigator of original research (To clarify with Department Chair)	3
• Produce or perform original creative work (e.g. artistic performance, creation of original work of art, plays, poetry, literature, and electronic media) Limit 2	3
• Author of a book	6
• Co-Author of a book	3-4
• Chapter of a Book	3
• Any scholarly activity assigned by the Department Chair or Dean to accomplish the University/College/Department's strategic goals	3 - 6
• Lead Auditor for national accreditation (3 pts. per visit)	3
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
2 Points	
• Paper published in a Refereed State or Regional Print or Online journal	2
• Funded Grants totaling less than \$5,000	2
• Development of New Workshop/In-service provided to school/school district (up to 3/yr) (Presentation goes under teaching or service, can not be counted in both)	2
• Other - End Product contributes to field of study, text that is descriptive of your work Must be pre-approved in writing by department chair in Writing	2
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
1 Point	
• Team member of a research project	1
• Other presentations at local, state or regional conferences	1
• Paper published in a popular journal or publication print or online	1
• Presentation given at a School District or local venue	1
• Consulting Auditor for national accreditation	1
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
Total Points	_____

Faculty Evaluation Process

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Scholarly/Creative Activity:

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 Exceptional Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 6 credits of approved scholarly/creative activities in Scoring Guide. See Scholarly/Creative Activities Scoring Guide.
80-89 Standard Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 4 credits of approved scholarly/creative activities in Scoring Guide.
70-79 Low Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 3 credits of approved scholarly/creative activities in Scoring Guide.
< 70 Unacceptable Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Scholarly/Creative Activity Rating:

$$\frac{\text{Score out of 100}}{\text{Score out of 100}} \times \frac{\text{Weighted \%}}{\text{Weighted \%}} = \text{Scholarly/Creative Activity Rating}$$

Faculty Evaluation Process

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. In the case of a dispute over criteria for a service-related activity, the question will be resolved by a committee of a representative faculty member, department chair, and Dean. Check those that apply and cite evidence for each one selected. Multiple credits in each area are allowed, except where noted.

Activity	Points
3 Points	
• Officer in a National Organization	3
• Active Service on National Committees	3
• Service award given by a State or National group	3
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
2 Points	
• Active Service on State and Regional Committees (limit 3)	2
• Active Service on University Committees (limit 3)	2
• Officer of a State or Regional Organization	2
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
1 Point	
• Active Service on College and Department Committees (Limit 3)	1
• Active Service on Graduate Thesis Committees (limit 6)	1
• Member of a National Organization (limit 3)	1
• Member of a State or Regional Organization (limit 3)	1
• Community service (Include documentation)	1
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
Total Points	_____

Faculty Evaluation Process

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Service:

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 Exceptional Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 6 credits of approved service activities in Scoring Guide.
80-89 Standard Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 4 credits of approved service activities in Scoring Guide.
70-79 Low Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 3 credits of approved service activities in Scoring Guide.
< 70 Unacceptable Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Service Rating:

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

Faculty Evaluation Process

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

Activity	Points
3 Points	
• Letter of support from College or University administration (limit 2)	3
• Letter of support from University peers/colleagues within the department (limit 2)	3
• Letter of support from peers/colleagues outside of the department (limit 2)	3
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
2 Points	
• Mentoring of new faculty (Include documentation)	2
• Involvement in peer or department learning communities (Include documentation)	2
• Involvement with peer(s) in a collaborative endeavor (Include documentation)	2
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	
1 Point	
• Attendance at faculty meetings	1
• Positive interaction with faculty, staff, and colleagues (Include documentation)	1
• Positive interaction with professional colleagues (Include documentation)	1
• Positive interaction with students (Include documentation)	1
• Other agreed upon by faculty and department chair. _____	

Faculty Evaluation Process

100 Point Scoring Rubric for Collegiality:

Point Value	Criteria
90-100 Exceptional Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 6 credits of approved collegiality activities in Scoring Guide.
80-89 Standard Professional Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 4 credits of approved collegiality activities in Scoring Guide.
70-79 Low Performance (Department Chair, Dean, and LRT Committees to approve point allocation)	Minimum Criteria: Participated in no less than 3 credits of approved collegiality activities in Scoring Guide.
< 70 Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory Performance.

Overall Collegiality Rating:

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

Faculty Evaluation Process

**Department of Teacher Education and Family Development
Faculty Evaluation Summary Rating Form**

1. Teaching Effectiveness Rating _____
2. Scholarly/Creative Activity Rating _____
3. Service Rating _____
4. Collegiality Rating _____

(A minimum Collegiality score of above 70 is required to be eligible for tenure and rank advancement.)

Total Combined Rating _____

The minimum *average of combined ratings over a period of three years* is required for tenure, rank advancement and post-tenure review using the following University guidelines:

1. For Advancement to Assistant Professor from Lecturer rank 80 %
2. For Advancement to Associate Professor and Tenure 80 %
3. For Advancement to Full Professor 85 %
4. For Post-Tenure Review 75 %
5. For Continuing Contract for Non-Tenure Track Faculty 75 %

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

APPENDIX A

Deadline Schedule for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Appendix A Policy 6.1

To:	Annual Review (F.A.A.R.) (6.1.1)	Three- Year Review (6.1.2)	Rank Advancement (6.1.3)	Tenure (6.1.4)	Post-Tenure Review (6.1.4)	Sabbatical Leave Request
Department Chair	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	First Tuesday of September	Second Monday of October
Department LRT	*Third Monday of September- For tenured faculty, only needed if Merit Pay sought or if sub-standard evaluation by Chair	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September	Third Monday of September	NA
College/School LRT	NA	Second Monday of October	Second Monday of October	Second Monday of October	Second Monday of October	NA
Dean	Second Monday of October	First Monday of November	First Monday of November	First Monday of November	First Monday of November	Last Wednesday of October
University LRT	NA	NA	First Monday of December	First Monday of December	NA	Second Monday of November
Provost	NA	Third Monday of November	Last Monday of January	Last Monday of January	Last Friday of December	Second Monday of December
Review by Chair with Faculty	Second Friday of December	Second Friday of December	NA	NA	NA	

* If there is a sub-standard evaluation by the Dean after a positive FAAR evaluation by the Chair, then the FAAR is sent to the Department LRT Committee for input, and the due date for their input in this case is extended to the 4th Monday in October. In any case, Department LRT input on a FAAR is only given once in any academic year.