

## POLICY #6.1

### SUBJECT: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure [TEMPORARY]

---

#### I. PURPOSE

The Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure process at Southern Utah University (hereafter the University) develops, supports, and celebrates Student-Centric Faculty Engagement in alignment with the values and mission of the University.

This Policy establishes clear expectations, roles, and timelines for faculty support, development, and advancement. This framework also guides Departments in creating a culture of shared responsibility for continuous improvement as well as the development of clear and current criteria for Faculty advancement.

This Policy establishes a framework of expectations and processes for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure for Non-Tenure-Track (NTT), Tenure-Track (TT), and Tenured Faculty and Academic Administrators. While the granting of Tenure for individual applicants is not guaranteed, this Policy is grounded in the belief that all Faculty can achieve Promotion and Tenure (as applicable to their position) and deserve transparency, open communication, and support as they progress through that advancement process.

---

#### II. REFERENCES

- A. [American Association of University Professors](#) (AAUP) (accessed February 25, 2018)
- B. Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), [High Impact Practices](#) (accessed February 25, 2018)
- C. Southern Utah University [Policy 0.0 Policy Development Authority](#)
- D. Southern Utah University [Policy 5.18 Nepotism](#)
- E. Southern Utah University [Policy 6.0 Definition of Faculty](#)
- F. Southern Utah University [Policy 6.2 Academic Officers](#)
- G. Southern Utah University [Policy 6.15 Faculty Leaves](#)
- H. Southern Utah University [Policy 6.22 Faculty Due Process](#)

- I. Southern Utah University [Policy 6.28 Faculty Professional Responsibility](#)
  - J. Southern Utah University [Policy 9.7 Family and Medical Leave](#)
  - K. Utah Code [§ 53B-2-106.1 Tenure – Reporting](#)
  - L. Utah System of Higher Education [Policy R312 Utah System of Higher Education and Institutional Missions and Roles](#)
  - M. Utah System of Higher Education [Policy R481 Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-Tenure Review](#)
- 

### III. DEFINITIONS

- A. Academic Administrator: A Faculty member who serves as a non-executive-level academic leader and administrative head of a Department or unit (e.g., Department Chair, or Associate Department Chair).
- B. Advanced Faculty: Associate NTT Professors, Associate Professors and Professors with Tenure, and Academic Administrators with Tenure at the Associate Professor or Professor rank.
- C. Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM): The AIM is an annual meeting where the Department Chair and Faculty member come together to align and integrate the areas of focus for the Faculty member with the Department's needs. During this meeting, they discuss and agree upon the expected Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (as applicable) for the upcoming academic year. The goal of the meeting is to ensure that the discussions and determinations made by the Faculty member and Department Chair align with the DEC.
- D. Conflict of Interest: Any circumstance in which an individual's financial, professional, or personal considerations may directly or indirectly affect, or reasonably appear to affect, an individual's professional judgment in exercising any University duty or responsibility.
- E. Departmental Evaluation Criteria (DEC): Department-created and maintained standards and expectations for Promotion and Tenure and Good Standing for Non-Tenure-Track, Tenure-Track, Tenured Faculty, and Academic Administrators.
- F. Evaluative Entity: A Faculty member, Administrator, or Committee responsible for evaluating Faculty. Evaluative Entities include the Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, Department Chair, College/School P&T Committee, Dean, University P&T Committee, and Provost.
- G. Evaluative Letter: A document written by any Evaluative Entity that assesses an evaluated Faculty member's activities as documented in a FEC Report or Mid-Point Review, Promotion, Tenure, or Five-Year Review application, and the alignment of

those documented activities with DEC, the definition of Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission.

- H. Evaluative Ratings: Ratings assigned by an Evaluative Entity and included as part of an Evaluative Letter. Evaluative Entities assign one of the following Evaluative Ratings for Annual FEC Reports (Non-tenured faculty)), and Mid-Point Review applications:

1. Acceptable Progress or
2. Development is Required or
3. Recommendation for Non-Reappointment

For all other applications (i.e., Promotion and/or Tenure and Five-Year Review), Evaluative Entities provide either a "yes" or "no" vote (including the number of "yes" and "no" votes). A "yes" vote indicates recommending Promotion and/or Tenure or continuing in Good Standing (in the case of a Five-Year Review). A "no" vote indicates not recommending Promotion and/or Tenure or not continuing in Good Standing (in the case of the Five-Year Review).

- I. Evidence-Based Practices: Teaching and Scholarly/Creative practices and other engagement strategies that are supported with qualitative and/or quantitative data.

- J. Faculty: See [Policy 6.0](#).

1. Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT): Faculty with term appointments who are not eligible for Tenure as set out in [Policy 6.0](#). NTT Faculty may hold the following ranks in order of rank progression.
  - a. Lecturer: The title of Lecturer is an entry-level (NTT) Faculty position. Lecturers have the primary responsibility for effective teaching while maintaining currency in their field and a secondary responsibility for Departmental participation.
  - b. Assistant Professor (NTT): This rank is an appointment for those with at least five (5) years of experience at the University as a Lecturer or those who have been directly hired into the rank of 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. Application for advancement to Assistant Professor (NTT) may be submitted at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year as a full-time Lecturer.

- c. Associate Professor (NTT): This rank is an appointment for those with at least seven (7) years of experience at the University as an Assistant Professor (NTT). 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. Applications for advancement to Associate Professor (NTT) may be submitted at the conclusion of the sixth complete academic year as a full-time Assistant Professor (NTT).
- d. Clinical Faculty: Clinical Faculty as well as their promotion criteria and evaluation procedures are defined in [Policy 6.0](#).
2. Tenure-Track (TT) and Tenured Faculty: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty are defined in [Policy 6.0](#). Tenure-Track Faculty will hold the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Tenured Faculty will hold either the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. If DEC is not developed for the ranks below, Evaluative Entities should use the definitions in this Policy. Rank descriptions are listed below in order of rank progression.
- a. Assistant Professor: The rank of Assistant Professor is an initial appointment in the Tenure-track. 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.
- b. Associate Professor: The rank of Associate Professor is an appointment for those with at least seven (7) full years of experience at Southern Utah University as an Assistant Professor (minus any years granted toward tenure/rank advancement at the time of hire) or those who have been directly hired into the rank of 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. Applications for advancement to

Associate Professor (and Tenure) are submitted at the conclusion of the sixth academic year as a full-time Assistant Professor. Early Tenure applications are possible. The process for this is given elsewhere in this Policy.

- c. Professor: The rank of Professor is an appointment granted to those who have earned a terminal degree in their field and have completed at least five years of service at the University as an Associate 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. The promotion to Professor is a significant milestone in an academic career and represents high achievement and recognition within the academic community. Applications for advancement to Professor may be submitted at the conclusion of the fifth complete academic year as a full-time Associate Professor.

3. Special Appointments: Special Appointments (e.g., Professional in Residence, Artist in Residence, Distinguished Fellow) are defined in [Policy 6.0](#).

4. Professor Emeritus: Emeritus Faculty are defined in [Policy 6.0](#).

- K. Faculty Dashboard: A web page designed to support Faculty and Evaluators in the Promotion and Tenure process. This [web page](#) can be found on the SUU Portal.
- L. Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report (FEC Report): A reflective narrative in which evaluated Faculty describe those duties and activities they performed during the previous academic year and how the duties and activities align with their DEC, the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model, and the University Mission.
- M. Good Standing: A status Faculty members achieve by maintaining a high level of Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, Scholarly/Creative achievement, and professional conduct toward the University and profession. The status of Good Standing is exclusively applicable to the Five-Year Review.

- N. Junior Faculty: Junior Faculty consists of two groups of faculty members. The first group includes NTT Faculty who have been hired at the rank of Lecturer and are in their first full five (5) years of employment with the University or who have been hired at the rank of Assistant and are in their first full seven (7) years of employment with the University. The second group includes TT Faculty who have been hired at the rank of Assistant in their first full seven years of employment with the University or hired at the rank of Associate in their first full four (4) years of employment with the University.
- O. Late Submission: The failure to comply with the schedule outlined in this Policy for submitting an annual FEC Report, or application for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, or Five-Year Review.
- P. Mentoring: A non-evaluative process that provides Junior Faculty members with non-evaluative guidance and support as they navigate the challenges of academic life and pursue their professional goals that may include Promotion and Tenure.
- Q. Mentee: A Junior Faculty member being mentored by an Advanced Faculty member. A Mentee is typically pursuing Promotion and/or Tenure.
- R. Mentor: An Advanced Faculty member who provides non-evaluative guidance and support to a Junior Faculty Member, known as the Mentee, during the Promotion and Tenure process.
- S. Non-Reappointment: A separation by which the University ends its employment relationship with probationary- or term-contract Faculty members at the end of a contract period.
- T. Peer Review: The evaluation of a Faculty's Scholarly/Creative product by experts in the same or related occupation, profession, or industry (peers).
- U. Pertinent Information: Any significant and applicable data, facts, or particulars directly related to evaluating a Faculty member's qualifications for annual evaluation, Promotion or Tenure.
- V. Promotion: Advancement in rank as defined under Section III.J. Faculty.
- W. Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee: An Evaluative Entity at the Department, College/School, or University level that evaluates Faculty in the Promotion and Tenure process.
- X. Scholarly/Creative Activities: Purposeful and intentional activities that seek to provide new knowledge or understanding to a particular field of study. These activities are skillfully interpreted and deployed and are deeply informed by current knowledge in a Faculty member's field of study and expertise. Scholarly and Creative Activities are of

equal value and importance to the University and may lead to innovative curriculum, and/or integrate thoughts and ideas from diverse disciplines or areas of inquiry.

- Y. Service/Leadership: Participation (usually by term of appointment) in the operation or function of a Faculty member's Department, College/School, University, community, or professional field and its organizations. Such Service/Leadership is vital to the Shared Governance of the University.
- Z. Shared Governance: Shared Governance provides various individuals and groups a voice in key decision-making processes through elected, appointed, or volunteered representation. It allows for the primary decision-making responsibility or input and recommendation responsibility to be delegated to specific constituencies under well-defined conditions. The concept of Shared Governance recognizes the interdependence of the various individuals and groups involved in campus governance, requires communication, and provides opportunities for joint planning and effort.
- AA. Student-Centric Faculty Engagement: Purposeful and intentional activities or contributions in the areas of Teaching, Service/Leadership, or Scholarly/Creative Activities, whether curricular, co-curricular, or extracurricular, that help students become informed, responsible, and productive members of society who explore diverse ideas, disciplines, skills, cultures, and places.
- BB. Teaching Effectiveness: The ability of a Faculty member to engage students in the learning process, facilitate critical thinking and intellectual growth, and achieve desired learning outcomes. Consistent with the University Mission, teaching is of primary importance. Teaching Effectiveness is a crucial component evaluated in the decision-making process for reviews and granting a Faculty member Promotion and/or Tenure. It is assessed through multiple measures, such as the documentation of and reflection on the use of approaches, and strategies that lead to improved student learning and achievement, student feedback, peer and Department Chair evaluations, classroom observations, professional development activities, and/or other Pertinent Information. Teaching efforts may involve the overlap of Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and/or Scholarly/Creative Activities.
- CC. Tenure: A condition of a continuous appointment that can only be terminated under specific circumstances and after receiving the right to due process (see [Policies 6.22](#) and [6.28](#)).
- DD. University Mission: The mission statement of the University as defined in Utah System of Higher Education Policy R312.



---

## IV. POLICY

Scope and Limitations: This Policy covers general criteria and processes for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure. It also describes the types of criteria and processes to be defined at the Departmental level. It does not cover sabbatical leave (see [Policy 6.15](#)). If there is any contradiction or disagreement between this Policy and any other 6.X policies, this Policy shall take precedence. In the event of a conflict with this Policy and other governing policies or laws, the order of precedence set out in [Policy 0.0](#) controls.

Applicability: This Policy applies to Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, Tenure-Track Faculty, Tenured Faculty, and Special Appointments at Southern Utah University with full-time or part-time appointments, on-campus or off-campus, and to Academic Administrators. This Policy does not apply to at-will appointees, such as adjuncts, emergency hires, visiting Faculty, or Emeriti.

Policy Sections: The Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure process hinges on 1) Departments carefully creating and maintaining standards and expectations for evaluation, Promotion and Tenure as articulated in the Departmental Evaluation Criteria (DEC) and making the DEC accessible to all Faculty; 2) Faculty having open communication with the Department Chair via a formal Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM) to discuss the upcoming academic year and related Faculty activities; 3) Junior Faculty receiving consistent support from Faculty Mentors as they progress toward P&T; and 4) Faculty receiving feedback on their progress toward P&T from thorough, thoughtful, and unbiased review. Thus, the Policy contains guidance on the following sections:

[Section IV.D. Evaluation Criteria](#)

[Section IV.E. Alignment and Integration Meeting](#)

[Section IV.F. Mentoring](#)

[Section IV.G. Evaluation Process](#)

Evaluation Criteria:

Departmental Evaluation Criteria (DEC) Committee: The foundation of Promotion and Tenure Evaluations are carefully created and maintained DEC, which are critical to the success of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process. Departments form a DEC Committee to create and maintain the



DEC, though individual faculty may be tasked to accomplish drafts or other input for the DEC. The DEC Committee consists of at least three (3) Department Faculty members, including a committee chair, who is, whenever possible, a Tenured Faculty member. The DEC Committee is created and organized according to Departmental guidelines for Faculty committee appointments. Committee members serve for three (3) years on a rotating basis. At least one (1) member should be replaced each year. Required Elements of the DEC: The University values academic contributions that support the student-centered University Mission. The central input into DEC are the elements of the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model shown below. Each category in the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model is defined in the Definitions section of this Policy. Note that the graphic is meant to illustrate the interconnected nature of Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities but does not imply that DEC should place equal weight on these areas. The extent of overlap will vary by individual Faculty members and across Departments.

### **Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model**



Using the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model as the basis of establishing evaluation criteria, the DEC Committee crafts the DEC based on input and feedback from Faculty within their Department. The DEC Committee may need to consider guidelines from programmatic accreditation in crafting the DEC.

While this Policy does not dictate the details of evaluation criteria, this

Policy outlines required elements. The DEC shall:

1. Reflect the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model by defining specific standards and expectations that include evaluation guidelines for Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship/Creative Activity (including requirements for Peer Review) to achieve each specific Faculty rank, and thereafter remain in Good Standing, set forth in the "Faculty" definition (Section III.J.) and Tenure (as applicable) for NTT Faculty, TT Faculty, Tenured Faculty, Academic Administrators, Faculty with partial reassignments, and Faculty wishing to apply for early Tenure.
  - a. While participating as a Mentor is not a required activity for advancement, the DEC must specify that voluntary participation as a Mentor is considered one form of demonstrating Service/Leadership.
2. Define standards and expectations for Faculty with Special Appointments that include evaluation guidelines for Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship/Creative Activity (including requirements for Peer Review). Note that Faculty with Special Appointments are subject only to completing annual AIMS and submitting Annual FEC Reports.
3. Include a variety of measures of Teaching Effectiveness outside of student feedback. The University acknowledges that Teaching Effectiveness is difficult to measure, that student feedback results may be subject to bias, and that student feedback results should not be the sole measure of evaluating Teaching Effectiveness. DEC measures of Teaching Effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, documentation of and reflection on 1) implementation of high-impact teaching practices; 2) professional development activities directly related to improving Teaching Effectiveness; 3) peer and/or Department Chair evaluations of teaching practices (Department Chairs may only evaluate their own Teaching Effectiveness as a self-reflection); or 4) Service/Leadership or Scholarly/Creative Activities that relate wholly or in part to Teaching Effectiveness.
4. Include a variety of measures of each area of the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model. Examples may include, but are not limited to, utilizing High Impact Practices as defined by the

Association of American Colleges and Universities, mentoring student projects and creative endeavors, co-authoring student-generated scholarly papers or professional presentations, participating in programs that enhance students' global perspective, being involved with student clubs and other organizations, participating in Scholarly/Creative Activities, participation in formalized community-engaged learning projects, providing educational opportunities for the University community, and implementing cooperative educational programs with community partners.

5. List required and suggested documents for Faculty to include in their FEC Reports or applications of Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, or Five-Year Review. University-driven student feedback is always required documentation for all FEC Reports and applications for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, and Five-Year Review. Faculty members who serve as instructors of record for any course must include all such feedback provided by the University for those courses, except for those in which the Faculty member is uncompensated.
6. Define procedures for Faculty seeking redress relating to measures of Teaching Effectiveness including outliers in student feedback or evaluations of Scholarly/Creative work.

Approval of the DEC: Approving the DEC occurs in the following order: Department Faculty, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost.

At any level of review, the reviewer can return the DEC to the previous approver for editing. The Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost must approve the DEC. The approved DEC must be dated, labeled current, and posted on the Faculty Dashboard, at which point it becomes effective.

In cases where a consensus cannot be reached at all levels for the completion of a DEC, the matter will be resolved by a committee comprised of the Provost, Dean, Department Chair, and the DEC Committee Chair.

The Department Chair shall make reasonable efforts so that the DEC Committee reviews the DEC at least every three (3) years and revises as needed with the same approval process as above. Should the Department

Chair fail to fulfill these responsibilities pursuant to [Policy 6.2](#), participation in Faculty Promotion and Tenure process, the DEC Committee Chair will notify the Dean.

Faculty Professional Responsibility: It is the sole responsibility of the Faculty member to prepare and submit a complete FEC Report or application for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, or Five-Year Review demonstrating alignment with DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission. Additionally, Faculty are expected to follow [Policy 6.28](#) in their professional efforts and adhere to the deadline schedule in [Appendix B](#).

As described in Section IV.G. Evaluation Process, when prioritizing their work and creating their FEC Report or application for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, or Five-Year Review, Faculty articulate how their contributions align with the DEC. Faculty apply guidance received from their Department Chair at their annual AIM and advice from their Faculty Mentor to effectively integrate their Faculty responsibilities, DEC, and the Student-Centric University Mission. However, it is important to note that some Faculty contributions, especially in the areas of Service/Leadership and Scholarly/Creative Activities, may still align with DEC and the Student-Centric University Mission even when they do not directly relate to students.

Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM): The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair or Associate Chair and Faculty members. All Faculty (Advanced and Junior) participate in an AIM annually before June 30 with most occurring between January and April. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement, newly hired Junior Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two (2) weeks of the start of contract.

In the AIM, the Department Chair and Faculty communicate, discuss, and agree upon expected Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (as applicable) for the subsequent academic year. Associate Department Chairs or Program Directors may assist the Department Chair in completing the AIM including

documenting the meeting on the Faculty Dashboard. If an Associate Department Chair or Program Director completes the AIM with a Faculty member, the Department Chair reviews meeting comments on the Faculty Dashboard and marks the AIM as reviewed. Mentors may attend the AIM at the Mentee's request.

These activities should align with the Faculty member's DEC and University Mission and address professional development and learning advancement. If a Department's DEC is unclear or does not exist, the Department Chair and Faculty member should approach the AIM using the principles of Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, the University Mission, and the criteria outlined in this Policy. The AIM intends to increase communication and acknowledge Faculty contributions.

In relation to the AIM, Department Chairs are responsible for monitoring both the teaching and Service/Leadership workload of their Faculty to ensure that Faculty are assigned an appropriate amount of teaching and Department, College/School, and University/ad hoc committee work, and that equity exists among members of the Department.

The Department Chair and individual Faculty document their agreement or disagreement, including notes regarding expected Faculty activities in the Faculty Dashboard.

Faculty may, but do not have to include AIM documentation in their report and/or application(s). AIM documentation from one (1) or more years may be downloaded from the Faculty Dashboard and included to provide context in understanding and interpreting previous and current FEC Reports, and applications for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, and Five-Year Review. In the event this information is not included in the report and/or application, Evaluative Entities other than the Department Chair will not have access to current or previous AIM documentation.

#### Faculty Responsibilities:

1. Approach the AIM with the intent to grow and develop and to promote positive change.

2. Articulate their intended contributions for the upcoming academic year and how those contributions align with DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission.
3. Use the Faculty Dashboard to record the following required information: 1) completion of the AIM; 2) Faculty-specific Service or Teaching expectations; and 3) any points of disagreement between Department Chair and Faculty. Faculty may use the Faculty Dashboard to record extenuating personal or professional circumstances that, if shared, may provide relevant background to Evaluators in reviewing Faculty submissions. Faculty are responsible for including AIM documentation, downloaded from the Faculty Dashboard, if desired, when submitting evaluation documents. Including AIM documentation in evaluation documents may be particularly relevant when the Department Chair and Faculty agree on re-assignment(s) of duties.
4. Meet annually with their assigned Mentor prior to the AIM, if desired, until the successful completion of the Midpoint Review.

Department Chair Responsibilities:

1. Schedule an AIM with Faculty at the appropriate frequency.
2. Assist Faculty in maintaining alignment with the DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission.
3. Discuss Faculty's alignment with teaching responsibilities, job description, and Departmental needs.
4. Discuss and assign a Mentor as applicable.
5. Facilitate setting of Faculty goals and provide feedback as Faculty progress through the next academic year.
6. Use the Faculty Dashboard to record the following required information: 1) completion of the AIM; 2) Faculty-specific Service or Teaching expectations; and 3) any points of disagreement between Department Chair and Faculty.

Dean Responsibilities:

1. Ensure that Department Chairs hold an AIM at the appropriate frequency.
2. In the case of a dispute between the Faculty member and the Department Chair regarding AIM discussions, the Dean or Associate Dean will serve as arbiter as Departmental needs and policies dictate. The Faculty Dashboard will be used to inform the Dean or Associate Dean of the issue.

Mentoring: Mentoring is essential to supporting Junior Faculty in the first three (3) years of the P&T process, but it is important to note: Current Mentors are not part of their Mentee's evaluation process. Mentors play a critical supportive role in guiding and encouraging Junior Faculty. Mentors must recuse themselves from evaluating Mentees during mentorship and at least one (1) academic year following the completion of mentorship. In such instances the Evaluative Entity will utilize an alternate Evaluator. Participation as a Mentor is entirely voluntary. Mentors must have a desire for and a strong commitment to active engagement with the Mentee.

Mentoring Process:

1. The Department Chair assigns one (1) Mentor to each newly hired Junior Faculty member no later than the newly hired Junior Faculty member's contract start date. Junior Faculty may request and be assigned a specific available Mentor with the approval of the Department Chair.
2. Mentors and Mentees hold at least one (1) scheduled meeting per semester, whether virtual or in person, to discuss any Mentee needs related to job responsibilities or progress toward P&T. Mentors and Mentees document the date of the meeting in the Faculty Dashboard. Mentors and Mentees may include notes or comments from the meeting in the Faculty Dashboard.
3. The Department Chair annually assesses both the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship and Departmental Mentoring needs. The Department Chair may reassign Mentors and Mentees as necessary. In addition, Mentees or Mentors may request a change in mentoring relationships. To the extent possible, Department Chairs ensure the continuity of effective mentoring relationships.
4. Mentorship is required until the successful completion of the Mentee's Mid-Point Review. A Junior Faculty member continues Mentorship past this point only if the Junior Faculty member requests it or if the Department Chair deems further Mentorship necessary to the progression of the Junior Faculty member. Sufficient Mentors must be available, and a Mentor must agree to further Mentorship.

Mentor Requirements and Expectations: Mentors will:

1. Hold one of the following statuses: 1) Professor with tenure, 2) Advanced Faculty, or 3) NTT Faculty with seven (7) years of



continuous employment at SUU and at least one rank advancement.

2. Assist Mentees in understanding the DEC, offer guidance and support in navigating the P&T process. Mentors must be familiar with the DEC and this Policy to support Mentees effectively.
3. Complete an annual training coordinated by the Dean. In circumstances where Mentors are from a different Department or College/School, Mentors will complete the annual training coordinated by the Mentee's Dean (or be trained by the dean) and become familiar with the Mentee Department's DEC and culture. Department Chairs will provide any Department-specific reporting forms to Mentors from other Departments.
4. Meet with any Mentees at least once per semester during contract (see Section IV.F.1.b).
5. Before the annual AIM, Mentors are strongly encouraged to meet with and help Mentees prepare for the AIM. Mentors will discuss Mentees' planned Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (when applicable). Mentors will provide feedback to help Mentees align their activities with DEC and the University Mission. Mentors may attend the AIM at the Mentee's request.
6. Mentor no more than two (2) Junior Faculty. Exceptions include: 1) no other Mentors are available in the Department, College/School, and the Mentor agrees; 2) the Department Chair and Mentee agree that a Mentor within the same College/School is necessary for sufficient support toward P&T, the Mentor is within the same College/School as the Mentee, and the Mentor agrees; or 3) under careful consideration, Mentors from other Colleges/Schools may be chosen.
7. Notify the Department Chair in a timely manner if the Mentor chooses to discontinue Mentorship. The Department Chair would then assign a new Mentor as soon as possible. Mentors may discontinue mentorship without prejudice at any point in the mentoring relationship.

Mentee Requirements and Expectations: Mentees will:

1. Communicate with their Mentor regularly, as determined by Department expectations and needs of the Mentee, to discuss ideas, address questions, and seek support regarding DEC and the P&T process.

2. Meet with their Mentor at least once per semester (see Section IV.F.1.b).
3. It is strongly encouraged that Mentees meet with their Mentor prior to the annual AIM to share planned Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (as applicable) activities and seek feedback from their Mentor regarding the alignment of their activities with DEC and the University Mission.
4. Notify the Department Chair and indicate whether they wish to keep their current Mentor or if the mentoring relationship is no longer productive or effective. Mentees may submit a letter of recommendation for their Mentor as evidence of service for the Mentor's Post-Rank Advancement or Annual Review (NTT Faculty) or Post-Tenure Five-Year Review (Tenured Faculty). Additionally, Mentees may request a change in Mentor without prejudice at any point in the mentoring relationship.

Department Chair Responsibilities: Department Chairs will:

1. Ensure that each Junior Faculty has one (1) assigned Mentor. The Department Chair uses judgment and care to assign Mentors in order to provide Junior Faculty the best support possible. If a Department has insufficient Mentors, the Department Chair can request Mentors from other Departments within the College/School. If insufficient Mentors are still unavailable after exhausting Mentors from the College/School, the Department must seek Mentors from other University Colleges/Schools. The Department Chair may assign more than two (2) Mentees to a Mentor only based on circumstances described in Section IV.F.2.f.
2. Annually assess the effectiveness of mentoring relationships via formal or informal communication and adjust Mentoring relationships as needed to best support Junior Faculty in their progress toward P&T.
3. Assign Mentors and facilitate mentoring relationships in cases where Mentorship continues past the successful completion of a Mid-Point Review.
4. Provide training on DEC and Department culture for Mentors serving from outside the Mentee Department.
5. Should the Department Chair fail to fulfill these responsibilities pursuant to [Policy 6.2](#), participation in Faculty Promotion and

Tenure process, the Mentor or Mentee will notify the Department P&T Committee Chair. The Department P&T Committee Chair will then inform their respective Dean.

Dean Responsibilities:

1. Coordinate and ensure the timely delivery of an annual, high-quality Mentor training.
2. Ensure that serving as a Mentor is given significant weight in DEC's from their College/School for Service/Leadership.
3. Should the Dean fail to fulfill these responsibilities pursuant to [Policy 6.2](#), participation in Faculty Promotion and Tenure process, the Department Chair will notify the Department P&T Committee Chair. The Department P&T Committee Chair will then notify the Provost.

Evaluation Process: The University shall have P&T Committees at the Department, College/School, and University levels. Faculty serving on P&T Evaluation Committees may serve on other P&T Committees only in the event the Evaluator does not evaluate any given report or application on more than one occasion during the annual review cycle. Evaluators cannot evaluate the same individual in subsequent committees but may serve on other Departmental or College/School P&T Committees.

Each member of any P&T Committee evaluates all applications sent to that committee except when recusal is required. Committee members recuse themselves from evaluating a report or application only under the following circumstances: (1) the committee member has a Conflict of Interest; (2) the Evaluator or committee member is related to the Faculty member being evaluated (as defined in SUU [Policy 5.18](#)); (3) the committee evaluates the recusing Faculty's own application; or (4) the committee member is required to recuse per Section IV.F. of this Policy. In instances of recusal, the committee member's position will be filled by a previously identified and voted-upon alternative.

For NTT FEC Reports and NTT applications for Mid-Point Review and Promotion, the Department and College/School P&T Committees must include at least one (1) eligible NTT Faculty as a voting member. Eligible NTT Faculty may be either an NTT Associate Professor or an NTT Assistant Professor with at least seven (7) years of full-time SUU service as a Faculty member.

The Department and College/School P&T Committees must have two (2) elected alternative committee members who serve in limited circumstances: one (1) Tenured Associate Professor alternate and one (1) eligible NTT Faculty alternate, per the P&T Committee information table below. These alternate committee members evaluate only as needed, such as in the event another committee member must recuse themselves, or a tie vote. Alternate committee members must meet eligibility requirements and

are selected as described in Sections IV.G.1.–IV.G.3.

If circumstances arise in which it is not possible to maintain an odd number of committee members and there is a tie vote, the chair of the P&T Committee notifies the Department Chair or Dean, as applicable, who then assigns one (1) of the previously identified and voted-upon alternates to serve on the committee as a voting member for that respective report or application.

The P&T Committee information table below shows the criteria for establishing P&T Committees.

	Department Committee	College/School P&T Committee	University P&T Committee
Voting Members	Three faculty, once must be NTT when Faculty is evaluated	Five Tenured Faculty; or NTT Faculty; or an NTT Faculty is/are evaluated	One Tenured Professor from each College/School and the Library
Committee Alternates	One Tenured or one NTT. Must meet eligibility requirements and elect evaluated Faculty**	One Tenured or one NTT. Must meet eligibility requirements and elect evaluated Faculty	N/A

Eligible Faculty	Tenured, with min. rank Associate Professor; NTT Assistant Professor; NTT Associate Professor; NTT Assistant Professor >7 years at SUU and rank advancement*	Tenured, min. Associate Professor; NTT Assistant Professor; years at SUU and one rank advancement	Tenured Professor only
Consecutive Members Allowed*	No	No	No
Roster Submitted By	Department	Dean	Each Dean
Selection Process	Elected by respective evaluated Faculty**	Elected by respective evaluated Faculty; see College/School bylaws & procedure	Respective College reviewed Faculty Senate Executive Committee confirms appointment Provost

Members from Other Unit	As needed, must meet eligibility requirements & elected by evaluated Faculty**	As needed, must meet eligibility requirements elected by evaluated Faculty	N/A
Administrator Serving	None	None	None
Exceptions Approved	University P&T Committee	University P&T Committee	Faculty Senate

\* Simultaneous membership on other P&T committees allowed only in the event Evaluator does not evaluate any given report or application on more than one occasion during the annual review cycle.

\*\* See individual department bylaws and procedures for specific Department P&T Committee composition and eligibility requirements.

The Evaluation Process section begins by defining the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, which serves as the first and most thorough Evaluative Entity. The section also defines Faculty and Evaluator Responsibilities that apply to all evaluations. The following is a summary of subsections:

[Section IV.G.1. Department Promotion and Tenure \(P&T\) Committee](#)

[Section IV.G.2. College/School Promotion and Tenure \(P&T\) Committee](#)

[Section IV.G.3. University Promotion and Tenure \(P&T\) Committee](#)

[Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations](#)

[Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and Expectations](#)

Section IV.G.6. Annual FEC Report (Junior Faculty only)

Section IV.G.7. Mid-Point Review (Junior Faculty only)

Section IV.G.8. Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable) (Junior Faculty only)

Section IV.G.9. Rank Advancement Following Promotion

Section IV.G.10. Post-Promotion Annual FEC Report (NTT Faculty only)

Section IV.G.11. Five-Year Review

Section IV.G.12. Administrators Returning to Faculty Positions

Section IV.G.13. Additional Considerations

1. Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee: Each Department organizes and maintains a P&T Committee to evaluate Faculty based on current DEC. Department P&T Committee members will be required to undergo annual training provided by the Provost's Office.
  - a. Role of the Department P&T Committee: The Department P&T Committee carefully adheres to Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and Expectations. Of all Evaluative Entities, the Department P&T Committee provides the most detailed and thorough evaluation of annual FEC Reports and applications for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, and Five-Year Review.
  - b. Composition of the Department P&T Committee:
    - i. Each Department, following Departmental bylaws or procedures, forms a Department P&T Committee consisting of three (3) Faculty members with the minimum qualifications of Tenured Assistant Professor or an eligible NTT Faculty Member (NTT Associate Professor or NTT Assistant Professor with at least seven [7] years of full-time SUU service as a Faculty member). Each Department must also identify and vote on one (1) eligible NTT Faculty alternate



and one (1) Tenured Faculty alternate to participate as required per Section IV.G.

- ii. The Department Chair may not serve on the Department P&T committee.
- iii. All Department P&T Committees must have exactly three (3) voting members when evaluating any given application or report. At least one (1) voting Committee member must be an eligible NTT Faculty if an NTT Faculty member is being evaluated. All Committee members, regardless of their affiliation with the Department, must be voted on by the members of the Department; no Committee member shall evaluate any given report, review, or application on more than one occasion within an academic year. Non-departmental Committee members familiarize themselves with and evaluate according to the applicant's DEC.
- iv. Each Department, in consultation with the Dean, must establish bylaws or procedures to determine the specific composition of the Department P&T Committee, particularly in cases where the NTT or Tenured alternate Committee members participate as voting members. Additionally, the bylaws or procedures must address the length of committee service, the percentage of Faculty votes required to be on the P&T Committee, and procedures for circumstances in which there is an insufficient number of eligible Faculty to serve on the Department P&T Committee. These rules and procedures will be publicly available on the Provost's Office website.
- v. By the last day of April, each Dean submits to the appropriate representative from the Provost's Office the names of the

Departmental P&T Committee members and alternates (one [1] Tenured Faculty member alternate and one [1] eligible NTT alternate) who will serve on the Departmental P&T Committee beginning in the next academic year.

2. College/School Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee: Each College/School organizes and maintains a College/School P&T Committee to evaluate Faculty based on the Faculty member's current DEC.
  - a. Role of the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee: The College/School P&T Committee follows Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and Expectations, with an emphasis on evaluating whether the Department P&T Committee and Department Chair conducted their evaluations with sufficient thoroughness and in accordance with the DEC from the Faculty member's Department. College/School P&T Committee members must evaluate Faculty based only on the applicant's DEC from the Faculty member's Department. Additionally, because Department Chairs are not evaluated by the Department P&T Committees, the College/School P&T Committee is the first evaluating entity in a Department Chair's review, and it is their responsibility to provide the most detailed and thorough evaluation of a Chair's performance, including annual FEC Reports and applications for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, and Five-Year Review.
  - b. To carry out this responsibility effectively, the College/School P&T Committee should:
    - i. Be familiar with the DEC for each evaluated Faculty.
    - ii. While exercising diligence and care, perform a review primarily focused on equity and fairness in the process and secondarily on alignment between the

Faculty member's duties and activities with and the Faculty member's DEC and the University Mission.

- iii. Carefully review all previous Evaluative Letters and Ratings.
- iv. Carefully evaluate the reasoning and basis for all previous Evaluative Ratings and request clarifying information or documentation as needed.

c. Composition of the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- i. Each College/School forms a College/School P&T Committee comprised of the following: five (5) Tenured Faculty members with a minimum rank of Associate Professor and one (1) NTT Associate Professor or NTT Assistant Professor with at least seven (7) years of full-time service as a Faculty member. In addition, two (2) qualified alternates, one (1) Tenured and one (1) eligible NTT Faculty member must be selected to participate only as required per Section IV.G.

- A. In the unlikely event that an even number of Committee members results in an equally split vote on a report or application, the chair of the College/School P&T Committee notifies the Dean. The Dean shall request the designated alternate Committee member to review the respective application or report and cast the tie-breaking vote. The Dean shall request the Tenured alternate in cases where the evaluated Faculty member is TT or Tenured and the NTT alternate in cases

where the Faculty member being evaluated is NTT.

- ii. Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Deans may not serve on the College/School P&T Committee.
- iii. The College/School P&T Committee membership should reflect, as much as possible, the breadth of disciplines represented in the Departments within the College/School.
- iv. All evaluated Faculty vote on the membership of the College/School P&T Committee.
- v. If a College/School lacks sufficient Tenured Faculty members with a minimum rank of Associate Professor or eligible NTT Faculty reflecting the breadth of disciplines to serve on the P&T Committee, or if no suitable candidates are available within the College/School, the College/School may consider candidates from other Colleges/Schools within the University. However, any Committee member outside the College/School must meet eligibility requirements and become familiar with the relevant P&T guidelines to ensure proper evaluation procedures. All committee members, regardless of their affiliation with the College/School, must be voted on by the respective College/School members.
- vi. Each College/School determines specific rules regarding the length of committee service and the percentage of Faculty votes required to be on the College/School P&T Committee. These rules and procedures will be publicly available on the Provost's Office website.
- vii. By the last day of April, each Dean submits to the appropriate representative from the

Provost's Office the names of the eligible and elected College/School P&T Committee members who will serve during the upcoming academic year (five [5] Tenured Faculty members, one [1] eligible NTT Faculty member, and two [2] alternates, one [1] Tenured and one [1] NTT).

3. University Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee: The University organizes and maintains a P&T Committee to evaluate Faculty based on the Faculty member's current DEC.
  - a. Role of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee: The University P&T Committee follows Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and Expectations, but with modifications that focus more on evaluating whether the College/School P&T Committee conducted their evaluations with sufficient thoroughness and in accordance with the applicable DEC. University P&T Committee members must evaluate Faculty based only on the DEC from the Faculty member's Department. To carry out this responsibility effectively, the University P&T Committee should:
    - i. Carefully review all previous Evaluative Letters and Ratings.
    - ii. Carefully evaluate the reasoning and basis for all previous Evaluative Ratings and request clarifying information or documentation as needed.
    - iii. Perform only a high-level, limited assessment of the alignment of the evaluated Faculty's duties and activities with DEC, Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission as needed for clarification of all or portions of the reasoning and basis for previous Evaluative Ratings.

b. Composition of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- i. The University P&T Committee is comprised of Tenured Faculty with the rank of Professor, with one (1) representative from each College/School and one (1) representative from the Library. Additionally, each College/School must appoint one (1) Tenured Faculty with the rank of Professor as an alternate committee member to serve only as required per Section IV.G.
- ii. Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Deans may not serve on the University P&T Committee.
- iii. As vacancies in the University P&T Committee occur, the Provost's Office notifies the Dean of each College/School for which there is a vacancy by April 1 of each year.
- iv. By the last day of April, each Dean submits to the appropriate representative from the Provost's Office the names of one (1) Tenured Faculty member and one (1) Tenured Faculty alternate (both of Professor rank) from their respective College/School who will serve on the University P&T Committee the next academic year. The Faculty Senate President assigns one (1) member of the University P&T Committee to serve as chair.
- v. The Provost's Office and Faculty Senate Executive Committee review the Deans' recommended members and alternates to confirm their eligibility, and upon confirming eligibility, the Provost appoints the recommended members for a three-year, renewable term. To renew, the member must receive approval from their

respective Dean and be re-appointed by the Provost.

4. Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations: Faculty members at all levels (i.e., NTT, TT, Tenured Faculty, Academic Administrators) have the following responsibilities:

- a. Obtain a copy of the current DEC from the Faculty Dashboard.
- b. Perform duties and activities related to Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (as applicable) in alignment with the DEC, the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission.
- c. According to deadlines in [Appendix B](#), complete a FEC Report or application for Mid-Point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, or Five-Year Review, using templates in the Faculty Dashboard, that is 1-3 pages in length documenting and reflecting on the duties and activities they performed and how the duties and activities align with their DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission. Faculty may include the following in their submission:
  - i. Justifications for deviations from duties required in Section IV.G.4.b.
  - ii. Appendices that include a teaching portfolio and other Pertinent Information such as peer evaluations, instructional delivery/design, professional development activities, and/or other sources of evidence for Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, or Scholarly/Creative Activities as applicable (e.g., copies of published, Peer-Reviewed manuscripts).
- d. Participate in the AIM according to Section IV.E. Alignment and Integration Meeting except for Administrators, who follow [Policy 6.2](#).



- e. Follow [Policy 6.28](#) including without limitation as related to integrity of documenting and reporting on activities from Section IV.G.4.b. and completing parts IV.G.4.c. and IV.G.4.d. according to deadlines in [Appendix B](#).
- i. Faculty are encouraged to review, in particular, Service/Leadership activities for completeness with the Department Chair or Dean (as applicable) prior to document submission deadlines in [Appendix B](#).
- ii. Late Submissions cause significant disruption to the evaluation process. To submit any materials past the deadlines in [Appendix B](#), Faculty must receive approval from the Department Chair and/or Dean. If approved, these materials will be marked as late in the Faculty Dashboard and may contribute to an adverse Evaluative Rating at the Department Chair and/or Dean level. Faculty members are strongly advised to communicate with their Department Chair and/or Dean as soon as possible regarding any extenuating circumstances that may cause a Late Submission. The Department Chair and/or Dean will carefully evaluate the circumstances and determine whether or not the Late Submission should contribute to an adverse Evaluative Rating.
- iii. A faculty member who fails to notify the Department Chair of Late Submission may be subject to corrective and/or disciplinary actions up to and including

Non-Reappointment or termination in accordance with [Policy 6.28](#).

- f. For Junior Faculty, fulfill all Mentee responsibilities.
  - g. Faculty members seeking to advance in rank may withdraw their application for Promotion at any point during the process before submission to the Board of Trustees without prejudice. If a Faculty member applying for Tenure in the final year that the Faculty member is eligible to be granted Tenure chooses to withdraw their application for Tenure, it will be treated as a resignation from their position effective at the end of the academic year. For Faculty members submitting a Five-Year Review, retracting their review would only be allowed under exceptional circumstances requiring significant justification and approval by the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost.
  - h. Faculty document their work in the FEC Report found in the Faculty Dashboard, where they 1) describe their accomplishments in Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (as applicable); 2) illustrate how their efforts meet their job description and engage students; 3) explain how their work aligns with their DEC; and 4) describe how their contributions align with Student-Centric Faculty Engagement and the University Mission.
5. Evaluator Responsibilities and Expectations: Evaluators play a crucial role in a substantive, supportive, and meaningful review process. To ensure that the evaluative process maintains its integrity and value, Evaluators have several key responsibilities and professional expectations:
- a. Write evaluations that are thorough and as fair and unbiased as possible. To increase the value and meaningfulness of the Evaluative Rating, Evaluators must include detailed feedback and (when needed)

suggested improvements for the evaluated Faculty for each area of the following: Teaching Effectiveness, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly/Creative Activities (as applicable).

- b. Provide evaluations that are based on the current DEC from the Faculty member's Department. Should a DEC not exist or fail to provide clear guidance for a particular area to be evaluated for an evaluated Faculty member, Evaluators should base their Evaluative Rating on the alignment of the evaluated Faculty member's efforts and accomplishments, as documented in their FEC Report or Promotion and/or Tenure application, with Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, the University Mission, and the criteria outlined in this Policy.
- c. Maintain independence in fact and appearance.
  - i. If Evaluators have a Conflict of Interest relative to an Evaluated Faculty, the Evaluators must recuse themselves from the Evaluation process. Examples include, but are not limited to, Evaluators serving as a Mentor to the Evaluated Faculty or Evaluators who, themselves, are the Evaluated Faculty (see also Section IV.G.).
- d. Submit an Evaluative Letter, containing an Evaluative Rating with detailed explanation and feedback, to the appropriate succeeding Evaluative Entity according to deadlines as listed in [Appendix B](#).

Evaluators assign an Evaluative Rating based *primarily* on the extent to which the evaluated Faculty's efforts and accomplishments—as documented in their FEC Report or application for Mid-Point Review, Promotion, Tenure, or Five-Year Review—align with DEC, Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission.

Evaluators shall base Evaluative Ratings related to Teaching Effectiveness on more than just student feedback results, if available in a Faculty submission, recognizing the inconsistent and sometimes inaccurate nature of student feedback results.

In the Evaluative Letter, Evaluators must include detailed, objective justification, based on requirements in the DEC, for the Evaluative Rating they assign:

For annual or Post-Promotion FEC Reports or applications for Mid-Point Review: "Acceptable Progress" or "Development Needed" or

"Recommendation for Non-Reappointment"; OR

For Applications for Promotion and/or Tenure: "Yes" or "No"

For Five-Year Review: "Acceptable Progress" or "Development Needed"

Evaluators may consider other Pertinent Information in assigning an Evaluative Rating, such as peer evaluations, summaries of relevant activity, Faculty Professional Responsibility defined in [Policy 6.28](#), Evaluative Letters and Evaluative Ratings from preceding Evaluative Entities, and AIM documentation contained in the Faculty Dashboard; however, AIM documentation must not be a primary factor in determining an Evaluative Rating.

As needed to support assigning an Evaluative Rating or to address any uncertainties that may affect assigning an Evaluative Rating, Evaluators may at any point in the

evaluative process solicit additional documentation or information from the evaluated Faculty regarding a FEC Report or other application. Requests for additional documentation or information are, however, limited to clarifying relevant facts and circumstances only. Evaluators are prohibited from requesting information that substantively changes the content of a FEC Report or application or the evaluation criteria.

Department Chairs are strongly encouraged to review, in particular, Mid-Point and Promotion and/or Tenure application materials prior to the first submission deadline noted in [Appendix B](#).

If Evaluators require and use additional documentation or information to assign an Evaluative Rating, they must document the request and describe the additional documentation or information's impact on the assigned Evaluative Rating in the Evaluative Letter. They must also upload the additional documentation or information to the Faculty Dashboard, which becomes part of the FEC Report or application that subsequent Evaluators will review.

Evaluators shall give consideration to Faculty members who have partial reassignment of duties, such as Chairs, fellows, those with administrative appointments, and part-time Faculty (not adjuncts). Although the *caliber* of work required of these Faculty should be held to the same standards as full-time Faculty, Promotion and Tenure expectations should be adjusted commensurate with their Faculty workload as determined by the DEC.

- FORMER DO NOT USE
- e. Maintain strict confidentiality regarding all aspects of the evaluation process including, but not limited to, the following: committee deliberations, Evaluative Letters, discussions with evaluated Faculty, and discussions with Mentors. To maintain confidentiality, Evaluators are required to not disclose in any format or to any person any information learned or shared through the evaluation process, unless required by University Policy, applicable law, or court or other lawful order; provided however, Department Chairs, Deans, and the Provost may use information from their own evaluation of the applicable Faculty member and from committees in discussions with the Faculty member being reviewed and to write Evaluative Letters, which will be shared with the Faculty member being reviewed. In writing such Evaluative Letters, the anonymity of the committee members will be maintained by the Department Chair, Deans, and the Provost to the greatest extent possible by summarizing feedback for the Faculty member being reviewed.
    - i. Evaluators shall not engage in conduct that violates professional expectations, including, but not limited to, engaging in communications that could be construed as influencing the deliberations and decisions of other Evaluative Entities, unless responding to questions by the next level Evaluative Entity for clarification or other legitimate purposes.
  - f. Follow the flow of review in [Appendix C3](#). Note that for all review processes for NTT and TT Faculty, the Departmental P&T Committee is always the first Evaluative Entity to review followed by the Department Chair.

- g. Complete required annual Evaluator training provided by the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office coordinates and ensures the timely delivery of required, high-quality training for Evaluators at all levels of the Evaluation Process.

6. Annual FEC Report:

- a. Faculty: Faculty follow Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard per [Appendix A](#).
- b. Evaluators: Follow Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard.
  - i. Ordering of evaluations
    - A. Junior Faculty: Annual evaluations for FEC Reports submitted by Junior Faculty will be evaluated in the following order: Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, and Dean.
    - B. Advanced Faculty: Annual performance evaluations for FEC Reports submitted by Advanced Faculty with Tenure will only be evaluated by Department Chairs or Associate Chairs prior to scheduled AIM Meetings unless the FEC Report is submitted for the purpose of a Five-Year Review. For Five-Year Reviews see Section IV.G.10.
  - ii. Each Evaluative Entity assigns an Evaluative Rating for each Faculty member being reviewed. The Evaluative Letter gets forwarded to each successive Evaluative Entity as a recommendation to the final decision maker for the applicable action,



with all materials submitted via the Faculty Dashboard including Evaluative Letters and Evaluative Ratings with detailed justifications.

iii. The Provost makes the final determination regarding Non-Reappointment after completing the following:

- A. Review the evaluated Faculty's application materials in the Faculty Dashboard including Evaluative Letters and Evaluative Ratings.
- B. Consult with the evaluated Faculty's Dean, Department Chair, and Department P&T Committee Chair as needed.
- C. Consider other relevant factors including extenuating circumstances.

iv. If the Provost makes the determination of Non-Reappointment, the Provost submits an Evaluative Letter via the Faculty Dashboard stating the determination of Non-Reappointment that includes written justification for the decision. The Provost's Office also provides a Notice of Non-Reappointment in writing to the evaluated Faculty according to the schedule defined in the Utah Board of Higher Education Policy R481.

7. Mid-Point Review (Junior Faculty only): The Mid-Point Review represents a major review of Junior Faculty contributions to determine whether Junior Faculty are making sufficient progress to receive Promotion and Tenure, as applicable. The Mid-Point Review occurs based on the table in [Appendix D](#). Junior Faculty who are also serving as Department Chairs prepare a Mid-Point Review according to the table in [Appendix D](#).

- a. Faculty: Junior Faculty follow Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard per Appendix A. Mid-point reviews are optional for Non-Tenure Track Junior Faculty if they choose not to pursue Promotion.
- b. Evaluators: Follow Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard based on the ordering of Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, College/School P&T Committee, Dean, and Provost.

- i. If three (3) consecutive Evaluative Entities assign an Evaluative Rating of "Non-Reappointment" for the Mid-Point Review application, the third Evaluative Entity to assign the "Non-Reappointment" rating and the Provost/Provost's Office follow the procedures listed in Section IV.G.6.b.

8. Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable) (Junior Faculty only):

- a. Faculty: Junior Faculty follow Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard per [Appendix A](#).
- b. Evaluators: Follow Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard based on the ordering of Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, College/School P&T Committee, Dean, University P&T Committee (TT Faculty only), and Provost.

- i. Evaluators assign either a "Yes" or "No" Evaluative Rating as to whether the evaluated Faculty member is recommended for Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable). In addition to assigning the Evaluative Rating, each P&T Committee documents the number of "Yes" or "No" votes in the

Evaluative Letter and the Faculty Dashboard.

- ii. If three (3) consecutive Evaluative Entities assign an Evaluative Rating of "No," the third Evaluative Entity to assign a "No" rating forwards all application materials to the Provost via the Faculty Dashboard including Evaluative Letters and Evaluative Ratings with detailed justifications.
- iii. The Provost makes the final recommendation to the President regarding awarding or not awarding Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable) after completing the following:
  - A. Review the evaluated Faculty's application materials in the Faculty Dashboard including Evaluative Letters and Evaluative Ratings.
  - B. Consult with the evaluated Faculty's Dean, Department Chair, and Department P&T Committee Chair as needed.
  - C. Consider other relevant factors including extenuating circumstances.
- iv. If the Provost makes the recommendation of not awarding Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable), the Provost submits an Evaluative Letter via the Faculty Dashboard stating the recommendation of not awarding Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable) that includes written justification for the decision.
- v. Prior to submission of Tenure application materials to the Board of Trustees, any Evaluative Entity may, by majority vote, recall/reconsider an application for Tenure.

Any such recall/reconsideration requires written detailed documentation and rationale submitted to the Provost.

- vi. The Provost's Office notifies the evaluated Faculty in writing regarding the Board of Trustees' decision to award or not award Promotion (and Tenure, as applicable).
- vii. If the Faculty is not awarded Tenure, the University either gives the Faculty a terminal contract for the next year or otherwise arranges for compensation equivalent to the Faculty member's current base salary for a terminal year.

- c. Tenure Standard: The University extends Tenure to approved members of the Faculty (those hired into Tenure-Track appointments and those granted Tenure at time of hire). Tenure will be given only to those members of the Faculty who, at the time of application for tenure, meet the evaluation criteria as specified in Section IV.D.

Tenure is a legally recognized property interest in a Faculty appointment designed to protect the academic freedom of a Faculty member and to provide the Faculty member with a sufficient degree of employment security to make the profession attractive to persons of ability.

- i. Tenure as a property right does not apply to the University as a whole, to a College/School, or to a Department. Rather, Tenure as a property right is restricted to the academic discipline for which a Faculty member has appropriate disciplinary expertise, credentials and degrees,

teaching experience, Service/Leadership, and Scholarship/Creative contributions.

- ii. The awarding of Tenure signifies the Faculty member's strong commitment to serve students, colleagues, the discipline, and the University in a manner befitting an academic professional.
- iii. The existence of an opportunity for Promotion of a Tenure-Track (TT) position does not imply the granting of Tenure.
- iv. Tenure indicates that an appointee can be terminated only for cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial exigency and program discontinuation (from AAUP) as defined in [Policy 6.22](#).
- v. The terms and conditions of each appointment and any revisions will be stated in writing at the time of this appointment, be provided to the affected Faculty member, and be made a part of the University personnel file.
- vi. Administrators are not Tenured in administrative positions. A Faculty member holding a position with Tenure in an academic program does not lose Tenure upon accepting an administrative position at the University, assuming Good Standing, and may return to former rank and role at the conclusion of administrative service.
- vii. A Faculty member receives Tenure only when the Board of Trustees approves an effective date for an award of Tenure. If an award of Tenure has not been made on or before the 30th day of June of the final year

of the probationary period, or an extension has not been approved in their final probationary year, the Faculty member will receive a terminal year of employment.

viii. Tenured Faculty can be terminated for cause as otherwise defined in [Policy 6.28](#).

d. Summary Timetable for Promotion and/or Tenure Applications: This table can be found in [Appendix D](#).

e. Probationary Period for Tenure: Faculty on Tenure-Track appointments are in a probationary period until they receive either Tenure or a notice of Non-Reappointment (at which time they move to a terminal appointment) or are otherwise terminated under applicable University policy. The probationary period for granting Tenure is normally seven (7) years unless waived, reduced, suspended, or extended as specified below:

- i. The Board of Trustees may award Tenure to the President of the University. Other academic officers may receive Tenure as provided in [Policy 6.2](#).
- ii. Based on full-time service at other institutions of higher education, the probationary period may be reduced by as many as three (3) years. Faculty with considerable experience may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The probationary period for Tenure for Faculty hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is three (3) years. Under exceptional circumstances, the probationary period may be waived and Tenure awarded at the time of hiring. Any reduction or waiver of the probationary

period or hiring at a rank other than Assistant Professor requires 1) careful scrutiny of the applicant's credentials; 2) detailed documentation justifying the exception; 3) the recommendation of the Department Chair, Dean, and the Provost; and 4) approval by the President and the Board of Trustees. If credit for prior full-time service at another institution is granted, this determination must be stated in the recommendation for initial appointment. No retroactive amendments to initial appointment contracts will be allowed.

iii. A Faculty member may apply to have the probationary period reduced by one (1) year only if all the following conditions are met:

- A. Faculty has completed three (3) full academic years of service at the University and was granted fewer than three (3) years toward Tenure at the time of hiring. Faculty granted three (3) years toward Tenure at the time of hiring are not eligible to apply for early Tenure.
- B. Faculty not only meets but also exceeds all DEC related to Tenure.
- C. Faculty discusses the merits, challenges, and expectations of reducing the probationary period with the Department Chair and Dean and obtains a letter of support from both by April 1 of

the calendar year in which the Faculty will submit a Tenure application. Faculty applying for early Tenure must include the support letters from the Department Chair and Dean in their Tenure application. Including the support letters is not a guarantee that the Faculty will be awarded Tenure.

- iv. Except for conditions stated in Sections IV.G.8.e.ii. and IV.G.8.e.iii. above, only complete academic years served at the University will count toward the probationary period for an award of Tenure.
- v. Unless a one-year reduction in the probationary period has been granted, Faculty members must apply for Tenure in the last year of the probationary period that begins with the Faculty member's Tenure-track appointment.
- vi. Certain situations such as family medical leave or military duty (see [Policy 9.7](#)) may merit temporary suspension of the probationary period. The Faculty member must make a written request for approval of the suspension to the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. Periods of duty spent off campus or on Scholarly/Creative Activities are counted as part of the probationary period unless other written agreement is made.

- A. Under [Policy 6.15](#), or when otherwise required by law, a



Tenure-eligible Faculty member may request a one-year extension of their pre-Tenure probationary period.

B. Applications for extensions waive rights or claims for de facto Tenure.

vii. At the request of the Faculty member, and as approved by the Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Board of Trustees, years granted toward Tenure at the time of hiring may be rescinded by the Board of Trustees. Such requests must be in writing. If approved, the rescinding of years will be for all years granted and the Faculty member is then ineligible for early Tenure.

9. Rank Advancement Following Promotion: Promotion opportunities encourage continuous Faculty development following the achievement of Promotion and/or Tenure. Advanced Faculty may apply for Promotion to the next succeeding rank.

a. Advanced Faculty: Follow guidance in Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and [Appendix A](#).

b. Evaluators: Follow Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard based on the ordering of Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, College/School P&T Committee, Dean, University P&T Committee (Tenured Faculty only), and Provost except Administrators, whose evaluations begin at the next highest Evaluative Entity after the Administrator's position.

i. Evaluators assign either a "Yes" or "No" Evaluative Rating as to whether the

evaluated Faculty is recommended for Promotion. In addition to assigning the Evaluative Rating, each P&T Committee documents the number of "Yes" or "No" votes in the Evaluative Letter and the Faculty Dashboard.

- ii. Each Evaluative Entity assigns an Evaluative Rating at their review level. Each Evaluative Rating is considered a recommendation. The subsequent Evaluative Entities may consider the Evaluative Rating and detailed justifications of prior Evaluative Entities and also follow the requirements for Evaluative Entities. The Provost then makes any final decision applicable based on the Provost's own Evaluative Rating, or when applicable, makes a recommendation of the applicable decision to the Board of Trustees. If three (3) consecutive levels recommend against supporting the application, the application is forward to the Provost.
- iii. Prior to submission of materials to the Board of Trustees or other final decision of the University, if new information becomes available that is relevant to applicable evaluation criteria (such as the DEC), the applicable Dean and the Provost may consider that information in making a final decision and/or in the recommendation referred for final decision making. Other Evaluative Entities will not reopen the evaluation process after submitting the Evaluation Letter(s).
- iv. The Provost's Office notifies the evaluated Faculty in writing regarding the Board of Trustees' decision to award or not award Promotion.

c. Other Considerations

- i. Administrators and Faculty applying for Promotion may retract and retrieve their application at any point of the process without prejudice.
- 10. Post-Promotion Annual FEC Report (NTT Faculty only): After Promotion to Assistant or Associate Professor, NTT Faculty continue to submit an Annual FEC.
  - a. Report following procedures in Section IV.G. In the case that an NTT Faculty at the Assistant or Associate Professor rank has a contract period longer than one (1) year, the NTT Faculty may submit a written request within two (2) weeks of the start of the contract period to the Department Chair and Dean to submit a FEC Report at an interval longer than one (1) year. The Department Chair and Dean may either reject the request or determine a reporting interval not to exceed five (5) years. In the case of a dispute among the Department Chair, Dean, and NTT Faculty regarding a request for a longer reporting interval, the Department P&T Committee Chair or Associate Dean will serve as arbiter.
- 11. Five-Year Review: Associate Professors with Tenure, Professors, and Academic Administrators with Tenure at the Associate or Professor rank (hereafter, Five-Year Review Faculty) are required to submit a FEC Report five (5) years after the initial P&T date, subsequent Promotion, or most recent Five-Year Review. The Dean's office will notify all scheduled Five-Year Review Faculty in writing that a Review will take place during the following academic year. If a Review falls in the same academic year as a subsequent Promotion, Five-Year Review Faculty may submit both the Five-Year Review and Promotion applications and required supporting documents as listed in [Appendix A](#) in a combined submission in the Faculty Dashboard.

Exceptions to submission of a Five-Year Review at five years include [Policy 6.15](#) or when otherwise required by law, where an

eligible Faculty member may seek a one-year extension of their requisite five-year period.

Five-Year Review Faculty are expected to conscientiously discharge their duties as outlined in Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities. Evaluators generally assess Five-Year Review Faculty based on the criteria and ratings in Section IV.D. unless otherwise determined by the Faculty of each Department in the DEC.

The evaluation will be discipline- and role-specific, including consideration for those receiving a Review while serving as a Department Chair. In addition, Faculty serving as Mentors receive significant weight in their Service/Leadership category. It is the intent of this to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of Faculty careers. The evaluation should be consistent with specialized accreditation requirements, state law, USHE policy, and this Policy.

- a. Five-Year Review Faculty: Follow guidance in Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and [Appendix A](#). In addition to the criteria set forth in Section IV.G.4. and DEC's, Five-Year Review Faculty will also be evaluated on the following:
  - i. teaching assessment, including student evaluations, for all courses taught;
  - ii. the quality of the tenured faculty member's scholarly research;
  - iii. service to the profession, school, or community;
  - iv. annual performance reviews;
  - v. intellectual property owned wholly or partly by, or commercialization efforts attributed to, the tenure faculty member;

- vi. the tenured faculty member's compliance with the degree-granting institution's policies regarding the responsibilities and ethical obligations of faculty members (SUU [Policy 6.28](#)); and
- vii. any improvement plans for underperformance.

b. Evaluators: Follow Section IV.G.5. Evaluator Responsibilities and upload required documents to the Faculty Dashboard based on the ordering of Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, Dean, University P&T Committee, and Provost. The Chair of the University P&T Committee will serve as the Provost's designee as permitted by Utah Code 53B-2-106.1(9)(a)(ii).

c. Other Considerations:

- i. Between Five-Year Reviews, Advanced Faculty with tenure complete an annual performance review with their Department Chair or Associate Chair by submitting an FEC Report and participating in an AIM. If there is evidence that the Five-Year-Review Faculty member is not fulfilling professional responsibilities per [Policy 6.28](#), the Department Chair collaborates with the Faculty member to address the issues as they arise or during the AIM. If issues remain unresolved, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, can petition the Provost's Office for a change in the nature and/or frequency of AIMs, reporting, and evaluation. After consulting with the Faculty

member, Department Chair, and Dean, the Provost's Office will render a final decision that includes details of modifications to the nature and/or frequency of AIMs, reporting, and evaluation.

- ii. At the time of Five-Year Review, if the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost determine that the Five-Year-Review Faculty member has not sufficiently fulfilled requirements from Section IV.G.4. Faculty Responsibilities and is not in Good Standing, they work together to create a development plan.
- iii. In accordance with the Utah System of Higher Education Policy R481, a Faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies (which may be evaluated at any time or a specified deadline) may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination following the process in [Policy 6.28](#).
- iv. In the case of a dispute between the Five-Year-Review Faculty member and the Department P&T Committee and/or Department Chair, the Dean or Associate Dean will serve as arbiter.
- v. Five-Year Reviews of Department Chairs at the Associate or Full Professor level begin with the College/School P&T Committee.

#### 12. Administrators Returning to Faculty Positions:

- a. When an Administrator leaves their administrative assignment and returns to a full-time Faculty position within their Department, they must hold an AIM within two (2) weeks of starting their full-time Faculty

contract. P&T expectations return to those described in the DEC commensurate with their Faculty status.

13. Additional Considerations:

a. Hiring with Academic Rank

- i. After evaluating the appointee's educational training and experience, the Dean, Department Chair, and the affected search committee jointly recommend to the Provost a rank that is consistent with University policies.
- ii. There may be circumstances where, in addition to the initial rank assignment, an appointee is granted a specified number of years toward the next rank. Any such credit must be negotiated between the appointee and the responsible Department Chair, approved by the Dean and Provost, and specified and clearly stated in the initial contract. A maximum of three (3) years may be credited toward Promotion. The number of years awarded for Promotion for a Tenure-Track Assistant Professor is the same as the number of year's reduction to the probationary period for Tenure.
- iii. At hiring, academic officers receive academic rank according to this Policy.

b. Time in Rank

i. NTT Faculty:

- A. Assistant Professor (NTT): Four (4) years as Lecturer before applying. The rank of Assistant Professor (NTT) will be granted normally after five (5) years of employment with the University as a Lecturer.
- B. Associate Professor (NTT): Six (6) years as Assistant Professor (NTT) before applying. The rank of Associate Professor (NTT) will

be granted normally after seven (7) years of employment with the University as an Assistant Professor (NTT).

ii. Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty:

- A. Associate Professor: Six (6) years as Assistant Professor before applying, unless years toward the next rank have been granted. The rank of Associate Professor will be granted normally after seven (7) years of employment with the University. The rank of Associate Professor will be granted with the awarding of Tenure.
- B. Professor: Minimum of five (5) years as Associate Professor before applying. The rank of Professor will be granted at least six (6) years after being granted the rank of Associate Professor.

c. Implementation

- i. Faculty hired prior to January 28, 2005 may choose, via written communication to the Department Chair, to be subsequently evaluated for advancement in rank according to Policy 6.1 approved on November 2, 1990; Policy 6.1 approved on January 28, 2005; or this Policy.
- ii. Faculty hired on or after January 28, 2005 apply for Promotion and/or Tenure according to this Policy.

---

## V. RELEVANT FORMS/LINKS

- [Appendix A: Required Documents for Reports and Applications](#)
- [Appendix B: Faculty Dashboard Deadline Schedule](#)
- [Appendix C1: Annual FEC Report Process Flowchart](#)



- [Appendix C2: Faculty Midpoint Review Process Flowchart](#)
- [Appendix C3: Promotion and Tenure Review Flowchart](#)
- [Appendix C4: Promotion Review Process Flowchart](#)
- [Appendix D: Promotion and Tenure Schedule](#)
- [Faculty Dashboard](#)
- [Faculty Evaluation, Promotion & Tenure, and Leave website](#)

---

## VI. QUESTIONS/RESPONSIBLE OFFICE

The responsible office for this Policy is the [Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs](#).

---

## VII. POLICY ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT DATES

Date Approved: November 2, 1990

Amended: [January 28, 2005](#); [November 29, 2007](#); [December 4, 2009](#); [May 6, 2011](#); [March 22, 2012](#); [June 13, 2013](#); [January 31, 2014](#); [March 24, 2016](#); [July 19, 2018](#); [March 19, 2021](#); [August 15, 2022](#) (non-substantive); [April 27, 2023](#); [August 15, 2023](#) (non-substantive); July 1, 2024 (temporary authorization)