

**Promotion and Tenure Standards
Department of Communication
Southern Utah University**

Required Yearly Activity for Faculty Engagement and Contribution Reviews, Mid-Point Reviews, Tenure Reviews, Rank Advancements, and 5-Year Post-Tenure Reviews

Approved by Department Vote (September 24, 2020)

Approved by HSS Dean (October 7, 2020)

Approved by Provost (April 19, 2021)

I. Categories of Evaluation

According to [Policy 6.1](#), SUU recognizes two performance standards for the purpose of assessing faculty efforts toward satisfactory job performance, granting of tenure, and rank advancement.

- Acceptable Progress Toward Faculty Engagement & Contribution Plan
- Development Required

While the Department of Communication recognizes that the university has only two formal ratings for faculty, we believe it is important to identify faculty in our department who are exceeding performance expectations even if this recognition is not received at higher levels of the P&T evaluation process. This meritorious level recognizes and commends the efforts of faculty members who: (1) continually reinvigorate the learning environment, (2) engage in ongoing, high quality research and other creative activities, and (3) apply their scholarship to the improvement of the various communities to which our faculty members belong. This would be noted as:

- Meritorious Performance efforts exceed expectations of acceptable progress standards.

The presence of an additional performance level should in no way diminish from the overall value of reaching the acceptable progress level.

The following document outlines the specific standards required for each level of performance. It also specifies additional standards that might be required for different types of reviews, such as annual, mid-point, tenure, and five-year post-tenure.

Acceptable Progress Toward Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan (AP)

The following is required for all faculty members (including graduate faculty) in the Department of Communication.

Acceptable Teaching

The department will use the university's current student teaching evaluation by looking for patterns that reflect the majority of comments. We have selected the following items along with a baseline standard for achieve acceptable performance in each item on the scale. Apart from Questions 1 and 38, this baseline generally consists of the top two response values.

Question 1 - The instructor provided learning activities beyond lecture/content postings (group discussions/chats, projects, presentations, field work, guest speakers, videos, demonstrations, labs, etc.) that helped me understand course concepts, and/or the world differently. Please provide the instructor feedback about these types of learning activities in your class.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be to reflect on the number of learning activities they provide and work to find a good balance.

Question 2 - For you, how effective were the learning activities?

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either "very effective" or "effective."

Question 5 - In this course, my instructor explained concepts in a way that helped me understand the material.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either "all of the time" or "most of the time."

Question 8 - My instructor helped me see real-world applications of the course content.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either "most of the time" or "often."

Question 11 - By incorporating relevant assignments, projects, activities, and/or exams, etc. into the curriculum, my instructor provided me opportunities to think about what I was learning in this class.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either "often" or "sometimes."

Question 20 - To my knowledge, my instructor was available and accessible to me as outlined in the syllabus.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either "always" or "most of the time."

Question 23 - I received my graded assignments, papers, projects, presentations, exams, and other assigned work in the time specified on the syllabus or discussed in class.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “all of the time” or “most of the time.”

Question 32 - My instructor invited students to ask questions in the course.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with “about the right amount for me.”

Question 35 - To me, my instructor seemed organized and well-prepared to teach.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be that the majority of students respond with either “always” or “most of the time.”

Question 38 - It is not possible to capture every nuance of effective teaching in a short survey. In the box below, please describe things your instructor did that were especially effective in helping you learn the material.

Benchmark: The goal for faculty should be to reflect on the open-ended comments and make changes as they see appropriate.

The department evaluative entities will also consider other elements of effective teaching in its assessment of faculty and encourage faculty members to include them in annual faculty engagement & contribution plans/reports or five-year plans/reports (whichever applies). These should include one or more of the following: revision of course syllabi, course development (face-to-face and online), curriculum development, undergraduate and graduate mentoring, integrating engaged learning components into classroom activities, peer evaluations of classroom teaching, peer review of classroom materials (collaborative teaching strategy meetings), self-evaluations, videos of teaching, evidence of substantive assignment feedback, program alumni ratings, teaching awards and nominations for awards, teaching portfolios, evidence of innovative approaches in the classroom, teaching abroad opportunities, invited guest lecturing, attending (or presenting at) teaching conferences or workshops, and meaningful outside of the classroom student correspondence. Faculty members engaged in administrative responsibilities are not exempt from the following measures of teaching effectiveness. As the number of teaching assignments are reduced as a result of assigned administrative duties, the faculty member’s responsibility toward good teaching for whatever load remains is not reduced.

During times of crisis (e.g. natural disasters, pandemics), the department’s evaluative entity (either the P&T mentorship committee and the chair) will strongly consider environmental factors in assessing teaching performance. Additionally, they may also consider upward trends in performance ratings as evidence of faculty effort to improve teaching performance.

Acceptable Scholarship

In an effort to recognize and to quantify the various forms and activities of scholarship within the broad field of communication, the department uses a tiered point system in order to gauge faculty performance. The following activities constitute most, but not all, of the types of scholarly and creative activities that count toward acceptable progress (AP). Although much of the work done in the department falls under the three-tier system, the Department of Communication recognizes that authoring or co-authoring a peer-reviewed academic book from an outside publisher represents a different distinction. These published peer-reviewed books will count for five points toward faculty evaluations of scholarship. However, a total of three points is required to fulfill acceptable progress for one academic year (five-year plans/reports will consider cumulative totals). Above three points constitutes meritorious performance and below three points constitutes that development is required for the faculty member.

Additionally, the Department of Communication supports the practice of collaborative research between faculty members, professionals in the field, and students. In an effort to encourage faculty to collaborate in their scholarly activities, the department does not devalue faculty who work on projects as secondary authors/contributors. Because this is a common practice in our discipline nationwide, it is assumed that “collaboration” means the sharing of workload and that each faculty member has contributed substantively to the completion of a given project.

Faculty members engaged in administrative responsibilities inside or outside of the department (such as serving as chair or graduate director) generally have reduced scholarship responsibilities, but the specific expectations for these faculty will be negotiated between the department chair and the faculty member during the five-year plan and discussed during the five-year review.

Upper Tier (3 points each):

Academic article published in a quality international, national, regional or state peer-reviewed journal

Authored chapter in edited peer-reviewed book (outside publisher)

Top Paper award in competitive submissions

Journal editor

Program planner for an international, national, regional, or state conference

Competitive grant awarded by international, national, or state funding agency

Juried, refereed, peer-reviewed, award-winning media work (peers validate high quality)

(Such as, but not limited to: Print, magazine or web articles, radio broadcasts, video productions, multi-media or web productions, photography, advertising campaigns, PR campaigns, etc.)

Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their plans/reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T mentorship team (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Middle Tier (2 points each):

- Academic book review
- Encyclopedia or web excerpts (outside publisher)
- Paper published in a conference proceeding
- Authored academic book (self-published)
- APEX (formerly SUU Distinguished Faculty Lecture) and paper
- Conference paper presentation at international, national, regional, or state conference
- Panelist with paper at international, national, regional, or state conference
- Serve on the editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal
- Media work for hire determined to be of professional quality
(Professionally peer-reviewed by editors, news directors, producers, clients, and others who validate their quality before publication, presentation or broadcast, such as, but not limited to, print, magazine or web articles, radio broadcasts, video productions, multi-media or web productions, photography, advertising campaigns, PR campaigns, etc.)
- Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their plans/reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T mentorship team (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Lower Tier (1 point each-3 points maximum per year from lower tier):

- Panel respondent (no written paper)
- Conference attendee
- Paper/Production reviewer for conference
- Paper reviewer for journal
- Invited research lecture outside of the department
- Consulting (minimum of 20 hours, each client only counts once per year. Maximum of two clients per year toward scholarship calculations)
- Review faculty scholarship prior to conference/journal submission
- Reviewing student work for conference submission beyond regular classroom feedback
(Maximum of one paper per year)
- Department colloquium presentation of current research
- Self-initiated, self-reviewed, and self-distributed media work
(Such as, but not limited to: Print, magazine or web articles, radio broadcasts, video productions, multi-media or web productions, photography, advertising campaigns, PR campaigns, etc.)
- Chair of capstone committee (cannot be counted in scholarship and service/leadership simultaneously)
- Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their plans/reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T mentorship team (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Acceptable Service/Leadership

Faculty members must serve on a minimum of two committees during each academic school year. These committees can function at the department, college, university, or discipline levels. Additionally, faculty members may count chairing capstones and

serving on the graduate council as part of their overall service requirement. Other activities may be factored in as presented/justified by faculty and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T mentorship team (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

Faculty members engaged in administrative responsibilities inside or outside of the department (such as serving as chair or graduate director) generally have reduced service responsibilities (outside of the primary administrative responsibilities), but the specific expectations for these faculty will be negotiated between the department chair and the faculty member during the five-year plan and discussed during the five-year review.

Meritorious Performance (MP)

The following criteria will be used to assess whether faculty have achieved a performance level beyond Acceptable Progress (AP).

Meritorious Teaching

Faculty members designated as meritorious in teaching will demonstrate involvement in three or more of the following pedagogical activities: revision of course syllabi, course development (face-to-face and online), curriculum development, undergraduate and graduate mentoring, integrating engaged learning components into classroom activities, peer evaluations of classroom teaching, peer review of classroom materials (collaborative teaching strategy meetings), self-evaluations, videos of teaching, evidence of substantive assignment feedback, program alumni ratings, teaching awards and nominations for awards, teaching portfolios, evidence of innovative approaches in the classroom, teaching abroad opportunities, invited guest lecturing, attending (or presenting at) teaching conferences or workshops, and meaningful outside of the classroom student correspondence.

If in a given year, a faculty member is awarded the distinction of Professor of the Year, Outstanding Educator of the Year, Distinguished Educator of the Year, or a finalist for Professor of the Year, he/she will automatically be classified as “meritorious” for that year.

Meritorious Scholarship

In an effort to recognize faculty members who achieve a Meritorious Performance level (MP), the department uses the tiered point system illustrated within Acceptable Progress (AP) requirements. In order to achieve a meritorious level of scholarship, a faculty member is required to achieve a minimum of 5 points, using a combination of activities within the three tiers.

Meritorious Service

Beyond the minimum of two committees that faculty members must serve on to achieve Acceptable Progress (AP), faculty members can reach the Meritorious Performance Level (MP), by serving on two additional committees (a total of four in a given year). These committees can function at the department, college, university, or discipline levels. Again, faculty members may count chairing graduate capstones once as part of their

overall service requirement. Other activities as presented/justified by faculty in their plans/reports and then deemed appropriate by the department P&T mentorship team (for non-tenured or tenure-track faculty) and the department chair (for tenured faculty).

II. Annual Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plans/Reports

The Department of Communication will conduct annual evaluations of non-tenure track (NTT) and tenure-track faculty as stipulated by university [policy 6.1](#). The evaluations are intended to: 1) encourage faculty development and excellence; 2) ensure that the department is meeting its strategic objectives; 3) determine whether a faculty member needs assistance from the P&T mentorship team or chair to improve or attain an “Acceptable Progress” level of performance; and 4) ascertain salary enhancement, i.e. merit pay (when available).

For NTT, lecturers, special-appointment faculty, and tenure-track faculty, the faculty engagement and contribution report from the previous year is reviewed in collaboration with the departments P&T mentorship team to determine progress toward goals outlined in the existing plan. The faculty member will then work with the P&T mentorship team to develop a plan for the coming year. This P&T mentorship team will consist of at least two tenured faculty members when faculty under review are tenure-track and at least one tenured faculty member when faculty under review are non-tenure track, lecturers, or professionals in residence. These assignments are made by the department chair in consultation with available faculty. The department will rotate the make-up of the mentorship team every three years, although some faculty may be asked to serve longer depending on department needs and faculty availability. Faculty members from outside of the department may be asked to assist in this process as needed. After the mentorship team evaluates the faculty member’s progress from the previous year, an evaluative letter is drafted by the team. The faculty member will always an opportunity to respond to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the chair for review. Once the P&T mentorship team and chair’s evaluations have been completed, all materials are forwarded to the dean. Tenured faculty in the department are not required to complete annual plans/reports but are encouraged to monitor their progress diligently for their 5-year plans/reports.

In completing the faculty engagement and contribution report, the faculty member is required to provide a narrative of his/her performance utilizing the form provided in “Appendix A” of the university [Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policy](#). The faculty member will also provide a current and dated curriculum vitae, copies of student evaluation forms, and other samples relevant to recent performance (sample syllabi, conference papers, publications, etc.). Although a current vitae and teaching evaluations are required of all faculty up for annual review, each faculty member will use his/her own discretion with regards to other materials that might provide evidence of acceptable progress and given the opportunity to submit additional support if/when asked by a committee, provided the committee can show the relevance/necessity of such a request.

The Department of Communication recognizes that striving for and achieving equal levels of activity across each of the three areas is ideal, but not required because it is counterproductive and fosters lower overall performance. While it is ideal for faculty

members to achieve acceptable progress in all areas, they may provide a justification for lower performance in one area by showing meritorious work in other areas.

III. Major Reviews

A. Mid-Point Review

In order to achieve the university's designation of Acceptable Progress (AP) for the three-year review, the faculty member should demonstrate that, on balance, his/her performance meets standard performance across the following areas:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member will meet the acceptable progress standard during his/her first three years as outlined previously in the acceptable teaching section of this document.

Scholarship: The faculty member should show that he/she has achieved 9 points during the first three years utilizing the department's tiered point system.

Service/Leadership: The faculty member should show that he/she has served on six committees during the first three years. These committees can function at the department, college, university, or discipline level. Additionally, the faculty member should have received an "acceptable progress" evaluation on previous reports during the first three years of employment.

The department P&T mentorship team and the chair may factor upward trends in performance or faculty efforts to improve upon lower areas of performance.

B. Tenure and Associate Professor (Rank Advancement Review)

In order to receive the university rating of Acceptable Progress (AP) for tenure and advancement to the rank of associate professor, the faculty member should demonstrate that on balance, his/her performance meets acceptable progress across the following areas:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member should show that he/she has received a "acceptable progress" rating for teaching on previous reports during the three years following the mid-point review.

Scholarship: The faculty member should show that he/she has earned a "acceptable progress" rating for scholarship on previous reports during the three years following the mid-point review.

Service/Leadership: The faculty member should show that he/she has earned a "acceptable progress" rating for service on previous reports during the three years following the mid-point review.

In addition to achieving acceptable progress in the years leading up to tenure and promotion, the faculty member should also publish two quality peer-reviewed journal articles or produce comparable peer-reviewed media work from the upper tier of

scholarship activities. If this scholarly work is collaborative, the faculty member should be the lead author/contributor on at least one of the projects.

The department P&T mentorship team and the chair may factor upward trends in performance or faculty efforts to improve upon lower areas of performance.

C. Full Professor (Rank Advancement Review)

In order to qualify for advancement to the rank of full professor, the faculty member should be recognized as a highly competent teacher, scholar, and institutional leader and demonstrate continued development in faculty engagement ([Policy 6.1](#)). The faculty member can demonstrate that his/her professional performance justifies this distinction by reaching the department's meritorious level or above in teaching and scholarship and the acceptable progress level in service/leadership:

Teaching Effectiveness: The faculty member should show that he/she has received a "meritorious performance" average rating for teaching during at least one academic year since advancement to rank of associate professor.

Scholarship: The faculty member should show that he/she has earned a "meritorious performance" rating for scholarship during at least one academic year since advancement to rank of associate professor. The faculty member should also have published during that time two quality peer-reviewed journal articles or produced comparable peer-reviewed media work from the upper tier of scholarship. If this scholarly work is collaborative, the faculty member should be the lead author/contributor on at least one of the projects.

Service: The faculty member should show that he/she has earned an "acceptable progress" rating for service during all years following advancement to associate professor.

The department P&T mentorship team and the chair may factor upward trends in performance or faculty efforts to improve upon lower areas of performance.

D. Five-Year Post-Tenure Plans/Reports

The Department of Communication requires all tenured faculty to submit five-year plans at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester (as stipulated by the revised university [policy 6.1](#)) and then every five years following the initial plan. The department chair reviews each five-year plan to determine if it is acceptable with respect to SUU policy on faculty engagement, the university mission, and the department evaluation criteria. The plans are designed to encourage faculty development and excellence, ensure that the department is meeting its strategic objectives, determine whether a faculty member requires assistance from the chair in order to improve or attain an "acceptable progress" level of performance, and ascertain salary enhancement, i.e. merit pay.

Five years after the initial plan is completed, the faculty member will submit a five-year report describing contributions made during the time frame that fit with the university and department's expectations for faculty engagement. These reports will initially be forwarded to the department chair, followed by the dean of the college, and then the

provost. In conjunction with the five-year review process, each faculty member will file a new five-year plan and discuss the goals outlined in the plan with the department chair.

If there is evidence that the faculty member is not fulfilling professional responsibilities ([Policy 6.28](#)) or the goals outlined in his/her five-year plan, the department chair will collaborate with the faculty member to address the issue. If the issues remain unresolved after a reasonable amount of time (as deemed appropriate by the chair and the dean), a change in the nature and/or frequency of evaluation and reporting may be required.