

**For Reference: SUU Policy 6.1**

[https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP61Faculty\\_RevFall2019.pdf](https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP61Faculty_RevFall2019.pdf)

**Approved by the H.S.A. dept., April 2019**

**Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology: Promotion & Tenure Policy**  
Revised 2019

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology has devised an LRT policy to assess and document a faculty member's performance and productivity according to the categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service. Additional sections define Professional Responsibility and lay out the procedures for constituting Mentorship teams. As specified in SUU Policy 6.1 (implemented Fall 2019), this document also stipulates the required levels of performance and productivity for annual and major reviews.

## **I. LRT Standards and Categories of Evaluation**

In accordance with SUU Policy 6.1 IX D (amended July 2019), the Department of HSA and Southern Utah University recognize two performance standards for assessing faculty for rank-advancement and tenure.

### **Acceptable Professional Performance (AP)**

Meets or Exceeds expectations of professional performance. This is the accepted standard for tenure and rank considerations.

### **Unacceptable Performance (UP)**

Does not meet minimum expectations of professional performance. If the faculty member is retained, a development plan is required.

## A. Teaching Effectiveness:

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology assesses faculty teaching effectiveness by: ensuring that faculty meet their professional responsibilities as laid out in Policy 6.28 section IV (<https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP628Faculty.pdf>); using data from SUU administered student evaluations; and relying upon peer evaluations of teaching. As indicated in Policy 6.1, teaching efforts may involve the overlap of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship, and/or Service/Leadership. However, when attributing points for evaluative purposes, the Department of HSA has decided that the publication of a peer-reviewed article, peer-reviewed or editor-reviewed book, or book chapter devoted to pedagogy can be used towards teaching or research, but not both. Faculty members have the flexibility to make this decision on a case-by-case basis.

In addition to those metrics, the department chair and the mentoring teams will evaluate a faculty member's teaching effectiveness by considering the following criteria:

- 1) the use of innovative teaching pedagogies and evidenced based high-impact educational practices (for a list of high-impact practices see <https://www.suu.edu/cetl/pdf/high-impact-practices.pdf>)
- 2) the introduction of new courses and academic programs
- 3) research into the pedagogy of teaching
- 4) presentations and publications on pedagogy
- 5) leading or participating in teaching workshops and trainings
- 6) winning any college, university, or professional organization teaching award
- 7) positive feedback and/or award nominations from students and/or peers.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member undergoing the annual, five year, or major review to demonstrate s/he has met the criteria listed above (i.e. by listing the new courses created; the workshops participated in; the awards won; etc.).

### **For all Faculty (Teaching Effectiveness Averages)**

In order to receive a rating of "Acceptable" for Teaching Effectiveness, faculty must demonstrate that their median student teaching evaluation scores are "average" or "above average," that their peer evaluations of teaching are "Good" to "Exceptional," and that they are engaged in a variety of innovative and high impact practices (see <https://www.suu.edu/cetl/pdf/high-impact-practices.pdf>).

The ratings earned for Teaching Effectiveness are *partially* based on scores received on student evaluations of teaching administered by SUU. Prior to fall semester 2019, these teaching evaluation scores were derived from the "Summary Evaluation" scores (either

raw or adjusted) on the IDEA forms. After spring semester 2019, scores will be derived from SUU's own online student teaching evaluation system. Overall or summary scores for each course per semester will be totaled and an average obtained per semester. These semester averages will then be combined and averaged for the total teaching effectiveness average for each academic year.

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology permits its faculty members to exclude one course per year when compiling student evaluations of teaching averages for annual reviews, third-year reviews, five-year reviews, and tenure and rank advancements. Because they are voluntary and not administered in class as with face to face classes, evaluations for online courses historically have had very low response rates deemed "unreliable" and "not representative." All evaluations for online courses must be included, however, these will not be computed in overall teaching effectiveness averages. If faculty achieve median ratings of "Average" or "Above Average" on their overall student teaching evaluation scores, they will receive 0.35 points for their teaching effectiveness.

In addition to the student evaluations of teaching, faculty undergoing annual reviews, five-year reviews, and major reviews are required to have their teaching assessed by at least two tenured or tenure track department faculty. If faculty achieve average ratings of "Good" to "Excellent" on 6 out of 10 components on classroom evaluations from these peer evaluations (using the H.S.A. peer evaluation of teaching form, see Appendix A), they will receive 0.35 points for their teaching effectiveness.

The teaching effectiveness average may be adjusted upward (in 0.1 increments) in light of evidence from the following indicators of innovative teaching strategies or pedagogical commitment (the maximum incremental advancement is 0.3 in any one academic year):

- a) the development and implementation of new course(s)
- b) the development and implementation of a new program -- the program must have required completion of a R401 form (0.3 points)
- b) peer-recognition of teaching performance (e.g., SUU "Distinguished Educator" award)
- c) publication of a peer-reviewed article, peer-reviewed or editor-reviewed book, or book chapter devoted to pedagogy
- d) reception of grant for pedagogical purposes
- e) significant improvement (10% or more) on teaching effectiveness average score from fall to spring semester or spring (previous FECR) to fall (current FECR)

- f) participation in educational seminar, workshop, and/or conference
- g) conducting field school (non-overload) or study abroad event
- h) faculty incorporates community engagement, global engagement, leadership engagement, outdoor engagement, and/or creative or innovative engagement as major components of her/his pedagogy.

If a faculty member thinks that a pedagogically-relevant activity ought to be recognized, she/he may request that 0.1 points be added to the teaching effectiveness average – the maximum incremental adjustment cannot exceed 0.3 per academic year. The chair will then decide if the request is merited. This request must be approved or denied by the chair of the department and the teaching effectiveness average adjusted accordingly prior to forwarding the review to the faculty member’s mentors.

## **B. Scholarly/Creative Activity:**

Consistent with university policy #6.1, the Department of History and Sociology with Anthropology follows the Boyer model for scholarship. In an effort to recognize and to quantify various forms and activities of scholarship, the department uses the following point system.

### **Tier I.<sup>1</sup>**

- Authored peer-reviewed academic book with a university or other quality press: 45 points.
- Edited academic peer-reviewed book with a university or other quality press: 20 points.
- Primary author of a peer-reviewed textbook with a university or other quality press: 20 points.
- Academic article in a peer-reviewed journal: 15 points

---

<sup>1</sup> The peer-review standard as applied to books is effective 5/01/2013. Books published prior to this date fall under the previous LRT Policy amended and approved 9/01/2011. No points for scholarship will be awarded for works published by “vanity presses” or that otherwise fit the following descriptions. If a book, edited book, and/or book chapter is published or distributed by a publisher that prints family histories, prints for specific purposes related to a professor’s career advancement (the individual contacts the publisher to print her/his work), the printer contacts the professor to print his/her work for a fee, or prints works directed toward specific classes, the author has paid for the book, edited book, or chapter to be bound, published, and/or distributed; no peer-review is conducted; the press does not meet the professional standards of academic publishing; or the edited book is simply a collection of readings or other material (or part of a collection of readings or other materials) that have been bound and sold as a “course pack” – no points for scholarship will be awarded for that book, edited book and/or chapter. A faculty member can make a case that his/her work falls under the “quality press” category. The burden is upon the faculty member to prove her/his work qualifies under this standard, i.e. is published by a nationally-recognized, respected commercial press that conducts some form of peer-review and quality review.

- Chapter in an academic peer-reviewed book with a university or other quality press: 15 points.
- Chapter in a peer-reviewed textbook with a university or other quality press: 15 points.
- Awarded competitive, external grant for academic or pedagogical research,<sup>2</sup> or awarded competitive, external research or pedagogical fellowship

\$5,000-\$9,999	6 points	\$30,000-\$34,999	11 points
\$10,000-\$14,999	7 points	\$35,000-\$39,999	12 points
\$15,000-\$19,999	8 points	\$40,000-\$44,999	13 points
\$20,000-\$24,999	9 points	\$45,000-\$49,999	14 points
\$25,000-\$29,999	10 points	\$50,000 +	15 points

## Tier II.

- SUU Distinguished faculty lecture and paper: 4 points.
- Invited lecture or keynote address<sup>3</sup>: 3 points.
- Encyclopedia article: 3 points.
- Peer-reviewed newsletter article: 3 points.
- Paper presented at an academic conference<sup>4</sup>: 2 points.
- Academic book review: 2 points.
- Academic field work requiring significant reporting to an external agency and lasting four weeks or more: 2 points.
- Reprint of a peer-reviewed article or book or film (including translations into other languages, wherein the translation was conducted by a 3rd party).
- Translation of primary work into a second language conducted by the author.
- Academic field work requiring significant reporting to an external agency and lasting 2 or 3 weeks: 1 point.
- Commenter, panel/session at an academic conference: 1 point.

---

<sup>2</sup> The burden is on the faculty member to show the external grant was competitive, including evidence there was an external call for applications, the number of submissions garnered, the competitive nature of the review process, and other documents showing the grant was not given to the faculty member because he/she is employed by SUU. This category does not apply to ongoing grants internally awarded to faculty as part of a grant administered through SUU per its contractual obligations to an external reporting authority. This would include grants contracted and/or secured by SUU for which a professor is needed to undertake the work even if the faculty member writes grants or completes other documents for renewal or continuation each year. For external grants for research or pedagogical development below \$5,000 faculty may make a written request to the chair of the department that points be awarded. If the chair agrees that points should be awarded, she/he may not award more than 5 points and is expected to follow the pattern of point allotment above (e.g., 5 points may be awarded for grants valuing \$4,500 to \$4,999, etc.).

<sup>3</sup> Points will not be awarded if a guest lecture or keynote address is associated with a university course or class. Points will only be awarded for invited presentations for conferences, research centers, university-wide audiences, etc

<sup>4</sup> If the same paper is presented at multiple conferences, points will only be awarded for the first presentation.

## **Documentary Films** (Approved by the HSA Department in March, 2018)

A faculty member can make a case in his/her annual review that his/her work was distributed by a "quality" film distributor or shown at a "quality" film festival category. The burden is upon the faculty member to prove her/his work qualifies under this standard.

\*\* For Tier II documentary films (films of 5 to 22 minutes), acceptance to screen in at least 3 film festivals will count as peer-review. Note: Films shorter than 23 minutes, in the vast majority of cases, only have one form of peer-review: film festivals. That is, as of the year 2018, they are categorically much less likely to achieve distribution with a quality distributor or quality educational film market distributor (which constitutes a second form of peer-review).

\*\*\* For Tier I documentary films (films 23 minutes or longer), achieving distribution with a quality distributor, quality educational film market distributor, OR broadcast on a quality TV station AND acceptance to screen in at least 3 film festivals will count as peer-review.

### Tier I.

Film of 23 minutes to 45 minutes: **15 points** (equivalent to Academic article in a peer-reviewed journal)

Film of 46 minutes to 79 minutes: **20 points** (equivalent to Edited academic peer-reviewed book with a university or other quality press)

Feature-length film (at least 80 minutes): **45 points** (equivalent to Authored peer-reviewed academic book with a university or other quality press)

### Tier II.

Film short of 5 to 12 minutes: **2 points** (equivalent to Paper presented at academic conference)

Film short of 13 to 22 minutes: **4 points**

As appropriate and in conjunction with Policy 6.1, the P & T Mentorship Teams, the Department Chairs, and other Evaluative Entities will assess a faculty member's Scholarly & Creative activities as either Acceptable & Unacceptable. Although there is flexibility in evaluating the specifics of a faculty member's contributions, some basic benchmarks will help faculty plan and measure their progress in their Scholarly and Creative endeavors.

For Tenure, a HSA Department member must have earned at least 30 Tier I points. At least 15 Tier I points must be earned since tenure track employment at the university began.

For all faculty hired after August 15, 2016, 30 Tier I points must be earned since tenure track employment began at SUU.

Faculty are expected to demonstrate an ongoing research agenda, but the nature of academic research and publishing may result in inconsistent results from year-to-year. Although yearly variations in point-totals are expected, faculty, in collaboration with their mentors, should plan ahead in order to achieve the requisite number of Scholarship/Creative Endeavor points to warrant rank advancement.

### **C. Service**

The department recognizes service to the university (including student organizations and clubs), college, department, and one's profession. Faculty members in the HSA Department must demonstrate active service within the SUU community. Additional service to one's discipline is also strongly encouraged.

Faculty on sabbatical or with extraordinary personal circumstances should communicate with the Chair about what constitutes an acceptable level of service.

Active service in the following will be considered relevant for evaluative purposes:

Examples of active service within the SUU community would include:

- a) university committee(s)
- b) college committee(s)
- c) department committee(s)
- d) faculty senate
- e) advisor to student organization(s) or club(s)
- f) *ad hoc* committees.

Examples of service to one's discipline could include:

- a) editorial board of a university press or peer reviewed academic journal
- b) service in a national or international professional organization
- c) reviewer of journal manuscript(s) for an academic journal
- d) reviewer of book manuscript(s) for an academic press
- e) reviewer of grant application(s) for an external agency.

Faculty should make an effort to perform service on campus, as well as in their discipline. Since no list of relevant service can be exhaustive, a faculty member may petition the chair of the department to recognize service-related activities. This petition must be presented in writing and the chair's written confirmation of service relevance must be included in the faculty member's P&T Portfolio.

During the first year of a new hire's employment, there is no expectation of service; a rating of "Acceptable" will be given for that first year. Tenure-track faculty are not expected to contribute to university-level committees requiring substantial work, such as serving as Division Director, chairing a major committee, etc.

#### **D. Professional Responsibility**

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology follows the Southern Utah University's policies and procedures on professional conduct and collegiality (as outlined in Policies #6.1 and #6.28). A faculty member who engages in collaborative, cooperative, and/or constructive activities with colleagues, administrators and students fulfills the department's definition of "collegiality." Such behavior and attitude should be demonstrated in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity and service.

In keeping with SUU Policies 6.1 and 6.28, which outline faculty responsibilities towards students, colleagues, and the institution, members of the Department are expected to maintain basic standards of Professional Responsibility. These standards are:

Regularly attend department meetings and other required meetings; work effectively and efficiently with colleagues on both special and ongoing projects; meet the reasonable requests of department officers; and comply with the administrative assistant's requests for required information and the completion of paperwork.

Faculty members must provide reasonable notice to the Department Chair of any matter that will require an absence from a scheduled class, including conference, research travel, or illness. Faculty members are not to take leave from class for personal matters or trips without the consent of the Department Chair.

Faculty members must consult with the Department Chair and Departmental Administrative Assistant prior to requesting or spending Department funds.

Represent the Department in a professional manner when serving on college and university committees, as well as when providing outreach to the local community.

Treat colleagues and students and staff with respect and dignity at all times.

## **II. Plans and Reviews (Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan & Report)**

To facilitate our faculty's progress toward fulfilling the Department's mission, each mentee will submit a Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report (FECR) of the previous year and a Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan (FECP) for the upcoming year according to the procedures and schedule outlined in University Policy 6.1.

As outlined in Policy 6.1, each faculty member develops an annual plan (for Tenure-track and Non-Tenure -Track Assistant Professors and Lecturers) or Five-Year Plan (for Professors and both Tenured and Non-Tenure-Track Associate Professors).

See Appendix A of Policy 6.1 for an Engagement and Contribution Report template.  
[https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP61Faculty\\_RevFall2019.pdf](https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP61Faculty_RevFall2019.pdf)

The Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology will conduct annual reviews of untenured faculty as stipulated by university policy 6.1. The reviews are intended to: 1) encourage faculty development and excellence; 2) ensure that the department is meeting strategic objectives; 3) determine whether a developmental plan is needed in order to assist a professor to improve and attain an "Acceptable" level of performance/productivity.

For tenure-track faculty, one's FECR and FECP with the chair's evaluative letter is forwarded to the chair of the department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) committee to be evaluated by that committee; once that committee's evaluation is completed, all materials are forwarded to the dean. For tenured faculty, one's FECR and FECP with the chair's evaluative letter is forwarded directly to the dean.

The faculty is required to: 1) prepare a narrative of his/her performance according to the above-mentioned categories using the form in "Appendix A" in the university LRT policy document; 2) provide an up-to-date C. V.; 3) furnish a copy of the title page of each recently published monograph or edited book and/or the title page and Table of

Contents of each journal in which the faculty has recently published; and, 4) at his/her discretion, a faculty member may provide any other materials to support and document his/her performance in any specified category.

Point values and weighting have been assigned to the categories of: Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service (see chart below). In consultation with their mentors and the Department Chair, faculty may petition to change the category weights. The sum of all three categories must equal 1.

As stipulated in the chart below, a faculty member's category rating is based on his/her teaching effectiveness average and use of innovative and high impact educational practices (see above). **In keeping with the primary emphasis on teaching at this institution, faculty members' rating in Teaching Effectiveness will be weighted by 0.45.**

The point values for scholarly activity are listed above in I. B. Scholarly/Creative Activity, and the corresponding meritorious ratings are stipulated in the following chart. **Faculty members' points earned in Scholarly/Creative Activity will be weighted by 0.35.**

Ratings in Service have been determined by the level of the SUU committee and by the various venues or professional organizations in which faculty have participated. **Faculty members' points earned in Service will be weighted by 0.20.**

### **Acceptable & Unacceptable Ratings**

A faculty member will receive an overall rating of "Acceptable" for an accumulation of points between and including the scores of 1.0 to 3.4, and an overall rating of "Unacceptable" if the faculty member's overall score exceeds 3.5.

The following is the rating system based in part on university policy 6.1. and expanded for use in the Department of History, Sociology, and Anthropology's evaluation of FECR reports. Activities and items included in the FECR will be limited to publications, presentations, and awards that occurred, took place, or were given during the academic year under review (that is, July 1<sup>st</sup> through June 30<sup>th</sup> of the academic year under review).

Category	Rating/Point Value	Specifications[6]
Teaching Effectiveness	Acceptable	Faculty members will receive a rating of acceptable if they score at least 0.70 points or above on a holistic measure of their teaching effectiveness. If they achieve a student teaching effectiveness summary average score of average to above average they will receive .35 points. If they receive ratings of “Good” to “Excellent” on 6 of 10 components on classroom evaluations from peer evaluations (using the H.S.A. peer evaluation of teaching form) they will receive .35 points. This base score can be adjusted upwards by a maximum of .3 incremental points using the other criteria specified above.
	Unacceptable	Faculty member achieves a teaching effectiveness average score below 0.7 (after incremental adjustments). A score within this range requires that a developmental plan be implemented.
Scholarly/ Creative Activity	Acceptable	Faculty member shows demonstrable progress on research and scholarship. This includes activities such as presenting at conferences, publishing articles, book-chapters, book-reviews, book-contracts, etc.  For tenure, faculty must accumulate 30 scholarship / creative activity points.
	Unacceptable	Faculty member does not show progress on research and scholarship.

Service	Acceptable	<p>Active service in <u>three or more</u> relevant activities (as defined above).</p> <p>*Any faculty member who serves on the faculty senate, chairs a major committee, or who serves on the university's LRT committee will receive an Acceptable rating for service.</p>
	Unacceptable	<p>Active service in <u>less than three</u> relevant activities (as defined above.).</p>

**III. Major Reviews**

**A. Three-Year Review.** To receive a rating of "Acceptable Performance" for this review, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

**Teaching Effectiveness:** The faculty member must have achieved an "Acceptable" rating on all FECRs since the beginning of tenure track employment. If teaching is rated below "Acceptable" on any FECR since the beginning of tenure track employment, the faculty member must demonstrate improved teaching effectiveness via student-evaluations, peer-evaluations, and innovative / high-impact teaching practices.

**Scholarly/Creative Activity:** The faculty member must achieve at least 15 points from Tier I (above) by the end of the semester in which the application is submitted. Tier I points earned prior to employment at Southern Utah University will count for the third-year review but no more than 15 Tier I points will be considered for subsequent promotion and advancement.

**Service:** The faculty member must have received a rating of "Acceptable" on any two previous FECRs submitted.

**B. Tenure and Associate Professor (Rank Advancement Review).** To receive the university rating of "Standard Professional Performance" for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

**Teaching Effectiveness:** The faculty member must have achieved an "Acceptable" rating on all Promotion and Tenure reviews since the third-year review.

**Scholarly/Creative Activity:** The faculty member must have earned at least 30 Tier I points. At least 15 Tier I points must be earned since tenure track employment at the university began. For all faculty hired after August 15, 2016, 30 Tier I points must be earned since tenure track employment began at SUU.

**Service:** The faculty member must have received "Acceptable" ratings on all FECRs since the third-year review.

**C. Full Professor (Rank Advancement Review).** To receive the university rating of "Acceptable Performance" for full professorship, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

**Teaching Effectiveness:** The faculty member must have received an "Acceptable" rating on all FECRs and formal reviews since the application for tenure.

**Scholarly/Creative Activity:** The faculty member must have earned at least an additional 30 points drawn from Tier I since tenure was granted.

**Service:** The faculty member must have received "Acceptable" ratings on all reviews since tenure was granted.

**D. Post-Tenure Review.** To receive the university rating of "Acceptable Performance" for post-tenure review, an applicant must demonstrate the following:

**Teaching Effectiveness:** The faculty member must have received an "Acceptable" rating on all reviews since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review.

**Scholarly/Creative Activity:** The faculty member must have earned at least an additional 4 points since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review.

**Service:** The faculty member must have received “Acceptable” ratings on all reviews since tenure was granted or since the previous post-tenure review.

**E. Non-tenure track Assistant Professor to Non-tenure track Associate Professor (Rank Advancement Review).** To receive the university rating of “Standard Professional Performance” for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate the following:

**Teaching Effectiveness:** The faculty member must have achieved an “Acceptable” rating on all Promotion and Tenure reviews since the third-year review.

**Scholarly/Creative Activity:** While non-tenure track faculty are not primarily evaluated on the basis of their scholarship, we encourage our colleagues to demonstrate some level of ongoing scholarship and research in the form of participating in conferences, publishing articles, reviews, book chapters, and conducting original research.

**Service:** The faculty member must have received “Acceptable” ratings on all FECRs since the third-year review.

---

[1] By obtaining separate average scores per semester, an evaluator can see improvement over the course of an academic year or to the next year.

[2] The peer-review standard as applied to books is effective 5/01/2013. Books published prior to this date fall under the previous LRT Policy amended and approved 9/01/2011. No points for scholarship will be awarded for works published by “vanity presses” or that otherwise fit the following descriptions. If a book, edited book, and/or book chapter is published or distributed by a publisher that prints family histories, prints for specific purposes related to a professor’s career advancement (the individual contacts the publisher to print her/his work), the printer contacts the professor to print his/her work for a fee, or prints works directed toward specific classes, the author has paid for the book, edited book, or chapter to be bound, published, and/or distributed; no peer-review is conducted; the press does not meet the professional standards of academic publishing; or the edited book is simply a collection of readings or other material (or part of a collection of readings or other materials) that have been bound and sold as a “course pack” – no points for scholarship will be awarded for that book, edited book and/or chapter. A faculty member can make a case that his/her work falls under the “quality press” category. The burden is upon the faculty member to prove her/his work qualifies under this standard, i.e. is published by a nationally-recognized, respected commercial press that conducts some form of peer-review and quality review.

[3] The burden is on the faculty member to show the external grant was competitive, including evidence there was an external call for applications, the number of submissions garnered, the competitive nature of the review process, and other documents showing the grant was not given to the faculty member because he/she is employed by SUU. This category does not apply to ongoing grants internally awarded to faculty as part of a grant administered through SUU per its contractual obligations to an external reporting authority. This would include grants contracted and/or secured by SUU for which a professor is needed to undertake the work even if the faculty member writes grants or completes other documents for renewal or continuation each year. For external grants for research or pedagogical development below \$5,000 faculty may make a written request to the chair of the department that points be awarded. If the chair agrees that points should be awarded, she/he may not award more than 5 points and is expected to follow the pattern of point allotment above (e.g., 5 points may be awarded for grants valuing \$4,500 to \$4,999, etc.).

[4] Points will not be awarded if a guest lecture or keynote address is associated with a university course or class. Points will only be awarded for invited presentations for conferences, research centers, university-wide audiences, etc.

[5] If the same paper is presented at multiple conferences, points will only be awarded for the first presentation.

[6] As outlined in section I.A. (above), a faculty member may disregard one course evaluation per academic year when calculating her/his teaching effectiveness average. See section I.A above for instructions and rules on calculating teaching effectiveness averages and incremental adjustments.

[7] For example, if a faculty member publishes an article X in spring 2017 and a book chapter Y in spring 2017, in order to reward she/he for both works, she/he will receive an "Exceptional Performance" rating for article X on FECR 2016-2017, and "Exceptional Performance" for chapter Y the next year, FECR 2017-2018.

---

## **IV. H.S.A. Department Promotion and Tenure Mentorship Teams and Committee Procedures**

### Department Promotion and Tenure Mentor Teams (PTMT):

For each TT assistant or associate faculty member, a PTMT includes at least two faculty who are tenured faculty members. At least two of the mentors must be members of the H.S.A. department. For each lecturer and non-tenure track (NTT) assistant faculty member, a PTMT includes one mentor who is a non-tenure track (NTT) associate or a tenured faculty member. It is recommended that no mentor be assigned more than four mentees a year (and no more than one mentee from outside of the department) unless a larger number is approved in consultation with the Department Chair and the Dean of HSS.

In the event that there is a shortage of H.S.A. mentors, no more than one mentor on a team may be selected from another department on campus whose mission and P & T policies reasonably align with that of the H.S.A. department. Unless permission is granted by the Provost's office (which would only occur in rare circumstances, such as the lack of any other appropriate mentors from the mentee's discipline), department chairs may not serve as a mentors for other faculty.

Mentors provide advice and guidance to help their mentees develop as engaged, contributing members of the Department, College, and University in ways that align with SUU's student-centered mission. SUU policy 6.1 outlines additional responsibilities of the PTMT. A PTMT meets at the beginning of each fall semester. The mentee, mentors, or department chair may request additional meetings if they feel they would be helpful.

The department chair is responsible for selecting the mentors for each mentee. Faculty interests and workloads will help guide this process. Ideally, the department chair will match mentees with mentors in their same field of study (i.e. historians with historians, sociologists with sociologists). In the case of small programs where this is not possible, the department chair will ask other qualified department faculty (see paragraph one) to step in as mentors.

Typically, the mentee's assignments continue until the mentee achieves tenure (for TT faculty). However, if a mentor or mentee wishes to change the membership of the PTMT due to shifting interests, responsibilities, workloads, or other conflicts, they are encouraged to communicate this wish to the department chair at the earliest opportunity

to do so. The department chair will then consult with the mentee and mentoring team and reconfigure the mentorship team prior to the start of the next academic year.

#### Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC):

The department PTC will be composed of all tenured faculty members who serve as department faculty mentors. Unless dictated by necessity, the department chair does not serve on the PTC. The Department's PTC members shall not serve on College or University-level P & T Committees. Each discipline in HSA should be represented on the Committee. In the event that members of the PTC are of one gender, and at the request of a mentee, the Department Chair shall arrange for a member of the other sex to become a member of the PTC. This PTC member shall be a NTT associate or tenured member of the Department. If not available, this member shall be selected from another SUU department whose mission and P & T policies reasonably align with the Department's.

The PTC reviews each mentee's faculty engagement and contribution plan (FECP). Care is taken to ensure that the faculty member's planned scholarship, and service/leadership contributions do not become so excessive as to interfere with the faculty member's performance, objectives, and goals in the area of teaching and mentoring. The PTC's review is informed by the extent to which the plan satisfies the Department's evaluative criteria.

Each fall semester, the PTC will review each mentee's engagement and contribution report (FECP). The PTC's review and evaluation is informed by the extent to which the faculty member achieved the goals and objectives described in his/her annual plan. This review and evaluation is shared with the Department Chair.

The PTC's review and evaluations will be completed in adequate time for the Department Chair to submit his/her evaluation of the faculty mentee to the Dean (as defined in SUU policy 6.1). The PTC shall also meet at the request of a mentee, or should concerns about a faculty member's performance (any rank or status) arise.