Kinesiology & Outdoor Recreation (KOR) Department
Evaluation Criteria (DEC)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: KOR Performance Review Policy

Introduction: Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC)

Consistent with University Policy 6.1, this DEC document establishes a framework for Faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure within the KOR Department. Our policies and procedures stress activities and efforts that provide individualized opportunities for both Faculty and students to realize their academic, professional, and personal goals. We promote and support the role and mission of SUU, as well as the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model. We acknowledge that "teaching is of primary importance", thus we seek to advance the roles and missions of the Department, College, and University as engaged teachers and mentors. We also acknowledge that Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty are primarily responsible for teaching (Policy 6.0), thus non-teaching activities are of secondary importance to individuals with these appointments; with no expectation to participate in scholarly/creative activities. Individuals appointed to Tenured and Tenure-Track (TT) roles are expected to participate in scholarly/creative activities. All Faculty, regardless of appointment, are also expected to engage in service/leadership activities and fulfill their professional responsibilities.

Faculty members of all appointments/levels should obtain the current version of University Policy 6.1, as well as this DEC document, and review all sections applicable to their appointment/level. It is ultimately each individual's responsibility to be familiar with these policies and to perform duties/activities aligning with the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Model and University mission. The "Faculty Dashboard", located within the "MySUUPortal" is utilized by each Faculty member to obtain the report and application templates and submit required FEC reports and/or applications [Mid-point Review, Promotion and/or Tenure]. For the purposes of creating and evaluating reports, applications, or reviews the Department operationally defines the semester order of the academic year as summer, fall, spring. Activities from the most recent summer semester may be included in applications for Tenure or rank advancement. Evaluative entities are required to use the "Faculty Dashboard" to complete the subsequent evaluations. Additional information pertaining to required and optional supporting documentation for FEC Reports and Applications is provided in Part I and II of this document. The Department follows procedures outlined in Policy 6.1, including the Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM) and mentorship process, and expects all Faculty, Academic Administrators and evaluative entities to fulfill their individual responsibilities as outlined in this policy and Policy 6.28.

DEC Committee

The Department Chair should organize and update the KOR DEC Committee as outlined in Policy 6.1. 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. The Committee should make a reasonable effort to ensure the Committee reviews this KOR DEC policy at least every three years and revise it as needed.

Transitioning from Previous Evaluative Criteria and Future Changes to the DEC

Requirements and timeline for transition (see 6.1 Transition Document) from previous DECs (KOR P&T

2022) to the current DEC are explained below. A list of Faculty members and their respective hire dates can be found at the end of this document.

    A. **Fall 2024:** All faculty writing and submitting annual reports, midpoint reviews, application for Tenure or Rank Advancement, or Five-Year Reviews for Fall 2024 can choose to use, as guidance, the most recent Departmental Evaluation Criteria (DEC) created under the previous Policy 6.1 or the new DEC created and approved the 2023-2024 academic year under the updated Policy 6.1.

    B. **Fall 2025:** If writing and submitting an annual report or midpoint review, faculty will use the new Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC) created and approved in the 2023-2024 academic year under the updated Policy 6.1. If applying for tenure or rank advancement or submitting a five-year review in Fall 2025, the faculty member can choose to use, as guidance, the most recent DEC created under previous Policy 6.1 or the new DEC created and approved in the 2023-2024 academic year under the updated Policy 6.1.

    C. **Fall 2026:** All faculty, whether submitting an annual report, midpoint review, five-year review, or applying for tenure or rank advancement will use the new Department Evaluation Criteria (DEC) created and approved in the 2023-2024 academic year under the updated Policy 6.1.

Future DEC Changes:

Future DEC revisions are approved as outlined in Policy 6.1. Each DEC iteration must be dated and stored in the KOR shared drive and Faculty Dashboard.

    A. **Changes not related to Evaluative Criteria:** It is likely the DEC will be updated regularly to reflect new Faculty hire dates, changes to the P&T Committee membership, changes to the DEC Committee membership, and additions or deletions of process-related information or other information not related to evaluative criteria. Any such changes will be made by **April 15th** by the DEC Committee. Changes will be voted upon by Departmental Faculty and if passed, based on the Departmental voting policy, will be effective at the beginning of the following Academic Year. Each year, any changes to the DEC will be summarized in a document accessible on the KOR shared drive. This document will serve as a running list of all changes made since AY23-24. Emergent issues related to the evaluative criteria may also be addressed, voted upon, and if approved, changed at this time.

    B. **Changes to Evaluative Criteria:** Every three years, or earlier if deemed necessary, in the fall semester, the Departmental Evaluative Criteria will be reviewed by the DEC Committee. If it is determined that Evaluative Criteria should be revised to reflect changes in the academic environment, best practices, and/or Faculty expectations, the DEC Committee will be tasked with making these changes. Any changes to the Evaluative Criteria will be proposed to Faculty no later than **November 1st** and voted upon prior to **December 1st**. If approved, changes will be reflected in the DEC for the following academic year. In these instances, Faculty may choose to use the previous DEC or the new DEC, per Table 1.

Table 1. DEC Transition Timeline.

	Year 1 of revised evaluative criteria	Year 2 of revised evaluative criteria	Year 3 of revised evaluative criteria	Year 4 of revised evaluative criteria
Annual Reports	Faculty member's choice*	Use most recent DEC	Use most recent DEC	Use most recent DEC
Mid-point Reviews	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Use most recent DEC	Use most recent DEC
Tenure & Promotion	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Use most recent DEC
5-year Reviews (Tenured)	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Use most recent DEC	Use most recent DEC
Rank Advancement (NTT)	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Use most recent DEC
Rank Advancement from Associate to Professor (Tenured)	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Faculty member's choice*	Use most recent DEC

Faculty may choose to use the previous DEC or most recently approved DEC. In the event the DEC evaluation metrics have changed multiple times since the Faculty member's most recent major review (mid-point, 5-year, or rank advancement), Faculty may also choose to use the DEC that was in place immediately subsequent to that review.

Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

The Department, in consultation with the Dean, determines specific rules regarding the percentage of Faculty votes required to serve on the P&T Committee and procedures for circumstances in which there is an insufficient number of eligible Faculty to serve on the Committee. All guidelines, presented in Policy 6.1, shall be followed. In addition, members of the Departmental P&T Committee shall serve a term of 3 years, after which time, the committee member shall have the option to run for reappointment every 3 years. These rules and procedures will be publicly available on the Provost's Office website.

Section A: Performance Review Policy for Tenure Track (TT) and Tenured Faculty

University Policy 6.0 defines Tenure-Track (TT) and Tenured Faculty. The process and Departmental expectations for these Faculty to apply for tenure and/or rank advancement, as well as to maintain good standing is provided below:

Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM)

TT and tenured Faculty are expected to complete AIM meetings as outlined in Policy 6.1.

Faculty Engagement and Contribution Reports (FEC Reports) and Applications

TT and tenured Faculty are expected to submit FEC Reports and applications as outlined in Policy 6.1. For the purposes of creating and evaluating reports, applications, or reviews the Department operationally defines the semester order of the academic year as summer, fall, spring. Activities from the most recent summer semester may be included in applications for Tenure or rank advancement. The Department *requires* the following documents be included:

- **A.** A link to the appropriate DEC document to be used by Evaluating Entities.
- **B.** All syllabi from the most recent academic year (note: all previous years' syllabi included in the report/application must be available upon request).
- **C.** Student course evaluations from all years included in the report/application & action-oriented goals following reflection. (*note: The Department, along with the University acknowledges that student feedback results may be subject to bias, thus student feedback results should not be the sole measure of evaluating Teaching Effectiveness*).
- **D.** Other applicable evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
- **E.** Evidence of Scholarship activities
- **F.** Evidence of Service/Leadership activities

Assistant Professor

To receive an evaluative rating of "acceptable progress" a TT Assistant Professor should achieve the following *minimum* benchmarks each year:

- a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The Faculty member should choose and document progress on developmental goals from Teaching Effectiveness categories (Part II, Section A, items A thru E) each year, with each category included over the course of 2-3 years. Goals and subsequent reports should include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities over a number of years. Activities may be applied to more than one category; therefore, the Faculty member should provide an explanation of which category(ies) the activity is applicable. The Department P&T Committee and Chair should verify the category(ies) and value of activities as part of their annual evaluations. The Dean will serve as arbiter in the case of a dispute between the Department P&T Committee and Chair.
- b. **Scholarly Contributions:** The Faculty member should demonstrate consistent engagement in scholarly activities and progress toward achieving the minimum benchmarks outlined below for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure. The Department P&T Committee and Chair should verify the value of scholarly activities as part of their annual evaluations. The Dean

will serve as arbiter in the case of a dispute between the Department P&T Committee and Chair.

c. **Service/Leadership:** The Faculty member should engage in service and leadership activities within more than one category (Department, College, University or Community/Profession). It is possible/acceptable that a TT Faculty member is appropriately engaged in service/leadership activities but within only one category during a given year. In the event this occurs, the Faculty member should provide further justification. The Department P&T Committee and Chair should verify the categories and/or the appropriateness of a single category as part of their annual evaluations. The Dean will serve as arbiter in the case of a dispute between the Department P&T Committee and Chair.

Mid-Point Review

Table 2. presents the timeline for the Midpoint Review. Faculty granted years towards service may include Teaching, Scholarly, and Service contributions from their previous institution but only for the respective years of service granted. For example, if a Faculty member receives two years of service towards Tenure, they may count Teaching, Scholarly, and Service activities conducted in the two academic years prior to the academic year of hire. To receive an evaluative rating of "acceptable progress" it is recommended that a TT Assistant Professor achieve the following *minimum* benchmarks as part of their mid-point review:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The Faculty member should achieve 1-2 goals in each of the Teaching Effectiveness categories (A-E). Goals should also include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities.

b. **Scholarly Contributions:** The Faculty member should achieve 1-2 contributions considered to be "Highly Valued" and 3-4 other contributions (any category). In the event the Faculty member does not have 1-2 Highly Valued contributions they should provide sufficient justification and/or an outlined plan demonstrating their ability to achieve the minimum benchmarks outlined below for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure prior to the conclusion of their probationary period.

c. **Service/Leadership:** The Faculty member should have a history of involvement in service and leadership activities within various categories (Department, College, University or Community/Profession) spanning the length of their probationary period to date. It is possible/acceptable that a TT Faculty member is appropriately engaged in service/leadership activities but primarily within only one category. In the event this occurs, the Faculty member should provide further justification.

Table 2. Timeline for Midpoint Review

Years Granted Toward Promotion (NTT) or Tenure (TT) at Time of Hiring	Years of Service Before Mid-Point Review
0	3 full years
1	3 full years
2	2 full years
3	1 full year

Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Following University Policy 6.1, a TT Faculty member may opt to apply to have the probationary period reduced by one year. A Faculty member considering early tenure should discuss this with the Department Chair and Departmental P&T Committee by February 1 of the calendar year in which the Faculty will submit a tenure application. To pursue early tenure a Faculty member must obtain letters of support from the Department Chair and the Dean by the April 1 deadline, as well as demonstrate that all Departmental tenure requirements are not only met, but exceeded. The Department defines "exceeds" for the purpose of early tenure via the following criteria:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The Faculty member should achieve a minimum of 3 goals in each of the Teaching Effectiveness categories (A-E), as well as a minimum of 5 goals within any 3 categories of their choosing and in consultation with the Department Chair during previous AIM meetings. The TT Faculty should also demonstrate their efforts extended beyond the scope of their academic program and/or discipline.

b. **Scholarly Contributions:** The TT Faculty member should achieve a *minimum* of 6 "Highly Valued" contributions and 12 other contributions (any category). The TT Faculty should also demonstrate contributions that extend beyond the scope of their academic program and/or discipline.

c. **Service/Leadership:** The TT Faculty member should have a history of involvement in service and leadership activities within the Department, College, University, and Community/Profession that demonstrate growth and development as evidenced by taking on leadership roles and/or advanced responsibilities within organizations. The TT Faculty should also demonstrate that their service/leadership activities have had an impact that extends beyond the scope of their academic program and/or discipline.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Table 3. presents the standard timeline for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty granted years towards service may include Teaching, Scholarly, and Service contributions from their previous institution but only for the respective years of service granted. For example, if a Faculty member receives two years of service towards Tenure, they may count Teaching, Scholarly, and Service activities

conducted in the two academic years prior to the academic year of hire. To receive an evaluative rating of "yes" for promotion to Associate Professor and the corresponding award of tenure the following *minimum* benchmarks for TT Faculty are as follows:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The TT Faculty member should achieve 2-3 goals in each of the Teaching Effectiveness categories (A-E). Goals should also include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities.

b. **Scholarly Contributions:** The TT Faculty member should achieve 4 contributions considered to be "Highly Valued" and 8 other contributions (any category).

c. **Service/Leadership**: The TT Faculty member should have a history of involvement in service and leadership activities within various categories (Department, College, University or Community/Profession) spanning the length of their probationary period.

Table 3. Tenure/Promotion timeline for TT Faculty hired as Assistant Professor. TT Faculty hired as Associate Professor follow the same timeline prior to applying for tenure.

Years Granted Toward Tenure/Promotion at Time of Hiring	Years of Service at SUU Before Tenure/Promotion Application	Application Submission	Granted (after a successful evaluation application)
0	6 full years	at the conclusion of the sixth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the seventh complete academic year
1	5 full years	at the conclusion of the fifth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the sixth complete academic year
2	4 full years	at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the fifth complete academic year
3	3 full years	at the conclusion of the third complete academic year	at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year

Post-Tenure Review (5-year reviews unless otherwise specified)

To receive a "yes" vote to remain in "good standing" the following *minimum* benchmarks for tenured Faculty should be met and demonstrated every five years:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The tenured Faculty member should achieve at least 1 goal in each of the Teaching Effectiveness categories (A-E) and five additional goals from any category (A-E). Goals should include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities. Goals should demonstrate ongoing learning and implementation of new teaching strategies, technologies, and knowledge pertaining to the Faculty member's teaching assignments.

b. **Scholarly Contributions:** The tenured Faculty member should achieve 2-3 contributions considered to be "Highly Valued" and 4-6 other contributions (any category). Note, if 2 Highly Valued contributions are made, it is expected 6 "other" contributions have been made. If only 1

Highly Valued contribution has been made, the Faculty member should provide justification and demonstrate at least 8 "other" contributions.

c. **Service/Leadership:** The tenured Faculty member should have a history of involvement in an array of service and leadership activities within various categories (Department, College, University or Community/Profession) and/or demonstrate greater involvement and responsibility over time.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A Professor is a Faculty member who has demonstrated excellence in Teaching, Service/Leadership and Scholarly/Creative Activities over a sustained period, typically granted at least six years after being granted tenure (application may be submitted at the time of the first 5-year review or any year thereafter so long as the posted application deadline is met). To receive an evaluative rating of "yes" for promotion to Professor the following *minimum* benchmarks, after being granted tenure, should be achieved:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The Faculty member should achieve at least 2 goals in each of the Teaching Effectiveness categories (A-E) and five additional goals from any category (A-E). Goals should include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities. Goals should demonstrate ongoing learning and implementation of new teaching strategies, technologies, and knowledge pertaining to the Faculty member's teaching assignments.

b. **Scholarly Contributions:** The tenured Faculty member should achieve 4 contributions considered to be "Highly Valued" and 6 other contributions (any category).

c. **Service/Leadership:** The tenured Faculty member should have a history of involvement in an array of service and leadership activities within various categories (Department, College, University or Community/Profession) ***and*** demonstrate greater involvement and responsibility over time.

Section B: Performance Review Policy for Non-tenure Track Faculty (NTT)

University Policy 6.0 defines Non-tenure Track (NTT) Faculty. The process and Departmental expectations for these Faculty to apply for rank advancement, as well as to maintain good standing is provided below:

Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM)

NTT Faculty are expected to complete AIM meetings as outlined in Policy 6.1.

Faculty Engagement and Contribution Reports (FEC Reports) and Applications

NTT Faculty are expected to submit FEC Reports and applications as outlined in Policy 6.1. For the purposes of creating and evaluating reports, applications, or reviews the Department operationally defines the semester order of the academic year as summer, fall, spring. Activities from the most recent summer semester may be included in applications for rank advancement. The Department *requires* the following documents be included:

A. A link to the appropriate DEC document to be used by Evaluating Entities.

B. All syllabi from most recent academic year (*note: all previous years' syllabi included in the*

report/application must be available upon request)

C. Student course evaluations from all years included in the report/application & action-oriented goals following reflection. (*note: The Department, along with the University acknowledges that student feedback results may be subject to bias, thus student feedback results should not be the sole measure of evaluating Teaching Effectiveness*).

D. Other applicable evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

E. Evidence of Service/Leadership activities

F. Optional - Evidence of Scholarship activities (*NOT required)

Lecturer

To receive an evaluative rating of "acceptable progress" it is recommended that a NTT Lecturer achieve the following *minimum* benchmarks each year:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The Faculty member should choose and document progress on developmental goals from multiple teaching effectiveness categories (A thru E). Goals and subsequent reports should include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities. Activities may be applied to more than one category; therefore, the Faculty member should provide an explanation of which category(ies) the activity is applicable. The Department P&T Committee and Chair should verify the category(ies) and value of activities as part of their annual evaluations. The Dean will serve as arbiter in the case of a dispute between the Department P&T Committee and Chair.

b. **Service/Leadership:** The Faculty member should engage in service and leadership activities within more than one category (Department, College, University or Community/Profession). It is possible/acceptable that a NTT Faculty member is appropriately engaged in service/leadership activities but within only one category during a given year. In the event this occurs, the Faculty member should provide further justification. The Department P&T Committee and Chair should verify the categories and/or the appropriateness of a single category as part of their annual evaluations. The Dean will serve as arbiter in the case of a dispute between the Department P&T Committee and Chair.

Mid-Point Review (*optional for NTT Faculty)

NTT Faculty preparing for promotion may opt to complete a mid-point review. In these instances to receive an evaluative rating of "acceptable progress" it is recommended that NTT Faculty achieve the following *minimum* benchmarks:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The NTT Faculty member should achieve half of the requirements for promotion to NTT Assistant/Associate Professor as listed below. In the event less than half of the requirements are met, they should provide sufficient justification and/or an outlined plan demonstrating their ability to achieve the minimum benchmarks outlined below for promotion.

b. **Service/Leadership:** The NTT Faculty member should demonstrate current and previous participation in a variety of service/leadership activities on campus.

Promotion to NTT Assistant Professor

Table 4. shows the timeline for promotion to NTT Assistant Professor for NTT Faculty hired as LecturerTo receive an evaluative rating of "yes" for promotion to NTT Assistant Professor the following *minimum* benchmarks for NTT Faculty are as follows:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness**: The NTT Faculty member should achieve 2 goals in each of the teaching effectiveness categories (A-E). Goals should include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities.

b. **Service/Leadership:** The NTT Faculty member should have a history of involvement in service and leadership activities within various categories (Department, College, University or Community/Profession) spanning the length of their probationary period to date. It is possible/acceptable that a NTT Faculty member is appropriately engaged in service/leadership activities but primarily within only one category. In the event this occurs, the Faculty member should provide further justification.

Table 4. Timeline for promotion to NTT Assistant Professor for NTT Faculty hired as Lecturer

Hired as NTT Lecturer Years Granted Toward Promotion at Time of Hiring	Years of Service at SUU as NTT Lecturer Before Promotion Application	Application Submission	Promotion to NTT Assistant Professor Granted (after a successful evaluation application)
0	4 full years	at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the fifth complete academic year
1	3 full years	at the conclusion of the third complete academic year	at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year
2	2 full years	at the conclusion of the second complete academic year	at the conclusion of the third complete academic year
3	1 full years	at the conclusion of the first complete academic year	at the conclusion of the second complete academic year

Promotion to NTT Associate Professor

Table 5. shows the timeline for promotion to NTT Associate Professor for NTT Faculty hired as Assistant Professor or previously promoted from Lecturer to Assistant Professor. A NTT Associate Professor is a Faculty member who has demonstrated excellence in Teaching and Service/Leadership over a sustained period, typically at least seven years after being granted NTT Assistant Professor status. To receive an evaluative rating of "yes" for promotion to NTT Associate Professor the following *minimum* benchmarks after serving an a NTT Assistant Professor, should be achieved:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The NTT Faculty member should achieve 2-3 goals in each of the Teaching Effectiveness categories (A-E). Goals should also include both "Highly Valued" and "Valued" activities.

b. **Service/Leadership:** The Faculty member should have a history of involvement in service and leadership activities within various categories (Department, College, University or Community/Profession) spanning the length of their probationary period to date.

Table 5. Timeline for promotion to NTT Associate Professor for NTT Faculty hired as Assistant Professor or previously promoted from Lecturer to Assistant Professor.

Years Granted Toward Promotion at Time of Hiring (for NTT hired at Assistant Professor level only)	Years of Service at SUU as NTT Assistant Professor Before Promotion Application	Application Submission	NTT Associate Professor Promotion Granted (after a successful evaluation application)
0	6 full years	at the conclusion of the sixth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the seventh complete academic year
1	5 full years	at the conclusion of the fifth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the sixth complete academic year
2	4 full years	at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year	at the conclusion of the fifth complete academic year
3	3 full years	at the conclusion of the third complete academic year	at the conclusion of the fourth complete academic year

Section C: Performance Review Policy for Faculty with Special Appointments, Partial Reassignments, Academic Administrators, etc.

Faculty with Special Appointments

Faculty with Special Appointments are subject only to completing annual AIMs and submitting Annual FEC Reports. Requirements for teaching effectiveness, service, and scholarship will be made on a case-by-case basis with input from the Department Chair and Dean. Expectations will be documented and agreed upon prior to the start of the Special Appointee's contract date.

Faculty with Partial Reassignments including Academic Officers, Program Directors, Clinical Coordinators, and those with other non-executive level University-related responsibilities

As partial reassignments specifically pertain to reduced teaching load requirements, the quantity of teaching effectiveness expectations (goals) may be altered in a manner commensurate with the course reduction. Scholarship and service expectations remain the same; this also pertains to individuals who choose to receive a stipend or overload pay, as opposed to a course reduction. Within the FEC Report (Annual, Midpoint, Promotion, or 5-Year Review), individuals receiving partial reassignments should describe the associated responsibilities and briefly reflect on performance, development, and outcomes related to this role.

Section D: Performance Review Policy for Remediation for Unsatisfactory Performance and Faculty Seeking Redress

Remediation for Unsatisfactory Performance.
All Faculty, regardless of rank or assignment, may also be subject to remediation as outlined in Policy 6.28. Remediation for non-tenured Faculty is outlined in Policy 6.1. For Faculty undergoing a Five-Year Review, if at the time of review the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost determine the Faculty member has not sufficiently fulfilled DEC requirements and is not in Good Standing, they work together to create a development plan. The Five-Year-Review Faculty member returns to the annual FEC Report process, similar to annual AIMs and the process for TT Faculty, until they meet the expectations described in the development plan.

Redress.
This section of the document outlines conditions and procedures for faculty who chose to petition the department for redress regarding assessment measures or the assessment conclusions of the Department Evaluation Committee or Department Chair.

A. **Redress Procedures:**
a. **Assessment Measures:** Faculty may petition the Departmental DEC Committee regarding the validity of the assessment measures outlined in the DEC. The written petition must specifically address deficiencies, inaccuracies, or biases in the assessment measures. The petition must also propose alternate assessment measures that meet the University standard of the Student-Centric Faculty Engagement model. Petitions to change the DEC can be filed (emailed) with the Chair of the DEC Committee at any time. However, changes to evaluative criteria must be approved as described in Part I of this Policy and will not be implemented until the following academic year.
b. **Assessment Conclusions:** Faculty may petition the validity of the Departmental P&T Committee and/or Department Chair's assessment of their annual review, mid-point review, five-year review, tenure, or promotion materials. The written petition should present specific evidence or other support that was included in the initial application materials but was overlooked or misjudged by the Evaluators, and confirms the Faculty's work met or exceeded assessment measures.Faculty can choose from one or more of the following mechanisms to engage the assessment conclusion redress process:
   1) A meeting with the P&T Committee and/or Department Chair.
   2) A request for an outside evaluator or evaluators from faculty within another department of the College of Health Sciences
   3) Arbitration through staff or faculty from the Provost's Office

PART II: KOR Promotion & Tenure Evaluation Criteria

SUU Policy [6.1](#) states that Faculty contribute to SUU's Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Mission via exemplifying Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service/Leadership.

The KOR Department expects and appreciates that the types of contributions may vary among Faculty members, and even for individual Faculty members over time. To be eligible for tenure, a TT Faculty member needs to demonstrate increasing proficiency and effectiveness in their engagement and contributions documented in their FEC Reports. A TT Faculty member who receives a "Development Required" designation on more than one FEC Report within the tenure review period is less likely to receive tenure. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires the Faculty member to be a recognized leader 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 and service to SUU. NTT Faculty will have clearly established roles within the department that generally emphasize teaching/mentoring, with a secondary responsibility to Departmental, College and University service/leadership.

Section A: Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Criteria

The following KOR Departmental Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness and engagement is aligned with the most recently approved version of University Policy [6.1](#) and represents a broad interpretation of Teaching Effectiveness beyond student evaluations. Each year, Faculty should strive to achieve a variety of categorical goals to demonstrate the multifaceted nature of a dynamic, engaged and effective teacher.

Required Materials

a. All syllabi from most recent academic year (*note: all previous years' syllabi included in the report/application must be available upon request*)
b. Student course evaluations from all years included in the report/application & action-oriented goals following reflection. (*note: The Department, along with the University acknowledges that student feedback results may be subject to bias, thus student feedback results should not be the sole measure of evaluating Teaching Effectiveness*).
c. Other applicable evidence of Teaching Effectiveness. Examples of activities and forms of evidence demonstrating teaching efficacy are listed below. **Other types of materials or contributions can be included with appropriate justification.** Activities may be applied to more than one category; therefore, Faculty should provide an explanation for which category the activity is applicable. Specific requirements for "good standing", tenure, and promotion for TT, NTT, and Tenured Faculty can be found in Part I of this policy.

CATEGORIES for Teaching Effectiveness:

A. Course Materials Provided to Students
B. Assignments and Assessments
C. Feedback to Students
D. Student Evaluations of Professor and Course

E. Professional Development

CATEGORY A: Examples of Course Materials Provided to Students

Include examples as a linked file

Highly Valued

- Lecture notes or course Powerpoint presentations (partial/skeletal or complete, must be developed by the Faculty member).
- Solutions to homework assignments and/or completed examples developed by the Faculty member (text, pencast, or other format).
- Materials such as course manuals, laboratory manuals, and open-educational resources developed by the Faculty member

Valued

- List of objectives that are not topic related (critical thinking, problem-solving, etc.) and how each will be achieved.
- Student wikis or discussion boards with significant contributions from you.
- Practice exams or review guides.
- Animations, video clips, or simulations related to course material.
- Articles from scientific literature.
- New teaching methods or materials along with measurements to determine their impact on students.
- **Other** (please specify and explain the value).

CATEGORY B: Examples of Assignments and Assessments

Include sample documents which clearly demonstrate the purpose or goal of the assignment/assessment should be included in a linked file.

Highly Valued

- Integration of relevant High Impact Practices (HIPs) and/or evidence-based teaching strategies into course curricula and reflection on the development, implementation, and efficacy of those teaching strategies.
- Scheduled course work (class activities, tests, projects) in ways which encouraged students to stay up-to-date in their work.
- Problem sets/homework assigned contributing to course grade at regular and frequent intervals.
- Tests, projects, and assignments that cover the most important concepts of the course.

Valued

- Major paper or project (requires longer than two weeks and involves some degree of student control in the choice of topic or design).
- Assignments which require students to use multiple resources (e.g., data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding.
- "Hands-on" projects such as research, case studies, or "real life" activities.

- Assigned projects, tests, or assignments that require original or creative thinking.
- Use of pre-post survey of student interest and/or perceptions about the subject or to assess background knowledge.
- Opportunities for student self-evaluation of learning.
- **Other** (please specify and explain the value).

CATEGORY C: Examples of Feedback to Students

Include sample documents such as rubrics or examples of feedback given to students (in an anonymous manner) when applicable

Highly Valued

- Students see graded assignments/exams and answer key (in a timely manner as to facilitate future mastery of information).
- Rubric-based explanations and grading of student academic performance (in a timely manner which facilitates future mastery of information).
- Exams and/or assignment answers discussed in class (in a timely manner as to which facilitates future mastery of information).

Valued

- Students explicitly encouraged to meet individually with Faculty member for additional help or guidance.
- Assignments with feedback before grading or with the opportunity to redo work to improve grade.
- **Other** (please specify and explain value).

CATEGORY D: Examples of Professor and Course Evaluations

An explanation of the value of the evaluation(s) should be included

Highly Valued

- Peer/Mentor evaluation of teaching materials and/or teaching methods and the action-oriented goals related to this evaluation (recommended yearly).
- Chair evaluation of teaching materials and/or teaching methods, and the action-oriented goals related to this evaluation.

Valued

- Midterm course evaluation.
- Self-evaluation/reflection on teaching materials and/or teaching methods.
- Peer reviews of administrative evaluations.
- **Other forms of student feedback** (please specify and explain value).

CATEGORY E: Examples of Professional Development

An explanation of the value of these activities should be included

Highly Valued

- Attending a teaching conference or workshop and demonstration of the implementation of new teaching methods/theories.
- Acting as a Peer Evaluator for a colleague's class or teaching materials followed by a discussion with colleague and a written reflection. This can include access to and review of Canvas course organization and resources.

Valued

- Team-teaching a class, lab, or learning activity.
- Participation in professional development activities and reflection on how these activities will be used to improve teaching.
- **Other forms of professional development** (please specify and explain value).

Section B: Scholarship Evaluation Criteria

The KOR Department expects TT and Tenured Faculty members to participate in scholarship. Scholarly activities that align with the University's student-centered mission are especially valued. Specific requirements for "good standing", tenure, and promotion for TT and Tenured Faculty can be found in Part I of this policy.

Examples of Highly Valued Scholarship/Contributions:

- Significant publication *(book/lab manual/workbook, etc.)* in appropriate academic area
- Principal writer of funded external grant *(≥ $25,000.00)*
- Project director of funded external grant
- Scholarly paper/presentation or co-presenter with a student at a national or international professional meeting or conference *(peer-reviewed; poster presentation, etc.)*
- Published article or co-published article with a student in a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication of a book chapter
- Peer reviewed journal article/publication
- Peer reviewed technical report
- Other with justification

Examples of Valued Scholarship/Contributions:

- Principal writer of funded external grant *(<$25,000)*
- Assistant project director of funded external grant
- Principal writer or significant contribution to new academic program development *(R401 for Board of Regents)*
- Principal writer or significant contribution for national accreditation or accreditation self-study
- Scholarly paper/presentation or Co-presenter with a student at a state (e.g. UCUR), local (e.g. FOE) or regional professional meeting or conference
- Mentor student-led research project *(undergraduate or graduate)*

- Funded Faculty development grant *(e.g., FDSF or FSSF)* or Faculty advisor for student development grant *(e.g., UGRASP)*
- Book review for publishing company
- Workshop presentations
- Professional consultation *(submitted in writing to a client)*
- Development and integration of knowledge into a course that requires learning and applying new methods or technology
- Recertification of a currently held credential in the appropriate academic area *(re-exam, etc.)*
- Other with justification

EXAMPLES of Developmental Scholarship/Contributions:

- Published article in a journal or other print or electronic medium *(not peer-reviewed)*
- Invited speeches and lectures (*not peer-reviewed*)
- Submission and approval of an IRB application
- Significant progress of data collection
- Significant progress of grant development/submission
- Significant progress creating a book/lab manual/workbook etc.
- Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed journal *(rejected)*
- Contributor for national accreditation or accreditation annual review
- Attending professional development workshop/conference *(grant writing, national/regional/state professional organization, etc.)* and discussion of implications or effect on your teaching/scholarly work
- Maintain certification of currently held credential in relevant academic area *(CEUs, etc.)*
- Other with justification

Section C: Service/Leadership

All Faculty are expected to consistently provide service and leadership when requested and/or opportunities arise. In addition, the Department highly values the voluntary mentorship of Junior Faculty. Service/Leadership engagement and activities can be reported under several categories. Specific requirements for "good standing", tenure, and promotion for TT, NTT, and Tenured Faculty can be found in Part I of this policy.

Examples of Service to the University or College:

- Chair or member of University committees
- Faculty Senate
- Hosting off-campus groups, colleagues or other professionals in a formal setting
- Advisor to a student organization
- College P&T Evaluation Committee
- College committee chair or member
- **Other Service/Leadership activities may be included with justification**

Examples of Service to the Department:

- P&T mentor
- Peer teaching evaluator
- Scholarship development or evaluation of scholarship applicants
- Graduate thesis committee chair or member
- Departmental committee chair or member
- Hosting off-campus groups, colleagues or other professionals at an informal venue (e.g. community workshop)
- Writing letters of recommendation or support for students or colleagues, presentation at departmental seminars or meetings
- Formal academic advising
- **Other Service/Leadership activities may be included with justification**

Examples of Service to the Profession:

- President, board member, council member or office holder in national, regional or state professional organizations
- Recognized accomplishment in professionally related activity
- Professional consulting or editorial services
- **Other Service/Leadership activities may be included with justification**

Examples of Service to the Community:

- Involvement in organizing or directing a community service activity
- Participation in a community service activity
- Presentation of workshops or seminars for campus or community members
- Formal representative of the University, College or Department at community events
- **Other Service/Leadership activities may be included with justification**

EXAMPLES of Developmental Activities that may fall under the Service/Leadership Category:

- Participation in seminars or workshops that emphasize mentorship, advising or leadership principles
- Demonstrated improvement in these areas with justification (e.g. letter of support, informal student or peer evaluation, formal evaluation)
- **Other Service/Leadership activities may be included with justification**

Section D: Professional Responsibility

The KOR Department appreciates and values amicable, ethical, collegial, and responsible colleagues. KOR Faculty members are expected to adhere to all SUU policies and codes of conduct. Faculty are expected to attend and contribute to College and Department meetings. The KOR Department assumes that Faculty members comply with SUU policies on professional and ethical conduct unless evidence is presented to the contrary according to processes outlined in Policy 6.28.

PART III: KOR Faculty Hire Dates and Committee Members

Department Faculty

Hire Date	Name	Tenure Status	Rank
August 2017	Cody Bremner	Tenured	Associate Professor
August 2022	Jason Burton	NTT	Lecturer
August 2021	Jeff Cowley	TT	Assistant Professor
August 2018	Merrill Funk	Tenured	Associate Professor
August 2014	Kelly Goonan	Tenured	Associate Professor
August 2022	Amanda Hawkes	TT	Assistant Professor
August 2012	Abigail Larson	Tenured	Professor
August 2020	Marcus Lawrence	TT	Assistant Professor
August 2017	Paul Maggio	NTT	Assistant Professor
August 2011	Jacob Manning	NTT	Assistant Professor
August 2013	Nathan Slaughter	Tenured	Associate Professor
August 20 2003	Julie Taylor	Tenured	Professor

KOR DEC Committee Members

Name	Rank/Status	Starting year

Abigail Larson	Tenured/Professor	2023
Jeff Cowley	TT/ Assistant Professor	2023
Paul Maggio	NTT/Assistant Professor	2023

Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

Type	Name	Starting or assigned year (to inform the rotating basis)
Chair	Abigail Larson	2023
Member	Merrill Funk	2021
Member		2022
Alternate		

2

Date of DEC Approval: April 16, 2024

Policy 6.1 states that the Department Chair ensures that the DEC is reviewed at least every three years. If this does not occur, the P&T Committee Chair will remind the Department Chair, and if still not reviewed, the P&T Committee Chair will notify the Dean.

Date of last Review: Spring 2024 semester