

## Alignment and Integration Meeting (AIM) Purpose Statement

The purpose of the AIM is for the Department Chair and faculty member to communicate, discuss, and agree upon expected Teaching, Service/Leadership, and Scholarly Activities for the subsequent academic year. Recognizing that individuals have varying strengths and talents, the AIM should demonstrate a link between the faculty member's engagement and development, and the departmental/ university Evaluation, Promotion, & Tenure criteria. The AIM must serve several roles as there are multiple evaluative audiences, including:

- The Faculty Member - The AIM serves as a roadmap to help faculty intentionally plan out their engagement and development for the year. It allows faculty to prioritize their contributions and thoughtfully determine whether additional responsibilities that may arise throughout the year will be pursued. Faculty should approach the AIM with the intent to grow, develop, and to promote positive change. They must articulate their intended contributions for the upcoming academic year and how those contributions align with DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission. If faculty have Mentors, they are encouraged to meet annually with their Mentor(s) before the AIM until the successful completion of the Midpoint Review. Mentors may attend the AIM at the faculty member's request. Faculty will use the Faculty Dashboard to record the completion of the AIM and faculty-specific Service or Teaching expectations. Faculty may also use the Faculty Dashboard to record extenuating personal or professional circumstances that may provide relevant background to Evaluators in reviewing Faculty submissions.
- The Department Chair - They are responsible for scheduling an AIM with faculty at the appropriate frequency. The Department Chair will discuss faculty's alignment with teaching responsibilities, job description, and Departmental needs. As applicable, they will discuss and assign a Mentor and facilitate setting of Faculty goals and provide feedback as faculty progress through the next academic year. The Department Chair will ensure that the trajectory of the faculty member maintains alignment with the DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission. The AIM shall be a conversation between the Department Chair or Associate Chair and faculty member, during which the two will discuss activities that faculty should focus on, taking into account the faculty's professional specialties and interests, their rank and prior years' progress, and any developmental plans (if applicable). All efforts shall be made to come up with a plan with specific expectations that both find amenable and that will allow for sufficient progress and advancement for the upcoming year. The Department Chair will use the Faculty Dashboard to record the completion of the AIM and faculty-specific Service or Teaching expectations. The Associate Department Chair may assist the Department Chair in completing the AIM, including documenting the meeting on the Faculty Dashboard. If an Associate Department Chair completes the AIM with a faculty member, the Department Chair will review the meeting comments on the Faculty Dashboard and mark the AIM as reviewed.
- Evaluative Entities Within and Beyond the Department - A record of the AIM will be available for all evaluative entities within and beyond the department. All Evaluative

Entities may view any AIM documentation in the Faculty Dashboard but shall not use information from the documentation as primary criteria for assessment. The outcome of the AIM does not determine progress in the Promotion & Tenure process; however, the AIM documentation in the Faculty Dashboard may provide important context to evaluative entities in understanding and interpreting the Faculty's FEC Reports and applications for Midpoint Reviews and Promotion and/or Tenure.

## FEC Report Purpose

The purpose of the Biology Department FEC Report is to serve as documentation of, and reflection on, a faculty member's yearly contributions and development. Recognizing that individuals have varying strengths and talents, the FEC Report should demonstrate a link between the faculty member's engagement and development, and the departmental/university P&T criteria. The document must serve several roles as there are multiple audiences, including:

- The Faculty Member - The FEC Report serves as documentation of, and reflection on, the faculty's engagement and development over the previous academic year. It allows faculty to reflect and report on their successes and accomplishments and identify areas for additional growth and development, which helps to guide the next AIM. The FEC Report provides a description of the progress made towards their goals of professional growth, engagement, and development. Developed with feedback from Mentors (if applicable) and the Department Chair, it also provides documentation of the faculty's progress towards promotion and tenure.
- The Department Chair - They will provide evaluative feedback to individual faculty members regarding their engagement, activity, and development as submitted in their annual FEC Report. The Department Chair will evaluate the FEC Report for engagement and alignment with the DEC, Student-Centric Faculty Engagement, and the University Mission. Developed with feedback from the faculty member (and Mentors, if applicable), the Department Chair's evaluation of the FEC Report will provide documentation of the individual's progress towards promotion and tenure based on the approved P&T criteria at the department level, and university policy.
- Evaluative Entities Beyond the Department - The FEC Report will serve as documentation that the faculty member has fulfilled all responsibilities required by departmental and university policies (Policies 6.1 and 6.28).

### Teaching Effectiveness Rubric

Instructions for Use (suggested): This rubric is intended to serve as a summative assessment tool to evaluate a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness. Each criteria has three components [Provided, Reflected, Resolved (if applicable)] in each of the three rating categories [Development Required, Acceptable, Exceeds Expectations]. A faculty member should meet all of the components [Provided, Reflected, Resolved (if applicable)] under the rating category [Development Required, Acceptable, Exceeds Expectations] as determined by the mentors to receive that rating for the criteria being assessed. The evaluator should then look at the ratings for each criteria before providing a final assessment of teaching effectiveness [Development Required or Acceptable]. Under each criteria title, there are examples of 'Potential Evidence' that could be used for the 'Provided' component and a set of suggested 'Reflective Prompts' for the 'Reflected' component. The applicability column indicates if the criteria must be addressed each year by the faculty member being evaluated.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Applicability</u>	<u>Rating Categories</u>		
		<u>Development Required</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Exceeds Expectations</u>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Formative Evaluations</b></p> <p><u>Potential Evidence:</u> peer/mentor/chair evaluations, student evaluations, etc.</p> <p><u>Reflective Prompts:</u> what were the identified issues in the formative evaluations, how did you attempt to address them, what were the results and discuss, etc.</p>	Required	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of solicited feedback from formative evaluations as indicated by departmental policy.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> little to none on nor provided evidence of using solicited feedback from formative evaluations to inform teaching practices.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in formative evaluations identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of solicited feedback from formative evaluations as indicated by departmental policy.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on the evidence of feedback in formative evaluations and provided evidence of how teaching was informed by feedback.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> any major issues in formative evaluations identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of solicited feedback from formative evaluations beyond required by departmental policy.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence from formative evaluations of identified issues, improvements made, and discussed the results.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues identified from formative evaluations by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Use of Evidence-Based Teaching Practices (EBT Practices)</u></b></p> <p><u>Potential Evidence:</u> peer/mentor/chair evaluations, student evaluations, semester schedule, description of in-class activities, etc.</p> <p><u>Reflective Prompts:</u> what were some areas you identified for incorporating EBT Practices, which EBT practices were attempted, evaluate the success of the EBT practices, etc.</p>	Required	<p><u>Provided:</u> little to no evidence of the use of EBT Practices.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> little to none on the effectiveness of the EBT Practices that were used.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in EBT Practices identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of the use of EBT Practices.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of how the use of EBT Practices helped students achieve their learning outcomes.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> any major issues in EBT Practices identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of the <u>effective</u> use of EBT Practices and that the teaching practices used helped increase student learning.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of the <u>effective</u> use of EBT Practices and that the teaching practices used helped increase student learning.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in EBT Practices identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>

**Comments:**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Applicability</b>	<b>Rating Categories</b>		
		<b>Development Required</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p><b>Alignment of Objectives, Content, and Assessments within Courses</b></p> <p><u>Potential Evidence:</u> peer/mentor/chair evaluations, course syllabi, etc.</p> <p><u>Reflective Prompts:</u> what areas were identified for alignment improvement, what was attempted for alignment and how successful were they, etc.</p>	Required	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of course goals not articulated, or unclear, inappropriate or marginally related to curriculum. Content/materials are outdated or unsuitable for students in the course.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> little to none on alignment of objectives, content, and assessments. Did not report issue resolution when needed.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in alignment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence that courses are well planned and organized, course goals are articulated, content is current and appropriate for topic/students/curriculum/scope of this course, per Policy 6.36.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of the alignment of objectives, content, and assessments.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> any major issues in alignment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence that content is appropriately challenging, innovative, and/or related to current developments in field.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence that content is appropriately challenging, innovative, and/or related to current developments in field.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in alignment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>
<p><b>Positive Learning Environment</b></p> <p><u>Potential Evidence:</u> peer/mentor/chair evaluations, student evaluation comments, etc.</p> <p><u>Reflective Prompts:</u> what areas were identified for learning environment improvement, what was attempted for improvement and how successful were they, etc.</p>	Required	<p><u>Provided:</u> little to no evidence that learning environment is respectful or promotes a sense of belonging among students. Learning environment discourages learning or motivation.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> little to no evidence of a willingness to address legitimate student concerns about learning environment.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in learning environment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence that learning environment is respectful and motivating; students have a sense of belonging and are working toward self-efficacy.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of their learning environment; instructor seeks and is responsive to student feedback on learning environment.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> any major issues in learning environment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of intentionally creating/maintaining a positive and supportive learning environment that is inclusive, promotes respect, and encourages student motivation.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on intentionally creating/maintaining a positive and supportive learning environment that is inclusive, promotes respect, and encourages student motivation.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in learning environment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>

**Comments:**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Applicability</b>	<b>Rating Categories</b>		
		<b>Development Required</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p><b>Demonstrate Pedagogical Growth and/or Engagement</b></p> <p><u>Potential Evidence:</u> a copy of the annual report or list of activities (e.g., colleague observations/discussions, reading literature, conference attendance, professional development), etc.</p> <p><u>Reflective Prompts:</u> describe instances of improvement, growth, or engagement in a pedagogical area and how it was incorporated into the classroom, etc.</p>	<p>Applicable this Year: Yes/No</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> little to no evidence of pedagogical growth and/or engagement.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> little to none on their pedagogical growth and/or engagement.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in pedagogical growth and/or engagement identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of pedagogical growth and/or engagement.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on the evidence of their pedagogical growth and/or engagement.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> any major issues in pedagogical growth and/or engagement identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of multiple instances of pedagogical growth and/or engagement.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of multiple instances of pedagogical growth and/or engagement they aimed to focus on improving/growing.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in pedagogical growth and/or engagement identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>
<p><b>Teaching/Mentoring Students Outside the Classroom</b></p> <p><u>Potential Evidence:</u> working with Teaching Assistants, student workers, interns, students applying to graduate/professional programs, list of student letters of recommendations, projects involving students, etc.</p> <p><u>Reflective Prompts:</u> describe your current or proposed activities involving teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom, describe your attempts at incorporating students outside the classroom and how it facilitates student learning, etc.</p>	<p>Applicable this Year: Yes/No</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> little to no evidence of teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> little to none on teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of teaching/mentoring students outside of the classroom.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of how they teach/mentor students outside of the classroom.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> any major issues in teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Provided:</u> evidence of exceptional quality and time commitment to teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.</p> <p><u>Reflected:</u> on evidence of exceptional quality and time commitment to teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.</p> <p><u>Resolved (if applicable):</u> has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations.</p>

**Comments:**

## Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

# **SUU** CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHING & LEARNING

This Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument was created by the SUU Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning, and was modified for use by the Department of Biology, as a resource to provide faculty with formative feedback on their teaching. The instrument is broken into 5 categories, each of which contains a number of evidence-based teaching practices that have been shown to improve student learning. To use this instrument, the observer simply records whether each practice is observed by placing a checkmark in the box next to the practice. The observer is not asked to assess how well each practice is used, only whether or not it is observed. Comments can also be provided about individual teaching practices, or whole categories, to give the instructor additional feedback.

It is important to note that an individual instructor should not be expected to use all of the teaching practices on this list. Certain practices may not be practical within the context of a course, or may not fit with an instructor's teaching style. This instrument was also not designed to assess the quality of instruction. Rather, it is meant to provide instructors with formative feedback about their use of evidence-based teaching practices, highlighting which practices are currently in use, and giving ideas about additional practices that could be incorporated into a course. Finally, this instrument was designed with traditional, face-to-face instruction in mind, and may not be appropriate for other delivery methods such as laboratory, studio, or online.

The CETL encourages peers and department chairs to use this instrument as is, or to modify it to better meet the needs of individual instructors or departments. Our hope is that this provides some structure to teaching observations, gives instructors valuable feedback on their teaching practices, and contributes to the larger conversation about teaching effectiveness across campus. If you have questions about how to use this instrument, or if you would like help modifying it, please don't hesitate to reach out to the CETL. Happy teaching!

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_

## Course Organization:

<b>Objectives/goals</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Learning objectives or an outline for the session are provided at the beginning of class (verbally or visually).	
<input type="checkbox"/> Content and activities are aligned with the stated learning objectives or session outline for the class period.	
<b>Reinforcement of material</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Information is linked to previous class sessions and students' prior knowledge.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Topics are summarized periodically and/or at the end of class.	

## Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:



# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

## Instructional Methods:

<b>Teaching strategies</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Varied pedagogical methods are used to engage diverse learners when/if appropriate.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Examples are used to explain and demonstrate course concepts.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor periodically checks for student understanding and adjusts instruction accordingly.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor connects content to the real world experiences of the students.	
<b>Teaching activities</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Students are given opportunities to actively engage with the material.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Students are asked to reflect on what they have learned.	
<input type="checkbox"/> All students are encouraged to participate.	

## Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

## Instructor-Student Interactions:

<b>Building community</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor addresses students directly and respectfully.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor engages casually with students before and/or after class.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor effectively solicits questions from students and provides clear answers.	
<b>Course climate</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor provides an inclusive, welcoming, and positive learning environment.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor and students demonstrate mutual respect.	

## Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

## Presentation/Clarity

Style	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor speaks loudly and clearly.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Voice tone and pitch are varied to provide emphasis, demonstrate enthusiasm, and maintain interest.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor avoids reading excessively from notes or slides.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Eye contact is maintained with the students.	
Clarity	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Information is presented in a way that is clear and easy to understand.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Visual aids and whiteboard use are effective and clear.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The pacing is appropriate for students to follow along and take notes.	

**Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:**

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

## Content:

<b>Alignment</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Class content and expectations are set at an appropriate level.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The material presented is relevant to the course.	

  

<b>Expertise</b>	
Criteria	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> The instructor demonstrates a deep understanding of the subject.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The material presented is current and accurate.	

## Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:

Observer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Tenure Track / Tenured Professor Teaching Effectiveness Policy**

Consistent with SUU's mission as defined in [R312](#), teaching is of primary importance. The Department of Biology's evaluative criteria for rank advancement should emphasize contributions that are teaching and student-focused. Evaluation practices will also focus on faculty teaching efficacy. These can/will be assessed through the use of student, peer, Department Chair (except the Department Chair may not evaluate their own teaching effectiveness), self- evaluations, and other pertinent information as described in departmental teaching effectiveness rubric.

Adhering to SUU Policy 6.1, Tenure Track Faculty are expected to work with their Mentor(s) to develop and with their Department Chair to critically evaluate their teaching effectiveness and plan for professional growth as an educator. In cases where improvement is needed, teaching effectiveness can be developed through a wide array of evidence-based pedagogical practices and pedagogical development activities.

All faculty will develop a plan for teaching effectiveness in an Alignment Integration Meeting (AIM) with the Department Chair. The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair and Faculty members. The AIM must occur between January and April. Tenure Track Faculty have an AIM annually. Tenured Faculty hold an AIM at least once prior to submitting an application for Five-Year Review. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement for Tenure Track Faculty, newly-hired Tenure Track Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two weeks of the start of contract.")

### **Basic Responsibilities for TT Assistant Professor**

1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility).
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.
3. Receive a minimum of one classroom observation per year. For the first three years, this annual classroom observation must be conducted by either the Department Chair, Associate Chair, or Mentor(s). After the first three years, this annual classroom observation must be conducted by one faculty member (either NTT or Tenured) who has achieved rank advancement at SUU.
4. Perform a minimum of one (1) peer observation per year.
5. Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness included in their Annual FEC Report.

### **Basic Responsibilities for Tenured Associate Professor**

1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility) .
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.
3. Receive a minimum of one (1) peer observation for each year with a teaching load (to be included in 5-Year Report).
4. Perform a minimum of one (1) peer observation for each year with a teaching load.
5. Faculty must create a 5-year Report, beginning at the start of their sixth year as a Tenured Associate. This report should demonstrate Acceptable teaching performance for each year, as well as review and reflection of the past 5 years of teaching.

### **Basic Responsibilities for Tenured Full Professor**

1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility) .
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.

3. Receive a minimum of one (1) peer observation for each year with a teaching load (to be included in 5-Year Report).
4. Perform a minimum of one (1) peer observation for each year with a teaching load.
5. Faculty must create a 5-year Report, beginning at the start of their sixth year as a Tenured Full Professor. This report should demonstrate Acceptable teaching performance for each year, and well as review and reflection of the past 5 years of teaching.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

**Tenure Track faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis. Tenured faculty are evaluated every 5 years or when applying for rank advancement.**

#### **Acceptable:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance in teaching effectiveness based on information as described in departmental teaching effectiveness rubric.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their evaluations and integrated any changes necessary based on evaluation feedback and reflection.

#### **Development Required:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, FMLA/approved official University leave, may cause a faculty member's teaching performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with Consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with the Department Chair and their Mentor(s), if applicable, to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness over the following academic year.
4. A Developmental Plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, after two (2) consecutive **Development Required** evaluations. The faculty member will remain on that Developmental Plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Teaching Effectiveness.
5. If an official Developmental Plan is necessary and implemented, it must be documented and included in the faculty member's annual FEC report.
6. If the Department Chair provides evidence of significantly lacking teaching performance, the faculty member may be placed on a Developmental Plan after only one (1) **Development Required** evaluation or sooner.

### **Standards for Tenure/Promotion of from TT Assistant to Associate Professor**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. If placed on a Developmental Plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
3. The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Teaching Effectiveness a minimum of four (4) years.

### **Standards for Promotion from Tenured Associate to Full Professor\***

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.

2. Applications for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor must cover a minimum of five (5) to a maximum of eight (8) years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
3. Must have taught an average of at least a half time teaching load through SUU over the period being evaluated for rank advancement. Faculty who were at the level of Associate Professor prior to this policy's adoption are exempt from this requirement.
4. Of the required peer observations, at least one (1) must be from the Department Chair and at least two (2) must be from tenured faculty within the department.
5. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
6. Faculty must demonstrate continued development of teaching excellence through at least four (4) activities, outcomes, or achievements that demonstrate teaching development, impact, or leadership beyond the requirements for achieving the Associate Professor rank.

Examples of activities, outcomes, or achievements that faculty can document:

1. Mentoring of faculty or students.
2. Collaboration with other faculty outside of the department or university.
3. Contributions to the field in curriculum or program development beyond what is normally expected of a faculty member.
4. Establishing partnerships with outside agencies to foster student engagement.
5. Reflecting and responding to review/evaluation using teaching inventories.
6. Incorporation of other high-impact educational practices.
7. Receiving teaching recognition awards
8. Attending pedagogical conferences/workshops and providing evidence of adapting teaching practices.
9. Teaching activities performed as part of a special appointment by the university.
10. A teaching activity, pre-approved as a key contribution, in writing, by both the Dean of the College and the Department Chair of Biology.

*\* Faculty who intend to apply for rank advancement are strongly encouraged to have their application materials reviewed by both the Department Chair and other departmental faculty, prior to submission.*

## **Tenure Track / Tenured Professor Scholarly Activity Policy**

Faculty are selected, retained, and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of effective teaching. Departmental standards of performance in scholarship for tenure track faculty are based on the concept of the Teacher-Scholar, and the belief that faculty scholarship is beneficial to undergraduate education, the educational mission of the department, and development of the faculty member.

These standards emphasize the value of research, publication, and grant writing for establishing currency/expertise in their field and the use of this expertise in educating and engaging undergraduate students in scholarly activity. The department also recognizes the value of scholarly activity in creating communities of engagement, establishing collegial relationships through the department, college, university, and beyond.

### **Basic Responsibilities for Tenure Track and Tenured Professors**

1. Faculty will describe a plan for scholarly activity and development in an Alignment Integration Meeting (AIM) with the Department Chair. The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair and Faculty members. The AIM must occur between January and April. Tenure Track Faculty have an AIM annually. Tenured Faculty hold an AIM at least once prior to submitting an application for Five-Year Review. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement for Tenure Track Faculty, newly-hired Tenure Track Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two weeks of the start of contract.")
2. Faculty will demonstrate evidence of scholarly activity in the FEC Report by the second year of employment and continue to engage in scholarly activity throughout employment at SUU.

### **Key Contributions Required for Tenure/Rank Advancement to Associate Professor**

1. One (1) publication that fits one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
  - a. Must include a formal, external review.
  - b. Must be disseminated to at least a regional or national audience.
  - c. Must contribute to the scientific or pedagogical field.
  - d. Cannot be through a predatory journal.
  - e. Must be in print at the time of application. If *accepted* and *in press*, faculty must provide written documentation from the Department Chair and Dean that the publication will be acceptable within the application's time frame.
  - f. If first author, the majority of the work and/or writing must have been completed while employed at SUU.
  - g. If not the first author, faculty must document essential contributions to the work while employed at SUU.
2. One external grant submission.
  - a. Must be documented through the SPARC office or Department Chair, as appropriate.
3. Must demonstrate engaging with students in scholarly activity.
  - a. At least two (2) documented instances of mentoring students in extracurricular scholarly activity
    - i. The instance must be disseminated to an extracurricular audience.
    - ii. This may include research/data collection, scholarly writing work, formal presentations or publications of research.

### **Key Contributions Required for Rank Advancement from Associate to Full Professor**



Contributions in scholarly activity should demonstrate a continued development of their scholarly activity through the quality, quantity, and/or impact of work.

1. Associate Professors applying for Full Professor must meet the same Scholarly Activity Key Contributions as required for Associate Professor rank, but within the 5-8 year review period.
2. In addition, faculty must complete at least one (1) of the following:
  - a) One (1) additional publication that fits one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
  - b) One (1) additional external grant submission.
  - c) A conference presentation made at a minimum of a regional (multi-state) level.
  - d) A significant governmental report/map.
  - e) External publication of a textbook.
  - f) Two (2) supervised student research projects leading to appropriate student presentations at a minimum of a state level or broader.
  - g) Scholarly activities performed as part of a special appointment by the university.
  - h) A scholarly activity, pre-approved as a key contribution, in writing, by both the Dean of the College and the Chair of the Biology Department.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

**Tenure Track Faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis. Tenured Faculty are evaluated every 5 years or when applying for rank advancement.**

#### **Acceptable:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities of scholarly activity and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their scholarly activity and its impact on students, the department, the university, the community, and their own professional development.

#### **Development Required:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, FMLA/approved official University leave, may cause a faculty member's scholarly performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with Consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with the Department Chair and their mentor(s), if applicable, to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness over the following academic year.
4. A Developmental Plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, after two (2) consecutive **Development Required** evaluations. The faculty member will remain on that Developmental Plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Scholarly Performance.
5. If an official Developmental Plan is necessary and implemented, it must be documented and included in the faculty member's annual FEC report.
6. If the Department Chair provides evidence of significantly lacking scholarly performance, the faculty member may be placed on a Developmental Plan after only one (1) **Development Required** evaluation or sooner.

### **Standards for Tenure/Promotion**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor must cover a minimum of five (5) to a maximum of eight (8) years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
3. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
4. Completion of Key Contributions for Scholarly Activity as defined by the department.

## **Tenure Track / Tenured Professor Service Policy**

The Biology Department defines service as activities that contribute to the Department, College, University, Profession, or Community in ways that fulfill and support SUU's Mission, Vision, and/or Core Value statements. Although service is a key component to a faculty member's profession and the functioning of the Department and University, standards of performance in service contributions are limited to ensure that faculty members maintain a proper balance in workload that is appropriate for their rank.

SUU Policy 6.1 was designed to provide flexibility in the contributions faculty engage in, providing the ability to both play to one's strengths and to encourage growth through continual professional development. To ensure this flexibility, there is no specific requirement for the types of service activities that must be performed. Rather, emphasis is placed on the effort expended and on the impact of a faculty member's service.

Service activities may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Serving on or chairing committees at departmental, college, or university level.
- Community engagement related to one's area of professional expertise and/or as a representative of the University.
- Service to a professional organization relevant to the faculty member's field of study or specialization.
- Service directly interacting with students.
- Integrating service with scholarship and/or teaching.
- Mentorship and or collaboration with faculty.

### **Basic Responsibilities for Tenure Track and Tenured Professors**

1. Faculty will describe a plan for service in an Alignment Integration Meeting (AIM) with the Department Chair. The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair and Faculty members. The AIM must occur between January and April. Tenure Track Faculty have an AIM annually. Tenured Faculty hold an AIM at least once prior to submitting an application for Five-Year Review. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement for Tenure Track Faculty, newly-hired Tenure Track Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two weeks of the start of contract.") Faculty Mentor(s) and/or Department Chair will ensure that the plan for Service incorporates an increasing level of performance and impact appropriate with the faculty member's rank.
2. Faculty will demonstrate evidence of service contributions to department, college, university, profession, and/or community in the FEC Report.
3. Per Policy 6.1, the Department Chair is responsible for monitoring the service workload of their faculty to ensure that an inordinate amount of department/college/school/university/ad hoc committee work has not been assigned, particularly in the first year of employment.

### **Key Contributions Required for Tenure/Rank advancement to Associate Professor**

By the time of tenure application, the faculty member must have participated in a minimum of six (6) service activities, beyond basic responsibilities, as determined/approved by their Mentor(s) and Department Chair.

### **Key Contributions Required for Rank Advancement from Associate to Full Professor**

Faculty must develop their service contributions beyond basic activities/responsibilities. The faculty member must have participated in a minimum of six (6) service activities, beyond basic responsibilities, as determined/approved by their Department Chair. At least one (1) of these service activities will be demonstrated through the following examples:

1. Assuming leadership roles such as chairing committees, programs, or activities.
2. Serving on committees or through activities that have a broader impact, beyond the department.
3. Service as a faculty member on committees or with organizations outside of SUU.
4. Service performed as part of a special appointment by the university.
5. A service activity, pre-approved as a key contribution, in writing, by both the Dean of the College and the Chair of the Biology Department.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

**Tenure Track faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis. Tenured faculty are evaluated every 5 years or when applying for rank advancement.**

#### **Acceptable:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities and for service and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department and as approved by their Mentor(s), if applicable, and Department Chair.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their service contributions and their impact on students, the department, the university, the community, and their own professional development.

#### **Development Required:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, FMLA/approved official University leave, may cause a faculty member's service contributions to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with Consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a Development Required evaluation, it is expected that they will work with the Department Chair and their mentor(s), if applicable, to improve service contributions over the following academic year.
4. A Developmental Plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, after two (2) consecutive **Development Required** evaluations. The faculty member will remain on that Developmental Plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Service Contributions.
5. If an official Developmental Plan is necessary and implemented, it must be documented and included in the faculty member's annual FEC report.
6. If the Department Chair provides evidence of significantly lacking service contributions, the faculty member may be placed on a Developmental Plan after only one (1) **Development Required** evaluation or sooner.

### **Standards for Tenure/Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor must cover a minimum of five (5) to a maximum of eight (8) years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor

3. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
4. Completion of Key Contributions for Service as defined by the department.
5. The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Service Contributions a minimum of four (4) years.

## **Non-Tenure Track Teaching Effectiveness Policy**

Consistent with SUU's mission as defined in [R312](#), teaching is of primary importance. The Department of Biology's evaluative criteria for rank advancement should emphasize contributions that are teaching and student-focused. Evaluation practices will also focus on faculty teaching efficacy. These can/will be assessed through the use of student, peer, Department Chair, (except the Department Chair may not evaluate their own teaching effectiveness), self- evaluations, and other pertinent information as described in departmental teaching effectiveness rubric.

Adhering to SUU Policy 6.1, Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty are expected to work with their Mentor(s) to develop and with their Department Chair to critically evaluate their teaching effectiveness and plan for professional growth as an educator. In cases where improvement is needed, teaching effectiveness can be developed through a wide array of evidence-based pedagogical practices and pedagogical development activities.

All faculty will develop a plan for teaching effectiveness in an Alignment Integration Meeting (AIM) with the Department Chair. The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair and Faculty members. The AIM must occur between January and April. Non-Tenure Track Faculty have an AIM annually. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement, newly-hired Non-Tenure Track Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two weeks of the start of contract."

### **Basic Responsibilities for NTT Lecturer**

1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility).
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.
3. Receive a minimum of one classroom observation per year. For the first three years, this annual classroom observation must be conducted by either the Department Chair, Associate Chair, or Mentor(s). After the first three years, this annual classroom observation must be conducted by one faculty member (either NTT or Tenured) who has achieved rank advancement at SUU.
4. Perform a minimum of one (1) peer observation per year.
5. Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness included in their Annual FEC Report.

### **Basic Responsibilities for NTT Assistant Professor**

1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility)
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.
3. Receive a minimum of one (1) classroom observation per year. This annual classroom observation must be conducted by one faculty member (either NTT or Tenured) who has achieved rank advancement at SUU. If a faculty member is hired at the NTT Assistant Professor rank, then for the first three years, an annual classroom observation must be conducted by either the Department Chair, Associate Chair, or Mentor(s).
4. Perform a minimum of one (1) peer observation per year.
5. Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness included in their Annual FEC Report.

### **Basic Responsibilities for NTT Associate Professor**

1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility)
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.

3. Receive a minimum of one (1) peer observation per year.
4. Perform a minimum of one (1) peer observation per year.
5. Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness included in their Annual FEC Report.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis.**

#### **Acceptable:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance in teaching effectiveness based on information as described in departmental teaching effectiveness rubric.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their evaluations and integrated any changes necessary based on evaluation feedback and reflection.

#### **Development Required:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, FMLA/approved official University leave, may cause a faculty member's teaching performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with Consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with the Department Chair and their mentor(s), if applicable, to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness over the following academic year.
4. A Developmental Plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, after two (2) consecutive **Development Required** evaluations. The faculty member will remain on that Developmental Plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Teaching Effectiveness.
5. If an official Developmental Plan is necessary and implemented, it must be documented and included in the faculty member's annual FEC report.
6. If the Department Chair provides evidence of significantly lacking teaching performance, the faculty member may be placed on a Developmental Plan after only one (1) **Development Required** evaluation or sooner.

### **Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty from Lecturer to Assistant Professor**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor must cover a minimum of four (4) to a maximum of six (6) years of the most recent activity as a Lecturer.
3. If placed on a Developmental Plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
4. The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Teaching Effectiveness a minimum of 65% of years employed at the current rank.

### **Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate Professor must cover a minimum of six (6) to a maximum of nine (9) years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
3. If placed on a Developmental Plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.

4. The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Teaching Effectiveness a minimum of 65% of years employed at the current rank.



## **Non-Tenure Track Scholarly Activity Policy**

Faculty are selected, retained, and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of effective teaching. Departmental standards of performance in scholarship for non-tenure track faculty are based on the concept of the Teacher-Scholar, and the belief that faculty scholarship is beneficial to undergraduate education, the educational mission of the department, and development of the faculty member.

These standards emphasize the value of research, publication, and grant writing for establishing currency/expertise in their field and the use of this expertise in educating and engaging undergraduate students in scholarly activity. The department also recognizes the value of scholarly activity in creating communities of engagement, establishing collegial relationships through the department, college, university, and beyond.

### **Basic Responsibilities**

1. Faculty will describe a plan for scholarly activity and development in an Alignment Integration Meeting (AIM) with the Department Chair. The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair and Faculty members. The AIM must occur between January and April. Non-Tenure Track Faculty have an AIM annually. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement, newly-hired Non-Tenure Track Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two weeks of the start of contract.") Faculty Mentor(s) and/or Department Chair will ensure that the plan for Scholarly Activity is appropriate with the faculty member's rank.
2. Faculty will demonstrate evidence of scholarly activity by the second year of employment.

### **Key Contributions Required for Rank Advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor**

1. One (1) documentable scholarly activity/product that fits one or more of the Boyer Model categories.  
- OR -
2. At least one (1) documented instance of engaging students in extracurricular scholarly activity.
  1. The instance must be disseminated to an extracurricular audience.
  2. This may include research/data collection, scholarly writing work, formal presentations or publications of research.
  3. This may include assisting another existing student research project mentored by another faculty member or organization in a relevant scientific or pedagogical field.

### **Key Contributions Required for Rank Advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate Professor**

1. Demonstrate a level of scholarly engagement beyond the requirements of NTT Assistant Professor.
  - a. This scholarly activity/product should fit one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
2. Demonstrate student engagement beyond the requirements of NTT Assistant Professor.
  - a. The instance must be disseminated to an extracurricular audience.
  - b. This may include research/data collection, scholarly writing work, formal presentations or publications of research.
  - c. This may include assisting another existing student research project mentored by another faculty member or organization in a relevant scientific or pedagogical field.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis.**

**Acceptable:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities of scholarly activity and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their scholarly activity and its impact on students, the department, the university, the community, and their own professional development.

**Development Required:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, FMLA/approved official University leave, may cause a faculty member's scholarly performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with Consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with the Department Chair and their mentor(s), if applicable, to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness over the following academic year.
4. A Developmental Plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, after two (2) consecutive **Development Required** evaluations. The faculty member will remain on that Developmental Plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Scholarly Performance.
5. If an official Developmental Plan is necessary and implemented, it must be documented and included in the faculty member's annual FEC report.
6. If the Department Chair provides evidence of significantly lacking scholarly performance, the faculty member may be placed on a Developmental Plan after only one (1) **Development Required** evaluation or sooner.

**Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor must cover a minimum of four (4) to a maximum of six (6) years of the most recent activity as a Lecturer.
3. Applications for rank advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate Professor must cover a minimum of six (6) to a maximum of nine (9) years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
4. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
5. Completion of Key Contributions for Scholarly Activity as defined by the department.

## **Non-Tenure Track Service Policy**

The Biology Department defines service as activities that contribute to the Department, College, University, Profession, or Community in ways that fulfill and support SUU's Mission, Vision, and/or Core Value statements. Though service is a key component to a faculty member's profession and the functioning of the Department and University, standards of performance in service contributions are limited to ensure that faculty members maintain a proper balance in workload that is appropriate for their rank.

SUU Policy 6.1 was designed to provide flexibility in the contributions faculty engage in, providing the ability to both play to one's strengths and to encourage growth through continual professional development. To ensure this flexibility, there is no specific requirement for the types of service activities that must be performed. Rather, emphasis is placed on the effort put forth and the impact of a faculty member's service.

Service activities may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Serving on or chairing committees at departmental, college, or university level.
- Community engagement related to one's area of professional expertise and/or as a representative of the University.
- Service to professional organizations relevant to the field of study or specialization.
- Service directly interacting with students.
- Integrating service with scholarship and/or teaching.
- Mentorship and/or collaboration with faculty.

### **Basic Responsibilities**

1. Faculty will describe a plan for service in an Alignment Integration Meeting (AIM) with the Department Chair. The AIM is required for all full-time Faculty (except Academic Administrators) to facilitate communication between the Department Chair and Faculty members. The AIM must occur between January and April. Non-Tenure Track Faculty have an AIM annually. Note that, in addition to the annual AIM requirement, newly-hired Non-Tenure Track Faculty have an initial AIM within the first two weeks of the start of contract.") Faculty Mentor(s) and/or Department Chair will ensure that the plan for Service incorporates an increasing level of performance and impact appropriate with the faculty member's rank.
2. Faculty will demonstrate evidence of service contributions to department, college, university, profession, and/or community in the Annual FEC Report.
3. Per Policy 6.1, the Department Chair is responsible for monitoring the service workload of their faculty to ensure that an inordinate amount of department/college/school/university/ad hoc committee work has not been assigned, particularly in the first year of employment.

### **Key Contributions Required for Rank Advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor**

By the time of application, the faculty member must have demonstrated service and engagement, beyond basic responsibilities, as determined/approved by their Department Chair.

### **Key Contributions Required for Rank Advancement from Assistant to NTT Associate Professor**

By the time of application, the faculty member must have participated in a minimum of six (6) service activities, beyond basic responsibilities, as determined/approved by their Department Chair.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis.**

**Acceptable:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities for service and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their service contributions and their impact on students, the department, the university, the community, and their own professional development.

**Development Required:**

1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, FMLA/approved official University leave, may cause a faculty member's service contributions to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with Consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with the Department Chair and their mentor(s), if applicable, to improve service contributions over the following academic year.
4. A Developmental Plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, after two (2) consecutive **Development Required** evaluations. The faculty member will remain on that Developmental Plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Service Contributions.
5. If an official Developmental Plan is necessary and implemented, it must be documented and included in the faculty member's annual FEC report.
6. If the Department Chair provides evidence of significantly lacking service contributions, the faculty member may be placed on a Developmental Plan after only one (1) **Development Required** evaluation or sooner.

**Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

1. Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor must cover a minimum of four (4) to a maximum of six (6) years of the most recent activity as a Lecturer.
3. Applications for rank advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate Professor must cover a minimum of six (6) to a maximum of nine (9) years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
4. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
5. Completion of Key Contributions for Service as defined by the department.