Three Reviews of Faculty:

- Promotion and tenure
  (USU Policy 405.1 – 405.11)

- Annual performance review
  (USU Policy 405.12.1)

- Post tenure review of tenured faculty
  (USU Policy 405.12.2 – 405.12.5)
Role Statements:

- Research – XX%
- Teaching – XX%
- Extension – XX%
- Service – X%
- Scholarship expected within assignments
- May include administration but outside of tenure and promotion consideration
Annual Work Plan:

- Optional
- Describes plans for coming year
- Signed by faculty member and supervisor(s)
- Covers programs and scholarship
USU Policy 405.1 to 405.11:

- Process of tenure and promotion
- Criteria for faculty ranks
- Dates for third year review and final date of consideration
- Review of pre-tenure faculty by Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) must occur every calendar year
Tenure Advisory Committee:

- Five members of higher rank
- Meets every year
- Assessment of progress towards tenure
- Recommendation on reappointment
- Recommendations on improvement
- Final year – recommendation on tenure
Recommendations and Approvals for P&T:

- Recommendations by external reviewers, P&T committee, Department Head, College Dean, Central P&T Committee, Provost, President
- Decision by USU Board of Trustees
- Excellence in major emphasis, effective in all other assignments
- Recommendations sequentially “build” on each other
Promotion and Tenure Portfolio:

- Recommendations from P&T committee, department head, and dean
- External reviews (only final year)
- All P&T evaluation letters
- All role statements (can change over time)
- Self assessment letter
- Current CV
Promotion and Tenure Portfolio:

- Research documentation
- Teaching documentation
- Extension documentation
- Service documentation
- Appendices
- Supplemental material as needed

Electronic dossier – Fall, 2015
Self Assessment Letter:

- Why am I doing what I’m doing?
  - Strategic/program priorities
  - Tactical/program delivery
- What am I doing?
  - Participants, presentations, activities
- How do I know I’m making a difference?
- Reflective, informative and explains any adjustments in role assignment
Provost Feedback:

- **Internal letters**
  - Evaluative and persuasive
  - “Elephant in the room”

- **External letters**
  - Invitation template
  - Rationale for each reviewer
  - Arms distance from candidate
  - No names in internal letters!
Internal Letters:

- Satisfactory performance of role
- Appropriate progress (trajectory) towards tenure
- Recommendations for improvements
- Recommendation on renewal of appointment or tenure and promotion (final year)
- Excellence in the major assignment, effectiveness in all other assignments (final year)
Dates for Final Year Review:

- Committee letter – December 1
- Department Head letter – December 15
- Dean letter – January 10
- Notification by President – April 15

Recommendation of tenure and/or promotion
Dates for Third Year Review:

- Committee letter – October 26
- Department Head letter – November 9
- Dean letter – November 20
- Notification by President – December 10

Appropriate progress (trajectory) towards tenure
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Promotion:

- No specific time between tenure and promotion [USU Policy 405.8.2(1)]
- *Informational* meeting
- *Consider recommendation for promotion to professor the following fall* meeting (by February 15)
- “In order for me to recommend that your file goes forward, you must…”
USU Policy 407:

- Non-renewal of appointment
- Termination of appointment
- Grievance process
Grievance Process:

- Arbitrary (i.e. lacking a rational basis) or capricious (i.e. determined by chance, whim, or impulse; unreasonable; unsupported) conduct
- Violations of legal, constitutional, or statutory rights
- Violations of code, policies and procedures
Annual Performance Review:

- Current CV
- Self Assessment Letter
- Performance Review Report (Digital Measures)
- Annual Work Plan for the coming year
- Does the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position?
Post-tenure Review:

- Does the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position?

- New policy uses a “triggered approach”
Tenure Expectations for Extension:

Client programming
• Increasing numbers of programs and participants
• Publications – fact sheets, curriculum materials

Scholarship
• “Flagship” program
• Presentations at peer meetings
• Referred publications in peer journals (2-4)
• Funding - $10K/year