**School of Graduate Studies**

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION POLICY**

Faculty activities, including teaching, scholarly work in various forms of intellectual contribution and development, and service, should be consistent with the School of Graduate Studies mission. That mission prioritizes excellence in teaching and supports continual advancements through scholarly work and service to the profession, university, school, department, program, and local community interaction.

All full-time faculty participate in a formal, annual development and evaluation process to ensure faculty activities are consistent with SAU's mission. The specific process may vary between Tenure and Non-Tenure Track.

The development and review process provides an ongoing, mentoring experience that fosters improvement in teaching, advising, scholarly works in the form of intellectual contributions and development, and professional service.

**Development and Evaluation Process for Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

All faculty members participate in a structured annual cycle of the Faculty Development and Evaluation Process according to classification. This process includes self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation, and administrative evaluation. This process continues until the tenure-track faculty member receives tenure. The non-tenure-track faculty members participate in this process indefinitely.

**Basis for Evaluation for Non-Tenure Faculty**

The department chair will evaluate each non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty member on the Faculty Evaluation and Progress Form (FEPR)in *Mentor.* Data for consideration include faculty self-evaluation reported on the Annual Summary of Professional Activity, peer evaluations, student evaluations, student comments, faculty load, syllabi, and professional contributions to department and college operations. Additional data may be collected for evaluation and documented. Department chairs may solicit evaluative comments concerning external activities. The development and evaluation process for non-tenured and non­tenure-track faculty includes. at a minimum, the following annually:

**Preference Ranking and Point Distribution of Evaluation Categories**

Faculty will indicate their preference ranking for the evaluation categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty will distribute 100 points among the categories of faculty responsibility, such as teaching, scholarship, professional experience, service, and administration. These 100 points should correlate to the percentage of time devoted to each responsibility for that review cycle.

**Development Plan**

Non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty complete a development plan, including selecting one or more development areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service) and setting development goals. The faculty member will detail the activities planned to accomplish the developmental goals and the anticipated completion date for each goal.

**Student Evaluations of Teaching**

Student evaluations of teaching will be completed for each section of each course taught. Results of student evaluations will be included in the faculty member’s Mentor account and available for evaluation.

## **Peer Review Procedures**

All faculty are evaluated by a member of their peer group annually. Peer evaluation is an integral part of the annual development and review process. It consists of (1) a peer course evaluation for all full-time faculty (2) a peer evaluation of the Annual Summary of Professional Activity (Teaching category for Non-Tenure Track faculty).

A peer evaluator is a full-time faculty member, excluding department chairs and the dean for evaluation purposes. A peer evaluator is a member of the faculty member's peer group.

**Peer Evaluations of Annual Summary of Professional Activity**

Peer evaluation of the Annual Summary of Professional Activity (Mentor: Annual Academic Report) will be included in Mentor for annual evaluation consideration.

**Peer Course Review**

A peer course review will be conducted each year, and the peer review results will be included in Mentor for annual evaluation consideration.

**Development and Evaluation Process Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty**

Tenure-Track faculty members participate in an annual development and evaluation process. The evaluation process is based on the university's policies and procedures for faculty evaluation, as described in the Southern Arkansas University Faculty Handbook.

**Evaluation Materials Storage and Access.** (Mentor platform)

**Administrative Evaluation Procedures**

Working with the department chair, each faculty member sets development plans and distributes evaluation points; the chair prepares and communicates the subsequent annual evaluation. Working with the dean, each department chair sets development plans and distributes evaluation ratings; the dean prepares and communicates the subsequent annual evaluation for each department chair.

**Annual Faculty Development and Review Meeting**

By November I, each faculty member will meet with the department chair for a faculty Development and Review meeting. At the meeting, the department chair will communicate the results of the prior year's evaluation (including the assignment of evaluation points and comments) and the faculty member and department chair will discuss the development plan and point distribution for the current year. The faculty member may write additional comments on the evaluation in *Mentor*.

**Evaluation Timeline**

 The Faculty Development and Evaluation Process follows the timeline outlined below. During the first term of employment, a new faculty member participates in the initial Faculty Development and Evaluation and an initial progress meeting. New faculty follow the annual review timeline after the first term of employment.

**Evaluation for Tenure/ Tenured Faculty**

The department chair will evaluate each faculty member. Data for evaluation consideration include faculty self-evaluation, Annual Summary of Professional Activity (*Mentor*: Annual Academic Report), peer evaluations, student evaluations, faculty load, course syllabi, and professional contributions to the profession, department, school, and university. Additional data may be collected for evaluation and documented. The department chair may solicit evaluative comments concerning external activities. The dean will evaluate the department chair. The development and evaluation process for tenured and tenure-track faculty differs from that of non-tenured faculty.

**Ranking and Point Distribution of Evaluation Categories (Tenure-Track, Tenured Faculty)**: Faculty will indicate their preference of emphasis for each teaching, scholarship, and service category by assigning ratings among these categories to equal 100 points. Faculty serving in administrative roles will include administration as a 4th category. Each annual evaluation cycle will be rated according to faculty preference, utilizing 100 points that correlate to the percentage of time devoted to each responsibility.

**Development Plan**: Tenured faculty set personal development goals on an annual cycle. Following each annual evaluation cycle, these development goals should be copied into *Mentor*. This development plan encourages reflection and continued growth for the next evaluation cycle.

**Student Evaluations of Teaching**: Student evaluations of teaching must be completed for each course taught. Student evaluations are not collected from facilitated courses such as Comprehensive Exams or Dissertation. Any student evaluations of teaching collected during the current year will be uploaded in *Mentor* and included in the annual evaluation.

**Peer Evaluation of Annual Summary of Professional Activity**: Results of the peer evaluation of the Annual Summary of Professional Activity will be uploaded in *Mentor* and included in the annual evaluation.

**Evaluation for Clinical (Non-Tenure Track) Faculty**

Clinical faculty members participate in an abbreviated version of the evaluation process as non-tenured, full-time faculty members.

Upon receiving teaching assignments, clinical faculty members meet with the department chair to discuss course objectives, course content, and culture of student care. During this meeting, the clinical faculty member will complete sections of their development plan relevant to the courses assigned and program goals.

Clinical faculty will be held accountable for evaluations of teaching, accessibility to students, and professional experience relevant to the classes taught.

Clinical faculty are not required to meet specific evaluation points but maintain commendable or higher ratings through an annual comprehensive review established through student evaluations and peer and chair reviews.

Clinical faculty who teach actual courses in the spring or fall, repeat the above procedures prior to the first class meeting of their teaching semester.

### **General Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation**

1. *Preparation and Review of the* ***Development Plan*** *for Faculty Members:*

By November 1, in the first year, new tenure-track faculty members and full-time clinical faculty will meet with their chair to prepare the initial Professional Development Plan, using the template provided here as a guide. [Development Plan](https://web.saumag.edu/faculty-staff/files/2021/07/development-plan.pdf): The faculty member will follow up by submitting development plan information in Mentor.

By November 1 in subsequent years, the supervisor/department chair and the tenure-track faculty member or full-time clinical faculty will meet to discuss progress and update the development plan. The chair and the faculty member will date and initial the plan in the appropriate space

1. *Completion and Submission of* ***Annual Summary of Professional Activity****:*

By May 15, all full-time faculty members will have submitted their Annual Summary of Professional Activity (Annual Academic Reporting) within *Mentor.* This report provides self-evaluation data that may enhance a faculty member’s evaluation for the purposes of promotion, tenure, position retention, and/or salary increases.

1. *Chair’s Evaluation Scored in Mentor:*

By November 1, the department chair will evaluate each full-time faculty member for the previous academic year within *Mentor*. At the evaluation meeting between the department chair and faculty member, the two will also determine the faculty member’s preference ranking of evaluation categories for the upcoming evaluation cycle.

1. Data for consideration include student evaluations, student comments, faculty self-evaluation through the “Annual Summary of Professional Activities,” faculty load, various forms of scholarly works, and professional contributions to departmental, university, or professional fields.
2. Additional data may be collected for evaluation and documentation. Supervisors may solicit evaluative comments concerning external contractually assigned activities of faculty.

*Evaluation meeting, the following details will be completed*:

* the faculty member writes comments on the form, if so desired; and
* the faculty member signs and dates the form (by signing the form, the individual indicates only that the faculty member has read the form).

*Faculty Response to Evaluation Results*

* If a faculty member wishes to respond to the evaluation results of a supervisor, the faculty member may, within one week of receiving the annual evaluation report, write a letter to the supervisor explaining the problem. The supervisor will strive to solve the problem, which could include a re-evaluation, as soon as possible.
* A faculty member may request an evaluation by a supervisor at the level above that from which the faculty member is typically evaluated. Requests for re-evaluation or further evaluation may continue to the level of the Provost.
* Dean Review: The dean will review each faculty member’s annual evaluation and has the opportunity to add additional notes regarding each member’s performance for the evaluation cycle.

**Peer Evaluation Procedures**

*A peer, for evaluation purposes, shall*:

* be a full-time faculty member;
* have been employed as a full-time faculty member at SAU for more than one year;
* not include department chairs or deans.

*A peer review shall include the following*:

**Online Course Evaluation Procedures**:

*Peer assignment*: The chair will assign the peer to review a faculty member’s class. The faculty member, in consultation with the peer, will choose the course to be reviewed. Two faculty peers should not evaluate each other’s courses within the same academic year.

*Pre-Evaluation Communication:*The peer reviewer will communicate with the instructor before the course review. At that time, the instructor may share specific details or unique circumstances about the course with the reviewer.

*Post-Observation Feedback:* the peer reviewer will share their course review findings with the instructor. The instructor will be able to respond to the peer reviewer’s observations in writing.

The peer evaluation will occur at least once each academic year for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Non-tenure track faculty will have a course observation each year, while adjuncts will be observed at the discretion of the department chair.

Tenured faculty members seeking a promotion must undergo a course review, according to the rules above, during the semester prior to submitting their promotion portfolio.

* 1. **Evaluation of the Annual Summary of Professional Activity**:
		1. The chair will assign a peer to evaluate a faculty member’s Annual Summary.

By October 1, a faculty member’s Annual Summary of Professional Activity Summary (Annual Academic Reporting) will be evaluated by at least one peer. The peer reviewer will document their evaluations on the department’s designated Peer Evaluation forms. Two faculty peers should not evaluate one another’s Annual Summary. The faculty member will upload this peer evaluation in *Mentor*.

The faculty member will post their own self-evaluation of their overall annual summary of professional activity within the Self-Evaluation Overall Summary section of the Evaluation portion of *Mentor.*

* 1. **Peer Course Review Evaluation**:
		1. The evaluation will include the peer reviewer’s findings of their online course that will be documented in the Peer Course Review Form. This peer review should be completed by a different peer than the member who performed the Annual Summary Evaluation. The faculty member will be able to comment on the peer’s review findings when they sign the review form. The faculty member will upload this peer evaluation in *Mentor*.

**Course Survey Procedures: Student Evaluations**

All faculty will be evaluated by students in each course they teach each semester during the academic year. Unless the Office of Human Resources is notified by a department chair of a course that should not be surveyed, all current courses will be surveyed.

The University’s Student Survey Form (see Appendix I in the Faculty Handbook) will be used as the instrument for student course surveys.

Student course surveys shall be made available to students no later than the second Monday before the start of finals week each semester. When evaluations become available, an email will be sent to students from the Office of Human Resources with detailed instructions. Students no longer enrolled in a course will be excluded from completing the student course survey.

Students will have access to the Student Survey Form until 11:59 PM the night before the first day of final exams. After this time, the Student Course Survey portal will no longer be available.

The Office of Human Resources will prepare a summary of student course survey results. When the information is processed, the Office of Human Resources will send the results to the individual faculty and the department chair. At no time will student workers be involved in the summary process.

Data from the course surveys will be processed at the earliest possible convenience of the Information Technology Services (ITS) and Office of Human Resources, and information will be distributed to each faculty member and administrator.

Each faculty member will receive the results of the student course surveys of their courses. The faculty member is responsible for uploading each term’s student evaluation reports in Mentor.

**Department of Doctoral Studies Evaluation Timeline**

October 1

 **Evaluation of Annual Summary of Professional Activity**

* Peer Review of Annual Summary of Professional Activity (Peer assigned by Chair)
* Faculty Members Conduct a self-reflection of their own Annual Summary of Professional Activity and summarize their evaluation in the Evaluation section of Mentor.
* Peer Course Review (Different peer assigned to review online course)

November 1

 **Evaluation of Prior Year**

* The department chair and faculty member meet for the Annual Faculty Development Review Meeting.
* Chair and faculty acknowledge the review. Acknowledgment does not necessarily imply that the faculty member agrees with the evaluation.
* Faculty members may add comments related to each section of their evaluation in the "Faculty Member's Comments" section of the Mentor Evaluation form.
* The dean reviews the annual evaluation and may add additional comments to acknowledge the faculty member’s annual evaluation via Mentor.

April 1

**Evaluations**

* Peer Online Course Reviews and Peer Annual Summary Reviews completed. Reviews shared and signed by faculty members.
* Each faculty member will document their peer reviews by uploading copies in *Mentor.*

 May 10

**Current Year Evaluation**

* Each faculty member submits their Annual Summary of Professional Activity Peer Review Form, Peer Course Review, and their own Self-Evaluation for each category in the Evaluations tab of Mentor.
* Each faculty member ensures that all course syllabi are attached to their teaching assignments in Mentor.
* Each faculty member uploads their student evaluations for the year into Mentor.
* The chair reviews the collective information battery for the annual evaluation: Annual Summary of Professional Activity, Peer Review of ASPA, Peer Course Review, Student Evaluations, and the 3-year vitae.

**\*\*Faculty Challenge to the Chair9s Evaluation Results:** See *SAU Faculty Handbook.*

## **Evaluation Forms**

The following forms are provided in the Faculty Development and Evaluation Forms:

[Peer Evaluation of Annual Summary Form](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/1vdc8j899w7xo6n44yi37/Peer-Evaluation-Form_Doctoral-Studies.docx?rlkey=5bh3aeoatrdrn5g88df95ahsw&st=wzkk58d7&dl=0)s to be signed /**Annual Academic Report** (Mentor) All full-time complete for evaluation purposes before year-end Eval

[Annual Peer Evaluation of Annual Summary Rubric](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o4fxL1atnJqanZ7DqsEjL3ZPxGPu3bvS/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109470516516248607163&rtpof=true&sd=true)

[Online Course Peer Evaluation Form](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/qh0n58p5erjybfexdw9ww/Ed.D.-Peer-Course-Review-Template.docx?rlkey=mo5jwb1tr37115d0cwlhveju1&st=od5ox88y&dl=0)  and [Online Peer Review Rubric](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/pobi8b74id0cycuq2e5bp/Copy-of-SAU-Online-Course-Evaluation-Tool-REV3.xlsx?rlkey=t4cz7nlefzume8qsj7z9vavoj&e=1&st=10wh2ezs&dl=0)

[Development Plan](https://web.saumag.edu/faculty-staff/files/2021/07/development-plan.pdf) (hard copy to preview): Development Plan in the form of Annual Goals may now be documented in Mentor Evaluations.

**Faculty Self-Evaluation Overall Summary in Mentor Evaluations:** Each faculty member summarizes their annual performance of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service within the Evaluation tab of Mentor. (Clinical Faculty review their teaching only.)

**Faculty Evaluation and Progress Review (FEPR) in Mentor**

**Setting Point Ratios (required for all faculty) and**

**Development Plans (required for non-tenured faculty/ available for everyone)**

**Overview and Timeline**

Faculty use Mentor to complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation and Progress Review (FEPR).

**By November 1 of Year 1:** The first step is for each faculty member to set a point distribution at the beginning of each academic year to indicate the faculty member s preference ranking of evaluation categories. One point will be distributed in ratio form across the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Administration (if applicable).

**Non-tenured faculty** will also include details of their **Development Plans** in the appropriate spaces.

**Tenured faculty** may use the space provided for Development Plans to indicate **Goals** they wish to accomplish related to the evaluation categories.

**By November 1 of Year 2:** After completion of each academic year, each faculty member will upload the following documents to their FEPR form in Mentor in time for the department chair to evaluate the documents and meet with the faculty member (Evaluation Meeting) by November 1 of Year 2.

1. Online Peer Observations conducted by assigned peers using Online Course Peer Evaluation Form
2. Peer Evaluation of the Annual Summary of Professional Activity conducted by assigned peers using Peer Evaluation of Annual Summary (due October 1 of each year for the prior year)
3. Student Evaluations for fall, spring, and summer semesters
4. Other documents such as rubrics developed by Departments and Colleges, if required
5. Other optional documents related to evaluation categories the faculty member wishes to submit

At this same time, the faculty member will also complete the **Development Plan Self-Evaluation Summary** for any development plans or goals that were included.

The faculty member will also set point ratio distributions and update development plans (or goals) for Year 2 in consultation with the department chair.

The process is depicted below:



 Faculty member enters point ratios and development plans.

 Click submit and the form is locked.

Faculty member uploads required documents and completes self- evaluation.

Clicks submit and form is locked.

Chair completes evaluation. Unlocks form.

Faculty member reviews evaluation and completes Response to Evaluation.

Clicks submit.

Faculty sets points and plans on the Year 2 form.

Department chair approves points and plans and unlocks form.

Faculty member completes academic year. Peer and student evals take place.

Step-by-step instructions for faculty to accomplish the above tasks are provided below.

Use one of the following links to get to the Mentor Login page:

* Mentor is available by visiting: by visiting “Quick Links” on the [MySAU](https://mysau.saumag.edu/ics) portal.
* Mentor is also available by directly accessing [Mentor](https://www.axiommentor.com/login/axlogin.cfm?i=saumag)

https://[www.axiommentor.com/login/axlogin.cfm?i=saumag](http://www.axiommentor.com/login/axlogin.cfm?i=saumag)

Log in to Mentor using your user name and passwordthe same ones you use to log in to the computer in your office.

Once you arrive at the Mentor Login page, you should log in with the same username and password used to access campus computers and e-mail. Be sure that the Institution ID is set to **saumag**.

After you have logged in to Mentor, choose **Faculty Reporting** from the menu across the top. Then click the **Evaluations** menu from the left side, which will take you to the following page:



Click the name of the correct FEPR form to begin setting your point ratios and development plan(s).

**Note about years:** Beginning each fall, faculty will set points and development plans for the upcoming academic year. At this same time, returning faculty will use the prior year's form to upload their peer evaluations, student evaluations, and other documents for the prior year. Faculty returning for their second and subsequent years will work in both the current year’s and the prior year’s forms each fall (by November 1).

You are now ready to enter your **Development Plan** and **point ratios**, following the instructions in the next section.

**Entering Point Distribution Ratios and Development Plans**

The following steps will take you through setting point ratios and development plans for Teaching. You will repeat these steps for the other evaluation categories as appropriate (Scholarship, Service, etc.)

Click the **Teaching** tab to enter points and goals for teaching.



Click the **Edit Weight** button to enter your points for teaching.



Enter your points in **decimal format**. (For example, .5 or .8, keeping in mind your point ratios across all categories must equal 1.00 and align to the annual focus on each).

Some Colleges and Departments have guidelines for setting point ratios, so check with your Department Chair to see if any guidelines apply to you. Otherwise, point distributions should reflect the proportion of time and effort spent on the various categories of activities.

After you have entered your points, click **Save**.

Now scroll down and click the page icon to the left of the **Development Plans** heading and choose **Add Development Plan**. If you have used the evaluation system for multiple years, you would be able to **Copy Development Plans ** (for the purpose of updating the plans).



Now, you are ready to add your first **Development Plan** related to **Teaching**. If your development plan relates to scholarship or service and not teaching, just set the point ratio for teaching and then move on to the Scholarship or Service tab to enter the development plan related to that category.



For any development plan you add, please include the following:

1. The Growth Area identified.
2. Development activities planned. List projected completion date (s) and, if possible, method(s) by which results will be evidenced.
3. Support and resources to be supplied by the evaluator and the University When finished entering your Development Plan, click **Save**.

If you have more than one Development Plan related to teaching, repeat the steps above to enter your additional plans.

After you have entered your Development Plans and points for **Teaching**, click on the other applicable tabs to enter goals and points for **Scholarship, Service,** etc.

You may not be expected to have points set under each tab (For example, Administration may be available, but you may not have administrative responsibilities to report. This tab is primarily for Directors, Chairs, and others with administrative responsibilities.

After you have entered all your Development Plans and point ratios, click the Summary Tab to ensure your point ratios add up to 1.00 as shown in the sample below:



When satisfied that you have correctly entered your point ratios and development plans, click the **Submit** button above the **Summary** tab. This will alert the department chair that your goals and points are ready to be approved.

 **Department of Doctoral Studies Evaluation Criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Clinical** | **Tenure Track**  |
| **Scholarship** Professional Scholarship Publications Presentations Professional Organization/Board Institutional Impact & Professional Contribution Contributions, Initiatives, Reports, Grants, etc.DepartmentScholarly Engagement and Contribution to Doctoral Research Research for Developing Doctoral Policies, Procedures &Curriculum Development | 0 | .15-.30 |
| **Service**Collegiality Specified Services(Profession, University, School/Department, Program, Local Community) | 0 | .15-.30 |
| **Teaching:**Student EvaluationsOnline Course Peer Evaluations & Peer Annual Summary | 1.0 or 100% | .40-.70 |
| **Admin**Duties as Prescribed by Specific RolesDepartment Chair/Director | 0 | 0-.25 |

**Scholarship**

**Professional Scholarship**

**Publications**

Scholarly contributions to the broader academic and professional field, emphasizing activities that advance knowledge, practice, or policy in written form based on research.

Book

Book Chapter

Peer-reviewed publication in a professional journal

Editor or reviewer for academic journals or scholarly books.

Research in Progress

**Presentations**

Scholarly contributions to the broader academic and professional field, emphasizing activities that advance knowledge, practice, or policy in visual and oral representation that is based on a research-based approach.

Presentations at local, state, regional, national, or international academic conferences.

**Professional organization**

Leadership role in professional organization or board

**Institutional Scholarship**

Scholarly engagement and leadership that supports the mission and strategic goals of the university as a whole.

* Developing or implementing university-wide initiative utilizing a **research-based approach**.
* Conducting institutional studies or contributing to accreditation **reports**.
* Preparing and leading university-wide **professional development** sessions grounded in **scholarly** evidence.
* Securing **grants** that enhance the university’s research or educational capacity.

**Scholarly Engagement in Doctoral Research** (Contribution toward Diss Defense, DM, ProQuest publication)
Contributions to scholarly works as a committee member, demonstrating active engagement and professional expertise as Chair, Methodologist, and/or Content Member by guiding and evaluating student research in the form of a dissertation.

Actively contributes to developing, refining, and evaluating multiple dissertations annually, providing high-quality feedback and demonstrating expertise in the field. It shows evidence of a significant impact on student's academic and professional growth and contributions to the profession as well as the overall professional body of knowledge.

* Documentation of each finished research product in the form of a Dissertation Manuscript or ProQuest entry with an assigned digital object identifier (DOI) may be noted for faculty contribution to student research.

**Research for Developing Doctoral Policies, Procedures &Curriculum Development**

Scholarly engagement in advancing doctoral education through research-based contributions to policies, procedures, and curriculum development. Faculty demonstrate expertise by conducting research that informs programmatic decisions, enhances student success, and aligns with institutional goals.

Evaluation Criteria:

* Research-Based Policy & Procedure Development – Conducts research to inform and refine doctoral program policies and procedures that enhance student success and program effectiveness.
* Curriculum Innovation & Improvement – Develops and implements research-driven curriculum enhancements that align with institutional goals and support doctoral student learning and research development.

**Service**

**Collegiality**

Collegiality in department service emphasizes how effectively a faculty member works with colleagues and contributes to the department, school, and overall university community.

Collegiality in this context reflects behaviors and attitudes that promote collaboration, mutual respect, and a positive working environment. Collegiality underscores the relational aspects of service responsibilities, recognizing that fostering a productive and harmonious academic environment is integral to achieving institutional goals. It ensures that faculty are not only evaluated on *what* they do but also *how* they do it, promoting professionalism and respect.

* **Collaboration:** Congenial participation in committees, working groups, or other service roles that require teamwork.
* **Support for Colleagues:** Willingness to mentor, assist, or otherwise contribute to the professional growth and success of others.
* **Respectful Communication:** Maintains professional and courteous interactions.
* **Community Building:** Contributions strengthen the departmental culture and institutional environment.

**Specified Service** (Profession, University, Department, Program, Community)

The listed services can be categorized based on the scope and context of their focus.

**Profession:** Services or contributions to the broader professional field, such as memberships in professional organizations, professional board positions, hosting or organizing an event, contributions to the discipline, and extending the profession through various outlets such as podcasts, newsletters, or networking.

**University**: Involvement at the institutional level, such as serving on university-wide committees, participating in university governance, or leading campus-wide initiatives.

**Department**: Activities related to the user’s specific academic department, such as curriculum development, departmental committees, or mentoring within the department.

**Program**: Contributions specific to the academic program, including advising, program assessment, reviews or development, and recruiting/retention efforts.

**Community**: Engagement with external stakeholders or the broader community, such as partnerships with local organizations, outreach events, or volunteer work.

**Teaching**

Teaching is assessed by key areas of effective teaching, including Instructional Effectiveness (clarity and engagement), Course Organization and Design (logical structure and alignment with goals), Faculty-Student Interaction (respectful and responsive support), and Impact on Learning (student growth and skill development).

**Student Evaluations**

Student evaluations measure the faculty member's effectiveness in teaching and mentoring, based on student feedback provided through standardized evaluation instruments, open-ended comments, or other documented student input.

**Peer Evaluations**

Peer evaluations measure how well courses are structured, the clarity of learning goals, the use of effective teaching methods, and how course materials and assessments support student learning and success.

**Development & Mentorship During Dissertation** (Instructional guidance, feedback, reviews, proposals, & defenses)

Serving on dissertation committees contributes to teaching by directly mentoring students in the research process, guiding them through complex academic work, and fostering critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

* + Providing instructional guidance during the dissertation process.
	+ Offering feedback that enhances students' understanding of research methodologies, theoretical frameworks, and academic writing.
	+ Supporting students’ professional and academic growth by advising on disseminating findings or applying research.
	+ Number of students mentored in research through dissertation development in an annual cycle.

Faculty Evaluation Ratings:

PEER EVALUATION OF ANNUAL SUMMARY

for use in Peer Evaluations of Annual Summaries

**Peer Evaluation of (Peer being evaluated):**

**Instructions:** Using your peer's Annual Summary of Professional Activity and the workspace below, review your peer's activities and rate each area using the following scale.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| 4 - Exemplary | Evidence suggests performance consistently exceeds the institution's standards of professional performance. |
| 3 - Commendable | Evidence suggests performance consistently meets the institution's standards of professional performance |
| 2 - Satisfactory | Evidence suggests adequate performance of institution standards, but some areas could be enhanced with additional development, assistance, or initiative.  |
| 1 - Unsatisfactory | Evidence suggests deficiencies in institution standards of performance. Improvement necessary. |
|  NA\* | Not applicable (Possibly not an area of responsibility for this peer or Not available)  |

 Evaluation Notes:

\***N/A**. Not all faculty are responsible for all types of activities. Rather than expecting to find professional activities in all evaluation areas, simply evaluate the professional activities that *are* included in the annual summary and mark **"NA"** for areas in which data are not provided. "NA" should not be interpreted to indicate poor or less-than-satisfactory performance.

**Quality vs. Quantity**: Please consider the quality as well as the quantity of professional activities in the evaluation. One (or a few) high-quality professional activities may contribute in limited, but significant capacities. The number of categories that activities are exhibited should not equate to a higher or lower level of performance. One (or a few) activities may represent a commendable or exemplary level of professional performance. The determination rests on the judgement of the evaluator.

**School of Graduate Studies Lens for Considerations in Peer Evaluations:** Consider the level of professional impact, innovation, collaboration, and engagement for each activity.

**Impact –** Graduate programs are expected to focus on high-quality scholarship, meaningful contributions to the field, and documented outcomes that create lasting impact. This may include research that advances educational leadership theory, enhances teaching practices, and influences policy. Examples of impact may include, but are not limited to, research publications, contributions to policy development, graduate success stories, influence on professional or academic organizations, scholarly citations, development of high-quality educational materials, and service to the community, profession, or academia**.**

**Innovation –** The School of Graduate Studies is committed to continuous improvement, fostering creativity, and embracing new approaches to teaching, research, and leadership development. Innovation includes both the pursuit of groundbreaking initiatives and the willingness to take risks to drive progress. Examples may include, but are not limited to, the development of new courses and degree programs, initiatives that enhance student learning and professional development, strategic partnerships with educational institutions and community organizations, new research initiatives, and innovative outreach or service projects.

**Collaboration –** Graduate education thrives on collaboration, fostering partnerships that strengthen scholarship, leadership, and professional practice. The School of Graduate Studies encourages interdisciplinary and cross-sector collaborations that enhance student learning and faculty research. Examples may include, but are not limited to, partnerships with educational institutions, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and industry leaders, as well as interdisciplinary research initiatives and faculty-student collaborations that address complex educational challenges.

**Engagement –** Graduate programs are expected to cultivate meaningful academic and professional engagement among students and faculty. This includes engagement with educational practitioners, policymakers, and scholars to ensure research and teaching remain relevant and impactful. Examples may include, but are not limited to, faculty and student involvement in educational leadership initiatives, collaborative research with school districts and higher education institutions, participation in academic conferences, mentorship programs, and contributions to policy discussions that shape the future of education.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TEACHING | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| Each activity may contribute in multiple ways. Mark as many columns as appropriate. Use blank rows for additional activities not already listed below or for multiple activities within a given category you wish to recognize separately.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course Preparation/ Development  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curriculum/Program Contributions  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student Engagement  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Work with Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Development/ Trainings Attended |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance |
|  1 -Unsatisfactory 2 -Satisfactory 3 – Commendable 4 -Exemplary NA |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SCHOLARSHIP | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| Each scholarly activity may contribute in multiple ways. Mark as many columns as appropriate. Use blank rows for additional activity types not already listed or for multiple activities within a given category you wish to recognize separately.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Publications |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentations: (International/National/ State/ Regional/ Local) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Development/ Workshop Trainings/Lectures/Seminars |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research in Progress |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarly Engagement in Student Research: Diss Committee Contributions  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarly Engagement in Program/Department:Curriculum Innovation/Improvement or Policy/Procedure Development  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Organizations: Leadership |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Other: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Overall Evaluation of Professional Development |
| 1-Unsatisfactory 2- Satisfactory 3- Commendable 4 – Exemplary NA  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SERVICE | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| Each service may contribute in multiple ways. Mark as many columns as appropriate. Use blank rows for additional activities not already listed below or for multiple activities within a given category you wish to recognize separately.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to the Profession |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to the University |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to School of Graduate Studies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to Department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to Community |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Organizations: Membership |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student Advising |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collegiality: Collaboration/Teamwork/ Peer Mentorship/Support  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance |
|  1 -Unsatisfactory 2 -Satisfactory 3 – Commendable 4 -Exemplary NA |
| Comments: |

Please use the space below to make any additional comments on this faculty member's performance based on the Annual Summary of Professional Activity that you reviewed.

 Teaching

 Scholarship

 Service

Signature of Peer Reviewer Date of Review \_

FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

**Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy**

The School of Graduate Studies evaluates faculty for tenure and promotion based on performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly works, and professional service. Tenure and promotion decisions are made (I) in accordance with the University's tenure and promotion policies as described in Section IX of the Southern Arkansas University Faculty Handbook and (2) in accordance with the following additional School of Graduate Studies tenure and promotion policies presented below.

To ensure that promotion and tenure are consistent with the University policies, all faculty seeking promotion or tenure participate in a formal, periodic review process that identifies and measures progress toward appropriate levels of performance and development goals.

 All faculty applying for promotion and tenure participate in an additional formal, periodic review process described in the SAU Faculty Handbook.

**Objectives**

The faculty tenure and promotion process aims to ensure that the School of Graduate Studies (I) clearly communicates to faculty seeking tenure and promotion the expectations consistent with its mission and (2) consistently applies these expectations in tenure and promotion decisions.

**Criteria and Specific Rules for Tenure**

According to SAU’s University Handbook, the evaluation of applications for tenure will be based upon (I) the applicant's body of teaching effectiveness, scholarly works, and professional service and (2) satisfactory progress in achieving developmental goals. To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must hold a minimal Master’s level degree and have a tenure-track appointment.

\*Departments within the School of Graduate Studies may have additional requirements for attaining tenure which is agreed to at the time of employment.

All faculty within the Department of Doctoral Studies must hold a doctoral degree.

Evaluation of applications for tenure will not be based upon an arbitrary number of years at the institution; however, an adequate amount of time is necessary to demonstrate competence and for the institution to evaluate it.

A recommended probationary period is prescribed below.

Professor ~ after 3 completed years

Associate Professor ~ after 4 completed years

The president of the University may make exceptions to the above probationary period in extraordinary cases. A minimum probationary period with exceptional performance is prescribed below.

Professor~ after 2 completed years

Associate Professor ~ after 2 completed years

The following stipulations apply (I) requirements for notice of attainment or denial of tenure, (2) procedures for appeal of tenure decisions, (3) documentation required in the application for tenure, and (4) the University's application procedures for tenure.

The School of Graduate Studies tenure policy adheres to the above criteria for the evaluation of applications for tenure, and all stipulated University tenure policies. (Section IX)

**Additional Criteria and Specific Rules for Tenure in the School of Graduate Studies**

In addition to the University policy, the School of Graduate Studies applies the following criteria to be used in tenure decisions.

**Criteria Evaluated for Tenure**

Evaluation of applications for tenure will be based upon (I) the applicant's teaching performance, scholarly work in the form of intellectual contribution and/or development, and service *to* the University, profession, and community and (2) the applicant's satisfactory progress in achieving developmental goals. Evaluation of each criterion will be based on the benchmarks identified below.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

The evaluation of teaching will be given the **highest priority** in tenure decisions. The tenure decision will be based on teaching evaluations as averaged over the pre-tenure period and on the annual evaluations two years before the tenure application. Evaluation of teaching includes evaluations from students, peers, the department chair, and the dean.

To receive a recommendation for tenure, the applicant in the School of Graduate Studies must earn teaching evaluations of excellent as averaged over the pre-tenure period and earn no less than a commendable rating in each of the two years prior to the tenure application.

Operational definitions of performances for excellent, commendable, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory performance may be found in the SAU University Handbook.

**Evaluation of Scholarly Work**

Scholarly work in the form of intellectual contribution and/or development will be given secondary priority in tenure decisions. Scholarly work is viewed as a necessary condition for continuous improvement in teaching and for tenure. Therefore, to receive a recommendation for tenure, the applicant must earn scholarly work evaluations of excellent as averaged over the pre-tenure period and earn no less than a commendable rating in each of the two years prior to the tenure application.

To earn an excellent evaluation for Scholarly Work, the applicant for tenure should document:

* At least five intellectual contributions during the pre-tenure period.
* A minimum of two publications in peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or author of one book.

**Evaluation of Professional Service**

The evaluation of professional service in the form of profession, university, public, and/or communitywill be considered in tenure decisions. Appropriate professional service is viewed as a necessary condition for continuous improvement in teaching and for tenure. Therefore, to receive a recommendation for tenure, the applicant must earn service evaluations of commendable or better as averaged over the pre-tenure period and must earn no less than satisfactory or better as averaged over the pre-tenure period.

**Summary of Evaluation of Progress toward Tenure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluations of Teaching | * Excellent averaged over the pre-tenure period and no less than Commendable in each of the two years prior to the tenure application
 |
| Evaluations of Scholarly Work in the form of intellectual development & contribution | * Commendable or better averaged over the pre-tenure period
 |
| Evaluations of Professional Service | * Commendable or better averaged over the pre-tenure period
 |

Department chairs and tenure-track faculty should effectively communicate and evaluate progress toward tenure during the annual evaluation meetings.

**Criteria and Specific Rules for Promotion**

As stated in the SAU Faculty Handbook, eligibility for promotion consideration is determined based on academic credentials, years of professional experience, and time in rank. (Section IX. IV. A) Academic credentials and years of professional experience are evaluated in terms of the criteria for an initial rank appointment (Section IX. I. 11.) Time in rank, as defined in Section IX. IV. A., is considered the minimum criterion necessary to apply for promotion and is not considered indicative of meriting promotion. The School of Graduate Studies promotion policy adheres to these criteria, as summarized below, to determine eligibility for promotion.

Eligibility for promotion consideration is determined based on academic credentials, years of professional experience, and time in rank. Academic credentials and years of professional experience are evaluated in terms of the Criteria for Initial Rank Appointment (Part 1.0). The minimum times in rank to be eligible to apply for promotion arc as follows:

 Associate Professor to Professor ~~ 5 years

 Assistant Professor to Associate Professor~~ 4 years

Exceptions to the above time in rank requirements may be made in cases of extraordinary merit.

The above time in rank requirements arc minimum criteria necessary to apply for promotion and should not be considered indicative of meriting promotion.

**Criteria Evaluated to Determine Merit of Promotion**

As stated in the SAU *Faculty Handbook,* evaluation of the application for promotion will consider teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and professional service. The Handbook also states:

"Demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher is a necessary criterion and is a primary consideration in all promotion decisions. Scholarly activity-broadly defined to include published and unpublished research, creative works, and professional academic growth is a consideration in all promotion decisions. Service to the University, the profession, and the community is a consideration in all promotion decisions." (Section IX, IV.D)

The School of Graduate Studies promotion policy adheres to the above criteria to be evaluated to determine merit for promotion and to the relative weight assigned to each criterion for evaluation.

**Standards for Evaluation of Applications for Promotion**

As stated in the SAU Faculty Handbook:

Teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and professional service are evaluated as excellent, commendable, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory, based on documentation submitted in the application for promotion. Applicants for promotion should document activities meriting promotion as follows:

 For promotion to **professor**: document **excellent** performance in either teaching effectiveness or scholarly activity with, at minimum, a **commendable** evaluation in other categories.

 For promotion to **associate professor**: document commendable in teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and professional service.

 For promotion to assistant professor: document commendable teaching effectiveness with, at minimum, a satisfactory evaluation in all other categories. (Section IX, C)

**Additional Criteria and Specific Rules for Promotion** **in the School of Graduate Studies**

The SAU Faculty Handbook defines operational guidelines for subjective evaluation of merit in promotion decisions (Section IX, D). In addition to the University policy, the School of Graduate Studies applies the following criteria to be used in promotion decisions. Criteria evaluated to determine the merit of promotion will include the applicant's evaluation of teaching, scholarly works in the form of intellectual contribution and development, and professional service to the university, profession, public, and community. Evaluation of each criterion will be based on the benchmarks identified below.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

The evaluation of teaching will be given the highest priority in promotion decisions. The promotion decision will be based on teaching evaluations during the current evaluation period. Evaluation of teaching includes evaluations from students, peers, the department chair, and the dean.

To receive a recommendation for promotion to full professor, the applicant must earn teaching evaluations of excellent as averaged over the evaluation period and must earn no less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to the promotion application. Furthermore, to receive such a recommendation the applicant must earn an excellent evaluation in either teaching effectiveness or scholarly work.

To receive a recommendation for promotion to associate professor, the applicant must earn teaching evaluations of commendable or better as averaged over the evaluation period and must earn no less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to the promotion application.

To receive a recommendation for promotion to assistant professor, the applicant must earn teaching evaluations of commendable or better as averaged over the evaluation period and must earn no less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to the promotion application.

**Evaluation of Scholarly Work**

Continuing scholarly works in the form of intellectual development and contribution is viewed as a necessary condition for continuous improvement in teaching and promotion. Therefore, to receive a recommendation for promotion, the applicant must earn noted evaluations as averaged over the evaluation period. Appropriate scholarly work must be evidenced within any 5-year time period under review.

For promotion to full professor, the applicant should document no less than commendable performance over the evaluation period. Furthermore, to receive the full professor recommendation the applicant must earn an averaged excellent evaluation in either teaching effectiveness or scholarly work.

For promotion to associate professor, the applicant should document no less than commendable over the evaluation period.

For promotion to assistant professor, the applicant must earn evaluations of commendable or better as averaged over the evaluation period with no less than a satisfactory rating in each of the three years prior to the promotion application.

**Evaluation of Professional Service**

The evaluation of professional service will be considered in promotion decisions. Appropriate professional service is viewed as a necessary condition for continuous improvement in teaching and for promotion.

To receive a recommendation for promotion to professor or associate professor, the applicant must document commendable professional service during the evaluation period no less than commendable in each of the three years prior to the promotion application.

To receive a recommendation for promotion to assistant professor, must document commendable professional service averaged over the evaluation period and must earn no less than a satisfactory rating in each of the three years prior to the promotion application.

**Summary of Evaluation of Process Toward Promotion**

To receive a recommendation for promotion, applicants must earn and document the following levels of performance.

**For promotion to professor**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Teaching | * Excellent evaluation of teaching averaged over the evaluation period.
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to promotion application.
 |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Scholarly Work in the form of intellectual contributions and development | * Excellent evaluations of scholarly work averaged over the evaluation period.
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to the promotion application.
 |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Professional Service | * Commendable or better- averaged over the evaluation period
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the 3 years prior to promotion application.
 |

**For promotion to Associate Professor:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Teaching | * Commendable evaluation or better- averaged over the evaluation period
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to promotion application.
 |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Scholarly Work in the form of intellectual contributions and development | * Commendable or better- averaged over the evaluation period.
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to promotion application.
 |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Professional Service | * Commendable or better- averaged over the evaluation period
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the 3 years prior to promotion application.
 |

**For promotion to Assistant Professor:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Requirements related to evaluations of teaching | * Commendable or better averaged over the evaluation period
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to promotion application
 |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Scholarly Work in the form of intellectual contributions and development | * Commendable or better averaged over the evaluation period
* No less than a commendable rating in each of the three years prior to promotion application
 |
| Requirements related to evaluations of Professional service | * Satisfactory or better averaged over the evaluation period
* No less than a satisfactory rating in each of the three years prior to promotion application.
 |

### **Procedures for Appeal of Promotion Decisions**

The *SAU Faculty Handbook* includes procedures for appeal of promotion decisions. (Section IX. VI. E.) The RCD follows this policy. Criteria for

**Tenure and Promotion**

The *SAU Faculty handbook* includes guidelines for documenting criteria to be considered in tenure and promotion decisions. (Section IX, V.)

**Application Procedures for Tenure and Promotion**

The *SAU Faculty Handbook* stipulates procedures for tenure and promotion application (Section IX, VI.)