

Full-Time Faculty Handbook

Appendix 4: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

4.0 Introduction

4.1 Pre-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Process

4.2 Application for Tenure

4.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Process

4.4 Rank Advancement to Full Professor

4.5 Academic Department Tenure Files

4.6 Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

4.0 Introduction

Appendix 4 provides faculty, staff, and administrators at SLCC with procedures for the evaluation and promotion of full-time faculty. This document aligns with and is subject to the following policies:

- SLCC Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, and Tenure
- SLCC Employee Conduct
- SLCC Corrective Action
- USHE R312: Institutional Roles and Missions
- USHE R481: Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-Tenure Review
- USHE R482: Bona Fide Financial Exigency and Personnel Reduction
- USHE R485: Faculty Teaching/Instructional Workload Guidelines

The Faculty Role

Faculty at Salt Lake Community College are selected, retained, and promoted primarily on the basis and evidence of effective Teaching. Secondary criteria include professional activity and development, and service.

SLCC Academic Ranks

Non-Tenure-Track: Instructor

Instructors are full-time non-tenure-track faculty with an annual appointment renewable at the discretion of the college with no expectation of tenure.

Instructors are evaluated each year of their employment based on evidence of effective teaching but may engage in professional activities and service. The evaluation becomes part of their academic record but does not result in a Letter of Progress or Letter of Concern. The non-tenure track evaluation process will follow a similar process as the pre-tenure evaluation with an emphasis on teaching.

Table 1: Evaluation Process for Non-Tenure Track Instructors

Step	Responsible Party	Timeline
Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support and notification of sitting committee assignments	Faculty member and associate dean	Due by April 30 for continuing faculty, or September 30 for new faculty
Teaching observations	Sitting committee	Due by December 1
Teaching observation report	Sitting committee	Due by January 1
Submission of Academic Department Tenure File	Faculty member	Due by January 31
Notification of faculty performance evaluation meeting date and time	Sitting committee	Due by January 31

Form 2: Peer Evaluation	Sitting committee	Due by the date of the faculty performance evaluation meeting
Faculty performance evaluation meeting	Faculty member and sitting committee	Due by March 15
Form 3: Non-Tenure Track Evaluation Summary	Sitting committee	Due by March 31
Letter of Evaluation, if applicable	Dean	Due by March 31

Tenure-Track Faculty Ranks

- **Assistant Professor:** Tenure-track faculty are hired at the rank of Assistant Professor. Assistant professors work towards tenure during the pre-tenure probationary period, which is six years of full-time faculty service. Assistant professors are evaluated annually and receive a formal Letter of Evaluation each year.
- **Associate Professor:** After six years of satisfactory full-time service, faculty will apply for tenure. Following a successful tenure application and award of tenure, faculty are promoted to the rank of Associate Professor.
- **Full Professor:** Full Professor is the highest rank for faculty. A tenured faculty member is eligible to apply for rank advancement to Full Professor during their fifth year in good standing as an Associate Professor. Application for Full Professor is optional.

4.1 Pre-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Process

Faculty evaluation will occur on a yearly basis and will be based on teaching, professional activity and development, and service. Throughout the faculty evaluation process, faculty have opportunities to respond to or appeal specific actions.

Pre-Tenure Probationary Period

The pre-tenure probationary period is six years of full-time faculty service starting with a tenure-track appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Assistant professors are mentored through the tenure process by their associate dean and members on their evaluation sitting committee. The steps in the process are summarized in the table below and explained further in the following sections.

Table 2: Evaluation Process for Pre-Tenure Faculty

Step	Responsible Party	Timeline
Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support and notification of sitting committee assignments	Faculty member and associate dean	Due by April 30 for continuing faculty, or September 30 for new faculty
Teaching observations	Sitting committee	Due by December 1
Teaching observation report	Sitting committee	Due by January 1
Submission of Academic Department Tenure File	Faculty member	Due by January 31
Notification of faculty performance evaluation meeting date and time	Sitting committee	Due by January 31
Form 2: Peer Evaluation	Sitting committee	Due by the date of the faculty performance evaluation meeting
Faculty performance evaluation meeting	Faculty member and sitting committee	Due by March 15
Form 3: Tenure-Track Evaluation Summary and Recommendation	Sitting committee	Due by March 15
Form 4 (As Needed): Academic Administrator Supervisory Evaluation	Associate dean	Due by March 15

Letter of Evaluation	Dean	Due by March 31
Recommendation for tenure, if applicable	Dean	Due by March 31

Goal Setting

Each year, the faculty member will, in discussion with the associate dean, set goals for the evaluation period in the areas of teaching, professional activity and development, and service.

The goal setting process includes an assessment of the prior period, if appropriate, and includes planning and support needed to meet the new goals.

- The associate dean will convene the goal setting meeting for each faculty member.
- Evaluation sitting committee members provide guidance on the goal setting process and may attend the goal setting meeting at the faculty member's request.
- Goals should be appropriate for the faculty member's career stage and trajectory, the needs of the department, and the mission, vision, and values of the college.
- Goals should be achievable within an academic year working in a full-time faculty position.
- If the faculty member is on an institutionally approved reduced load or leave, the goals will reflect this.
- Goals may be modified during the evaluation period as circumstances change. Significant changes should be addressed in the Academic Tenure File Professional Statement.

Documentation: Form 1

- Goals will be recorded on Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support.
- Form 1 will record accomplishments from the prior year, describe how those accomplishments inform new goals, and indicate resources for planning and support in agreement with the associate dean.

- The faculty member and associate dean will sign Form 1 twice (for initial goal setting and after evaluating the year's goals).
- The faculty member will upload the completed and signed Form 1 to their Academic Department Tenure File (evaluation forms folder).
- It is recommended that the faculty member and the associate dean discuss the membership of the sitting committee for the upcoming year.

Formation of the Evaluation Sitting Committee

Evaluation sitting committee members serve as the primary mentors for faculty evaluation. Faculty members eligible to serve on an evaluation sitting committee are tenured faculty and faculty in Salt Lake Community College Tech (SLCCTech) who have achieved the status of continuous appointment plus three years. Peer evaluation is a standard professional performance expectation of all tenured faculty members and continued appointment faculty members in SLCCTech. The associate dean, in collaboration with the faculty, shall make every effort to ensure sitting committee service is equitably and appropriately distributed. Serving as an evaluation sitting committee member is a significant service commitment and will be formally recognized as part of the member's service contributions in annual reviews, where members will also receive feedback on their mentoring responsibilities.

The evaluation sitting committee member will support their faculty peer in the following ways:

- Provide continual formative feedback throughout the academic year.
- Assist in improving teaching, service, and professional activities.
- Guide understanding of shared governance.
- Emphasize a growth, rather than punitive, mindset.
- Discuss collegiality and collaboration.
- Be available, supportive, and hold the faculty member to the high professional standards of the discipline.
- Collaborate and assist with achieving Form 1 goals.
- Support navigation of the tenure process.

- Suggest opportunities for committee work.
- Communicate frequently.

Special Considerations

- While faculty are encouraged to maintain consistency in their evaluation sitting committee, they may select new members as needed.
- Evaluation sitting committee members are not limited to the department/college where the faculty resides. There are many reasons to choose a member from outside the department.
- The department or division lacks sufficient tenured faculty to form an evaluation sitting committee.
- The faculty aligns with a specific area of growth.
- The faculty wishes to collaborate with another department on curricular, professional development, or service activities.

Evaluation Sitting Committee Chair

The associate dean typically serves as the chair of the evaluation sitting committee. The associate dean must serve on faculty evaluation sitting committees but may designate an evaluation sitting committee member to be chair. If an evaluation sitting committee member is designated as chair, this decision should be made at the goal setting meeting that typically occurs in the spring semester. An evaluation sitting committee member serving as chair will have access to the administrative assistant resources of the department/division. The evaluation sitting committee chair ensures that all steps of the evaluation process take place and that all deadlines are met.

Teaching Observation

Members of the evaluation sitting committee must observe a minimum of one class or its equivalent during the evaluation period. Evaluation sitting committee members should give

prior notice before a formal evaluation occurs. Deans may observe faculty at their discretion and are encouraged to provide a teaching observation report if applicable.

- Evaluation sitting committee members will initiate contact with the faculty member to coordinate teaching observations and request access to syllabi, course materials, Canvas sites, and other artifacts necessary to conduct a meaningful observation. Faculty being reviewed will respond to these requests in a timely manner.
- When a faculty member teaches in multiple modalities, Evaluation sitting committee members will coordinate with each other to ensure all modalities receive substantive feedback.
- Teaching observations should not be disruptive to student learning.
- Evaluation sitting committee members should be granted appropriate access to the relevant LMS materials. Evaluation sitting committee members should retain this access only as long as it is necessary to give substantive feedback to the faculty. The faculty member being evaluated should submit a request to add the relevant Evaluation sitting committee member to a course. After the teaching observation is completed, the faculty member may submit a request to remove users.
- After the teaching observation, the evaluation sitting committee member will have a timely, informal conversation with the faculty member to discuss feedback. This discussion serves as an opportunity to highlight strengths, provide constructive feedback, and allow the faculty being observed to respond to feedback, and, if needed, outline areas for improvement. Additional observations may be conducted to assess progress.

Documentation: Teaching Observation Report

- Following the teaching observation and informal conversation, the evaluation sitting committee member will write a formal report, noting commendations and recommendations relevant to the standards of professional performance in teaching in the Faculty Job Description.

- The teaching observation report can be in the form of a letter/memo to the faculty member or a department may use a specific teaching observation form.
- The evaluation sitting committee member will upload a copy of the teaching observation report to the faculty member's Academic Department Tenure File (teaching evaluations folder) within two weeks of the informal conversation.

Academic Department Tenure File

Faculty will maintain an Academic Department Tenure File throughout their career at SLCC using the official SLCC platform. The Academic Department Tenure File is the primary repository for all documents and artifacts relevant to the faculty evaluation process. The specific guidelines for the Academic Department Tenure File are outlined later in this appendix.

Faculty Performance Evaluation Meeting

The faculty performance evaluation meeting provides the opportunity for the faculty member and the evaluation sitting committee to discuss the evaluation process and address any questions or needs.

The faculty performance evaluation meeting will be scheduled by the associate dean and will follow these steps:

- Before the meeting, each committee member will use Form 2 to independently evaluate the faculty member in each area of performance: teaching, professional activity and development, and service. Each area will be rated on the following scale:
 - Standard professional performance
 - Exceeds standard professional performance
 - Below standard professional performance
- The meeting will begin with the faculty member and the evaluation sitting committee discussing performance, answering questions, and identifying support needs.
- The faculty member will then leave the meeting and the evaluation sitting committee will discuss their evaluation of the faculty member. Evaluation sitting committee

members may change their Form 2 ratings based on the discussion. Evaluation sitting committee members may share the content of this discussion with the faculty member being reviewed. The performance evaluation meeting discussion will not include personnel matters which are confidential to the associate dean.

- If a committee member rates the faculty member as either exceeds or below standard professional performance, they must provide a rationale for their decision. If no rationale can be given, the rating should default to standard professional performance.
- The evaluation sitting committee will vote to recommend whether the faculty member should receive a Letter of Progress or a Letter of Concern.
- The evaluation sitting committee chair will complete Form 3 by summarizing the discussion, recording votes for the Letter of Evaluation, and gathering committee signatures.

Documentation: Form 2, Form 3, and Form 4 (as needed)

- Each member of the evaluation sitting committee will upload Form 2: Peer Evaluation to the faculty member's Academic Department Tenure File (Evaluations folder).
- The evaluation sitting committee chair will upload Form 3: Evaluation Summary and Recommendation to the faculty member's Academic Department Tenure File (evaluations folder).
- If relevant to the faculty evaluation process, supervisory or personnel information regarding the faculty member will be disclosed to the dean by the associate dean using Form 4: Academic Administrator Supervisory Evaluation. Form 4 will be placed in the faculty member's HR personnel file, not the academic tenure file. The use of Form 4 or its contents will not be shared with the evaluation sitting committee members. If Form 4 is used, the academic supervisor will immediately notify the faculty member. The faculty member may respond in writing to the dean within 15 calendar days.

Letter of Evaluation

At the end of each formal evaluation during the pre-tenure probationary period, the dean will issue a letter of evaluation. The letter of evaluation will be either a Letter of Progress or a Letter of Concern.

- A Letter of Progress indicates that the faculty member is in good standing and making appropriate progress to achieve tenure. A Letter of Progress is warranted if the majority vote of the evaluation sitting committee finds that the faculty member has met or exceeded standard professional performance in teaching and at least one other area. A Letter of Progress will include recommendations for continued improvement in all areas.
- A Letter of Concern indicates that the faculty member is not making appropriate progress towards tenure and must participate in institutional remediation requirements. A Letter of Concern should clearly articulate the deficits in a faculty member's performance and provide specific and attainable steps towards remediation. For a first Letter of Concern, the faculty member may add a response to their Academic Department Tenure File. This addition must be made by the end of the academic term when the Letter of Concern is received.

A Letter of Concern is warranted in the following instances:

- When the majority of the evaluation sitting committee finds that the faculty member is below standard professional performance in teaching or in more than one area of evaluation,
- recommendations from previous Letter(s) of Progress or remediations from a previous Letter of Concern have not been met,
- or if the faculty member has violated Standards of Professional Responsibility.

Second Letter of Concern

Assistant professors proceed through the pre-tenure probationary period unless they receive a second Letter of Concern, which serves as notice of termination for faculty cause effective at

the end of that contract year. Faculty receiving a second letter of concern may respond to the notice and request a formal hearing according to the procedures in the Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, and Tenure Policy. The faculty member must submit a written request for hearing within 15 calendar days after receipt of the second Letter of Concern. Failure by the faculty member to submit a written request for a hearing within 15 calendar days will terminate further proceedings.

Completing the Formal Evaluation Cycle: Goal Setting

By the end of the semester when the performance evaluation meeting is held, the associate dean will meet with each faculty member to review the evaluation period and to set Form 1 goals for the next academic year. The dean or the faculty member under review may request that evaluation sitting committee members attend this meeting. This step in the formal evaluation cycle may take place during the faculty performance meeting.

4.2 Application for Tenure

In the final year of the pre-tenure probationary period, the faculty member will apply for tenure. Tenure affirms that the faculty member meets criteria for standard professional performance in teaching, professional activity and development, and service (as defined in the Faculty Job Description).

If a faculty member receives a first Letter of Concern during the final probationary year, the pre-tenure probationary period will be extended one year. The pre-probationary period extension will be communicated to the faculty member in the Letter of Concern.

Tenure evaluation is a co-occurring, yet separate, process from the yearly tenure-track evaluation. The application for, evaluation of, and decision regarding the granting of tenure will address the entire pre-tenure probationary period.

The Tenure Decision

The decision to grant tenure is made by the president, after recommendations from the evaluation sitting committee, the dean, and the provost. Granting tenure shows that the faculty member meets professional standards and is competent as a teacher, in the discipline, and as a colleague. The granting of tenure automatically includes rank advancement to Associate Professor and a 5% salary increase with salary placement to minimum step 1 of the Associate Professor Grade or the next higher step effective the beginning of the next academic year, July 1.

Denial of tenure by the president serves as notice of termination for faculty cause effective at the end of that contract year. Faculty denied tenure may request a formal hearing as provided for in the Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, and Tenure policy.

Special Considerations

- **Credit for Previous Years of Academic Service:** A maximum of three years of previous full-time, satisfactory academic service may be credited to the pre-tenure probationary period at the discretion of the provost (or designee) upon written request and recommendation by the evaluation sitting committee and the dean with approval from the tenured members of the department faculty by simple majority vote.
- **Adjustments to Pre-Tenure Period:** The pre-tenure probationary period may be extended, interrupted, or reduced at the discretion of the Provost for Academic and Student Affairs in collaboration with the individual faculty member and the associate dean.

4.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Process

Tenured faculty are evaluated formally every fifth year and informally in the other years. Formal evaluations follow the same process as tenure-track evaluations. Informal evaluations are conducted between the faculty member and the associate dean and take place even during years of formal review.

Informal Evaluation

Goal Setting

In the informal evaluation year, the faculty member will, in discussion with the associate dean, set goals for the informal evaluation period in the areas of teaching, professional activity and development, and service. The steps in the process are summarized in the table below.

Table 3: Informal Evaluation Process for Post-Tenure Faculty

Step	Responsible Party	Timeline
Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support and notification of sitting committee assignments	Faculty member and associate dean	Due by April 30
Form 4 (As Needed): Academic Administrator Supervisory Evaluation	Associate dean	Due by March 15

The goal setting process includes an assessment of the prior period, if appropriate, and includes planning and support needed to meet the new goals.

- The associate dean will convene the goal setting meeting for each faculty member.
- Evaluation sitting committee members may provide guidance on the goal setting process and may attend the goal setting meeting at the faculty member's request.
- Goals should be appropriate for the faculty member's career stage and trajectory, the needs of the department, and the mission, vision, and values of the college.
- Goals should be achievable within an academic year working in a full-time faculty position.
- If the faculty member is on an institutionally approved reduced load or leave, the goals will reflect this.

- Goals may be modified during the evaluation period as circumstances change. Significant changes should be addressed in the Academic Tenure File Professional Statement.

Documentation: Form 1

- Goals will be recorded on Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support
- Form 1 will record accomplishments from the prior year, describe how those accomplishments inform new goals, and indicate resources for planning and support in agreement with the associate dean.
- The faculty member and associate dean will sign Form 1 twice (for initial goal setting and after evaluating the year's goals)
- The faculty member will upload the completed and signed Form 1 to their Academic Department Tenure File (Evaluation Forms).
- It is recommended that the faculty member and the associate dean discuss the membership of the evaluation sitting committee for the upcoming year.

Formal Evaluation

Goal Setting

In the formal evaluation year, the faculty member will, in discussion with the associate dean, set goals for the evaluation period in the areas of teaching, professional activity and development, and service. The steps in the process are summarized in the table below.

Table 4: Formal Evaluation Process for Post-Tenure Faculty

Step	Responsible Party	Timeline
Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support and notification of sitting committee assignments	Faculty member	Due by April 30 for continuing faculty, or September 30 for new faculty
Teaching observations	Sitting committee	Due by December 1

Teaching observation report	Sitting committee	Due by January 1
Submission of Academic Department Tenure File	Faculty member	Due by January 31
Notification of faculty performance evaluation meeting date and time	Sitting committee	Due by January 31
Form 2: Peer Evaluation	Sitting Committee	Due by the date of the faculty performance evaluation meeting
Faculty performance evaluation meeting	Faculty member and sitting committee	Due by March 15
Form 3: Formal Post-Tenure Review Summary	Sitting committee	Due by March 15
Form 4 (As Needed): Academic Administrator Supervisory Evaluation	Associate dean	Due by March 15
Letter of Evaluation	Dean	Due by March 31
Recommendation for rank advancement, if applicable	Dean	Due by March 31

The goal setting process includes an assessment of the prior period, if appropriate, and includes planning and support needed to meet the new goals.

- The associate dean will convene the goal setting meeting for each faculty member.
- Evaluation sitting committee members may provide guidance on the goal setting process and may attend the goal setting meeting at the faculty member's request.
- Goals should be appropriate for the faculty member's career stage and trajectory, the needs of the department, and the mission, vision, and values of the college.
- Goals should be achievable within an academic year working in a full-time faculty position.

- If the faculty member is on an institutionally approved reduced load or leave, the goals will reflect this.
- Goals may be modified during the evaluation period as circumstances change. Significant changes should be addressed in the Academic Tenure File Professional Statement.

Documentation: Form 1

- Goals will be recorded on Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support.
- Form 1 will record accomplishments from the prior year, describe how those accomplishments inform new goals, and indicate resources for planning and support in agreement with the associate dean.
- The faculty member and associate dean will sign Form 1 twice (for initial goal setting and after evaluating the year's goals).
- The faculty member will upload the completed and signed Form 1 to their Academic Department Tenure File (evaluation forms folder).
 - It is recommended that the faculty member and the associate dean discuss the membership of the evaluation sitting committee for the upcoming year.

Formation of the Evaluation Sitting Committee

Evaluation sitting committee members serve as the primary mentors for faculty undergoing post-tenure evaluation. Members are selected from the post-tenure standing committee, which comprises all tenured faculty and faculty at SLCCTech who have attained continuous appointment plus three years of service. In accordance with Utah statute, each post-tenure evaluation committee must include the associate dean, who serves as the provost's designee, and two committee members from outside the faculty member's department. The faculty member undergoing review may select two additional tenured faculty members from within their department to serve on the committee.

Peer evaluation is a standard professional performance expectation of all tenured faculty members and continued appointment faculty members at SLCCTech. The associate dean in collaboration with the faculty shall make every effort to ensure sitting committee service is equitably and appropriately distributed.

Serving as an evaluation sitting committee members is a significant service commitment and will be formally recognized as part of the member's service contributions in annual reviews, where members will also receive feedback on their mentoring responsibilities

The evaluation sitting committee members will support their faculty peer in the following ways:

- Provide continual formative feedback throughout the academic year.
- Assist in improving teaching, service, and professional activities.
- Guide understanding of shared governance.
- Emphasize a growth, rather than punitive, mindset.
- Discuss collegiality and collaboration.
- Be available, be supportive, and be professionally critical.
- Collaborate and assist with achieving Form 1 goals.
- Support navigation of the tenure process.
- Suggest opportunities for committee work.
- Communicate frequently.

Special Consideration

- While faculty are encouraged to maintain consistency in their evaluation sitting committee, they may select new members as needed.

Evaluation Sitting Committee Chair

The associate dean typically serves as the chair of the evaluation sitting committee. The associate dean must serve on faculty evaluation sitting committees but may designate a

evaluation sitting committee member to be chair. If an evaluation sitting committee member is designated as chair, this decision should be made at the goal setting meeting.

- An evaluation sitting committee member serving as chair will have access to the administrative assistant resources of the department/ division.
- The evaluation sitting committee chair ensures that all steps of the evaluation process take place and that all deadlines are met.

Teaching Observation

Members of the evaluation sitting committee must observe a minimum of one class or its equivalent during the evaluation period. Evaluation sitting committee members should give prior notice before a formal evaluation occurs. Deans may observe faculty at their discretion and are encouraged to give a teaching observation report if applicable.

- Evaluation sitting committee members will initiate contact with the faculty member to coordinate teaching observations and request access to syllabi, course materials, LMS course sites, and other artifacts necessary to conduct a meaningful observation. Faculty being reviewed will respond to these requests in a timely manner.
- When a faculty member teaches in multiple modalities, Evaluation sitting committee members will coordinate with each other to ensure all modalities receive substantive feedback.
- Teaching observations should not be disruptive to student learning.
- Evaluation sitting committee members should be granted appropriate access to the relevant LMS materials. Evaluation sitting committee members should retain this access only as long as it is necessary to give substantive feedback to the faculty. The faculty member being evaluated should submit a request to add users to add the relevant evaluation sitting committee member to a course. After the teaching observation is completed, the faculty member may submit a request to remove users.
- After the teaching observation, the evaluation sitting committee member will have a timely, informal conversation with the faculty member to discuss feedback. This discussion serves as an opportunity to highlight strengths, provide constructive

feedback, and allow the faculty being observed to respond to feedback, and, if needed, outline areas for improvement. Additional observations may be conducted to assess progress.

Documentation: Teaching Observation Report

- Following the teaching observation and informal conversation, the Evaluation Sitting Committee member will write a formal report, noting commendations and recommendations relevant to the standards of professional performance in teaching in the Faculty Job Description.
- The teaching observation report can be in the form of a letter/memo to the faculty member or a department may use a specific teaching observation form.
- The evaluation sitting committee member will upload a copy of the teaching observation report to the faculty member's Academic Department Tenure File (teaching evaluations folder) within two weeks of the informal conversation.

Academic Department Tenure File

Faculty will maintain an Academic Department Tenure File throughout their career at SLCC using the official SLCC platform. The Academic Department Tenure File is the primary repository for all documents and artifacts relevant to the faculty evaluation process. The specific guidelines for the Academic Department Tenure File are outlined later in this appendix.

Faculty Performance Evaluation Meeting

The faculty performance evaluation meeting provides the opportunity for the faculty member and the evaluation sitting committee to discuss the evaluation process and address any questions or needs.

The faculty performance evaluation meeting will be scheduled by the associate dean and will follow these steps:

- Before the meeting, each committee member will use Form 2 to independently evaluate the faculty member in each area of performance: teaching, professional activity and development, and service. Each area will be rated as one of the following:
 - Standard professional performance
 - Exceeds standard professional performance
 - Below standard professional performance
- The meeting will begin with the faculty member and the evaluation sitting committee discussing performance, answering questions, and identifying support needs.
- The faculty member will then leave the meeting, and the evaluation sitting committee will discuss their evaluation of the faculty member. Evaluation sitting committee members may change their Form 2 ratings based on the discussion. Evaluation sitting committee members may share the content of this discussion with the faculty member being reviewed. The performance evaluation meeting discussion will not include personnel matters which are confidential to the associate dean.
- If a committee member rates the faculty member as either exceeds or below standard professional performance, they must provide a rationale for their decision. If no rationale can be given, the rating should default to standard professional performance.
- If a faculty member is found to not be meeting standard professional performance, the faculty member and associate dean, in consultation with the evaluation sitting committee, will create a remediation plan for the next formal evaluation cycle or an agreed upon timeline. The faculty member will meet as directed with their committee to review progress until standards are met. Failure to remediate may result in disciplinary measures and possible termination-
- The evaluation sitting committee chair will complete Form 3 by summarizing the discussion, recording votes for the Letter of Evaluation, and gathering committee signatures.

Documentation: Form 2, Form 3, and Form 4 (as needed)

- Each member of the evaluation sitting committee will upload Form 2: Peer Evaluation to the faculty member's Academic Department Tenure File (Evaluations folder).
- The Evaluation Sitting Committee Chair will upload Form 3: Evaluation Summary and Recommendation to the faculty member's Academic Department Tenure File (Evaluations folder).
- If relevant to the faculty evaluation process, supervisory or personnel information regarding the faculty member will be disclosed to the dean by the associate dean using Form 4: Academic Administrator Supervisory Evaluation. Form 4 will be placed in the faculty member's HR personnel file, not the academic tenure file. The use of Form 4 or its contents will not be shared with the evaluation sitting committee members. If Form 4 is used, the associate dean will immediately notify the faculty member. The faculty member may respond in writing to the dean within 15 calendar days.

4.4 Rank Advancement to Full Professor

Full Professor is the highest rank for faculty. Application for rank advancement to full professor is optional. In addition to exceeding the standards of professional performance of a tenured professor in teaching, full professors are expected to demonstrate a pattern of professional engagement in and beyond their home departments. Full professors are reviewed according to the full-time faculty evaluation process. Full professors demonstrate a pattern of the following qualities:

- Leadership: Full professors are leaders. They voluntarily seek out opportunities to make positive differences not just for themselves, but for others.
- Deep Engagement: Full professors are deeply engaged with issues in teaching, their profession, and the institution. Full professors are notable for their contributions.
- Commitment to the College's Mission, Vision, and Values: All faculty must adhere to SLCC's Mission, Vision, and Values. Full professors demonstrate leadership and deep engagement with them.

Application for Rank Advancement to Full Professor

A tenured faculty member is eligible to apply for rank advancement to full professor starting in their fifth year in good standing after tenure. To apply for full professor, the faculty member must achieve exceeding standard professional performance in teaching and at least one of the two other evaluation areas in their current or most recent formal post-tenure evaluation. The faculty member must meet at least standard professional performance in the other area.

Evaluation of an application for rank advancement to full professor may be a co-occurring, yet separate, process with a formal post-tenure review or it may take place during an informal post-tenure review year. The application for, evaluation of, and decision regarding an application for rank advancement to full professor will address the post-tenure period.

- Along with the professional portfolio requirements, the faculty member will submit to the chair of the evaluation sitting committee the Application for Rank Advancement to Full Professor form.
- For rank advancement to full professor, the full professor statement will show how the faculty member has demonstrated a pattern of exceeding professional performance in teaching and one other area, either professional activity or service and leadership, persistent investment, and commitment to SLCC's Mission, Vision, and Values.
- Faculty applying for rank advancement to full professor must have at least one full professor on the evaluation sitting committee.

The Rank Advancement to Full Professor Decision

The rank advancement decision is made by the dean. A denial of rank advancement to full professor will be accompanied by specific reasoning for the decision and clear steps the faculty member may take to meet rank advancement criteria. Faculty are not limited in the number of times they may apply for Rank Advancement.

4.5 Academic Department Tenure Files

Faculty will create and maintain an Academic Department Tenure File throughout their career at SLCC. The tenure file is the repository for all documents and artifacts relevant to the faculty evaluation process. Each school's administrative staff will manage creation, organization, and access to the tenure file. Faculty are encouraged to download and maintain their own copies of all materials submitted to the Academic Department Tenure File. The content of Academic Department Tenure Files will vary depending on the specific phase of the evaluation process but may include the following components:

- Evaluation Forms
 - Form 1: Faculty Planning and Support
 - Form 2: Peer Evaluation
 - Form 3: Faculty Evaluation Summary
 - Letter of Progress or Concern
- A Professional Statement that includes the following:
 - Self-Assessment:
 - How are your teaching, professional activities, and service informed by and contributing to SLCC Mission, Vision, and Values?
 - How does your teaching reflect student-centered pedagogies and practices?
 - How have you developed as faculty during the evaluation period?
 - Professional Activity and Development Evaluation: A list of all professional activities and professional development completed during the review period.
 - Service Evaluation: A list of all service activities completed during the evaluation period.
- Teaching Evaluations:
 - Teaching observations from evaluation sitting committee members and the associate dean
 - Student course evaluations compiled by the department for the faculty member.
- Evidence:

- Evidence selection and gathering should be guided by the evaluation sitting committee. Any evidence submitted should take minimal effort to gather and should reflect a few highlights of faculty work over the evaluation period.
- Applications:
 - Application for Tenure
 - Application for Rank Advancement to Full Professor
 - Request to Credit Previous Satisfactory Academic Service
- Tenure Statement:
 - The Tenure Statement should follow the guidelines above for the professional statement but will address the full pre-tenure probationary period.
- Rank Advancement to Full Professor Statement:
 - The Full Professor statement will address the post-tenure period. It should follow the guidelines above for the professional statement, with a focus on showing how the faculty member has demonstrated leadership, deep engagement, and commitment to the mission, vision, and values of the college.
- Department Requirements (if needed):
 - Certifications, licenses, etc.

Tenure File Structure

To ensure consistency and ease of access for evaluation sitting committees, deans, and college-wide reviewers, faculty should follow the general organizational structure outlined below. Files should be housed in the official SLCC platform. Faculty are encouraged to download and maintain their own copies of all materials submitted to the Academic Department and Tenure File.

File Structure for Pre-Tenure Review

AY20XX-XX

- Professional Statement
- Evaluation Forms

- Teaching Evaluations:
 - Peer evaluations
 - Course evaluations
- Evidence

File Structure for Tenure Year Review

AY20XX-XX

- Tenure Statement
- Evaluation Forms
- Teaching Evaluations:
 - Peer evaluations
 - Course evaluations
- Application for Tenure
- Evidence

File Structure for Informal Post-Tenure Review

AY20XX-XX

- Evaluation Form 1

File Structure for Formal Post-Tenure Review

AY20XX-XX

- Professional Statement
- Evaluation Forms
- Teaching Evaluations:
 - Peer evaluations
 - Course evaluations
- Evidence

File Structure for Rank Advancement to Full Professor

AY20XX-XX

- Full Professor Statement
- Evaluation Forms
- Teaching Evaluations:
 - Peer evaluations
 - Course evaluations
- Application for Rank Advancement to Full Professor
- Evidence

4.6 Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Faculty Evaluation is based on the Full-time Faculty Job Description, which provides the expectations referenced in all evaluations, and the Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, and Tenure Policy. The guidelines and criteria listed in this section provide evaluation sitting committees, associate deans, deans, and the provost a metric by which to evaluate faculty. Teaching is the primary criterion for evaluation. Professional activity and development and service are evaluated in relation to teaching effectiveness and the needs of the department.

Evaluation Levels

Meets Standard Professional Performance

- Standard professional performance is the expectation of all full-time faculty at Salt Lake Community College.
- Criteria: Standard professional performance is given when the evaluation sitting committee finds that the faculty member has fulfilled the expectations for teaching and at least one of either professional activity and development and service.

Below Standard Professional Performance

- Below standard professional performance is not the expectation of full-time faculty at SLCC.
- Criteria: Below standard professional performance is given when the evaluation sitting committee finds that the faculty member has not fulfilled the expectations for teaching or for both professional activity and development and service.
- Below standard professional performance may consist of a pattern of moderate struggles with multiple criteria, or a single significant failure or serious problem. This can include, but is not limited to, repeated minor deficiencies documented over time or a severe breach of teaching responsibilities or unprofessional conduct.
- A rationale must be provided in Form 2 for below standard professional performance. If no rationale can be given, the rating should default to standard professional performance.

Exceeds Standard Professional Performance

- Exceeds standard professional performance is not the expectation of full-time faculty at SLCC.
- Criteria: Exceeds standard professional performance is given when the evaluation sitting committee finds that the faculty member has gone above and beyond expectations for teaching, professional activity and development, and service.
- A rationale must be provided in Form 2 for exceeds standard professional performance. If no rationale can be given, the rating should default to standard professional performance.

Suggested Rationale for Exceeding Standard Professional Performance in Teaching

The following examples are illustrative and not an exhaustive list.

- Implements high-impact practices such as team teaching, hybrid course design, learning communities, capstone courses, and service learning.
- Serves as a guest lecturer for colleagues.

- Continuously reviews, assesses, and reflects on pedagogical methods and technologies, demonstrating their impact on student learning outcomes.
- Develops curriculum and pedagogy informed by student feedback, research, or advancements in the field.
- Collaborates with colleagues by sharing effective teaching techniques and innovations.
- Demonstrates exemplary student performance on certification exams, competency assessments, and/or federal testing requirements, if applicable.
- Provides documentation of how annual peer reviews of teaching data and feedback influence pedagogical and curricular updates.
- Supervises independent study or internship students.
- Earns internal or external recognition for excellence in teaching and pedagogy (certificates, awards, SOTL contributions, etc.).
- Critically reflects on the relationship between teaching methods and students' ability to achieve higher-order learning.
- Maintains up-to-date industry knowledge across multiple courses, enabling instruction in various departmental offerings.
- Demonstrates leadership in pedagogical or discipline-specific initiatives that extend beyond standard curricular responsibilities.
- Designs new curricula that serve as models for faculty or inform the revision and development of courses and programs.
- Guides students in preparing for career-path or academic presentations at local, state, and national levels.

Suggested Rationale for Exceeding Standard Professional Performance in Professional Development and Activity

The following examples are illustrative and not an exhaustive list.

- Organizes peer discussion groups, teaching circles, professional workshops, and scholarly webinars, connecting participation to department or college initiatives.
- Develops and shares new research or teaching skills.

- Presents research to college, local, state, national, or international audiences.
- Demonstrates leadership through presentations, leading teaching circles, or chairing committees.
- Contributes to scholarly literature by reviewing proposals or manuscripts, writing book reviews for professional journals, or submitting articles to peer-reviewed journals.
- Develops new CCOs and/or creates model courses used to inform faculty revisions or new course development.
- Completes additional graduate-level coursework that supports departmental goals and initiatives.
- Earns external recognition for professional contributions.
- Creates professional development opportunities or significantly supports colleagues' professional growth.
- Organizes, manages, or evaluates testing services for national/state certifications.
- Serves as an evaluator for professional proficiency assessments.
- Actively integrates professional organization standards into college initiatives, aligning with institutional SLOs.
- Organizes regional or national professional conferences in collaboration with field experts.
- Demonstrates interdisciplinary connections between their field and other areas of study.
- Leads five-year course reviews, revising content to align with college and department strategic priorities.

Suggested Rationale for Exceeding Standard Professional Performance in Service

The following examples are illustrative and not an exhaustive list.

- Organizes, manages, or evaluates national/state certification testing services or proficiency exams.
- Integrates professional organization standards into departmental, college, or state initiatives.

- Assumes leadership roles in curriculum development and department research projects.
- Coordinates regional or national professional conferences, collaborating with experts at various levels.
- Oversees college events, programs, or seminars.
- Secures internal or external grants.
- Advises student clubs and organizes student-centered events.
- Serves on boards of higher education institutions, PACs, or other professional organizations.
- Holds faculty leadership positions on internal committees or task forces.
- Develops and implements effective program assessment activities.
- Chairs conference panels or organizes academic sessions.
- Evaluates state or national exams.
- Designs and delivers adjunct faculty training programs.
- Represents the institution as an officer, member, facilitator, or liaison for a professional organization.

Collegiality

Collegiality will be considered across the three areas of faculty responsibility with relevant standards in teaching, professional activity, and service, as outlined in the Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, and Tenure Policy:

- Collegiality is grounded in and contributes to the maintenance of SLCC values.
Collegiality is the willingness to cooperate and perform as responsible members of the faculty body.
- Collegiality means sharing the common workload of the overarching goals of the department, school, and college. Collegiality requires respect for the ideas of others.
- Collegiality does not mean agreement. The standard of collegiality should promote productive and respectful discussion, debate, and disagreement within the department, school, or college.

- This standard must be interpreted in a manner inclusive of differences in social and cultural communication norms. It must not impinge on academic freedom.
- SLCC full-time faculty members are responsible to their colleagues, the departments, divisions, and the college.