

## **Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education**

### **TENURE DOCUMENT**

*Approved by Faculty Senate April 16, 2009*

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to outline the criteria and the procedures used to evaluate faculty members for tenure in the Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education.

The normal probationary period for a faculty member in a tenure-track appointment is six years, with a formal interim review scheduled during the third year, and a formal, final tenure review scheduled during the sixth year. The time in rank for normal promotion from assistant to associate professor is six years. To be promoted from assistant to associate professor one must either have been granted tenure or be granted tenure at the same time as the promotion. A candidate who fails the tenure review process cannot be advanced in rank (see PPM8.11).

#### **Eligibility**

To be eligible for tenure candidacy, individuals must:

1. Have a doctorate in the discipline of primary responsibility or a closely related discipline and be on a tenure track. The Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education does not recognize instructor specialist as a track leading to tenure in the college,
2. Be in the third year of the probationary period for the interim review, and in the sixth year of the probationary period for the final tenure review,
3. Meet the Standards of Professional Behaviors specified in PPM 9-4 through 9-8.

#### **Categories of Formal Review**

In order to assist and guide faculty members preparing for tenure evaluations, the competencies to be considered are in three categories:

Category I: Teaching

Category II: Scholarship

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

Competencies in categories I, II, and III are rated from unsatisfactory to excellent.

Each committee and administrator in the review process will interpret information presented in terms of the 1) expectations of the department or college, 2) specific professional duties expected of the individual and 3) overall pattern of professional performance.

A written evaluation summary which includes the rationale for the ratings in each category will be submitted. The pattern of ratings must meet or exceed one of the channels described below:

	<b>Credentials/ Probationary Period</b>	<b>Standards of Professional Behavior</b>	<b>Category I Teaching</b>	<b>Category II Scholarship</b>	<b>Category III Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service</b>
A	Met	Met	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory
B	Met	Met	Good	Good	Good
C	Met	Met	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good
D	Met	Met	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory
E	Met	Met	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent

The faculty member is responsible to update the professional file according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13). The file should be organized by category and clearly document the candidates teaching, scholarship, and service activities. The candidate should include narrative summaries throughout the professional file. The candidate should create a support file for artifacts that are referenced in the narrative summaries as evidence, but which are not included in the professional file.

## **Ratings**

The ratings are to reflect the faculty member's academic career span rather than a single year's efforts. The ratings mean that the evidence describing the quality and quantity of the individual's professional efforts support a continuing level of performance judged by the evaluators as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent. While the same rating channels are used for both the interim and final review, ratings assigned for a formal interim (3<sup>rd</sup> year) review reflect the committee's judgment of the candidates work and progress towards tenure at that point and should be based on reasonable expectations for a third year faculty member. The interim review is expected to be formative in nature and both the ratings and the committee commentary should provide helpful feedback to the candidate as he/she evaluates priorities in preparation for the final tenure review. A candidate's recent work at other institutions, while it may be taken into consideration, is not weighted as heavily as work at Weber State University.

**Unsatisfactory:** This rating shall be given to a candidate who does not meet the minimum requirements of the satisfactory category.

**Satisfactory:** The candidate will be rated satisfactory if duties required of all faculty members are performed in an acceptable manner. Satisfactory means adequate and should not imply undesirable or below average endeavor.

**Good:** The candidate will be rated good if duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in a more than satisfactory manner. Good implies commendable and desirable levels of achievement. A rating of good in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels.

**Excellent:** The candidate will be rated excellent if duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in an outstanding manner. Inasmuch as a good rating in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels, a rating of excellent in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above those considered appropriate for a good rating.

## **Definitions of Categories and Criteria**

### **Category I: Teaching**

Teaching is defined as the processes or behaviors related to organizing and delivering knowledge; evaluating and facilitating learning; and in general, transmitting content to students (see PPM 8-11.E).

Evidence of Teaching Includes:

- a. Subject matter mastery: depth and currency of knowledge.
- b. Curriculum development: new course development, ongoing course revisions, review and updating of syllabi and course materials.
- c. Course design: instructional goals and objectives, content coverage, adequate assessment methods.
- d. Delivery of instruction: methods (lecture, discussion, labs), skills (speaking, explaining), and aids (handouts, use of technology).
- e. Professional behavior: attendance at classes, appropriate preparation, prompt feedback and availability to students.

Documentation of Performance in the Category of Teaching include student evaluations, faculty member's teaching portfolio (profile), peer review, and other appropriate items of review that could potentially be used based upon identified teaching areas a – e.

1. Student Evaluations. Each department will obtain student evaluations from all courses taught by the faculty member each semester during the regular academic year. While the department is responsible for providing summaries of these evaluations to the individual, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide interpretation of the evaluations, and comment on areas of improvement and concern.

2. Peer Review Committee Evaluation. A candidate's peer review must be completed during the fall semester of the academic year prior to the year of the formal tenure evaluation (3<sup>rd</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> year). The peer review committee will be appointed by October 1<sup>st</sup> of the peer review year by the department chair. The committee members will be chosen by the candidate in consultation with the chair. The peer review committee may be the department Ranking Tenure Review Committee (see PPM 8-15). If the peer review committee is not the department Ranking Tenure Review Committee then a minimum of three individuals who are familiar with the program will be selected. If the faculty member and the chair cannot agree on the makeup of the committee, the decision will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean.

The committee will review the faculty member's teaching portfolio, observe several classroom sessions, interview several students from the classes observed, and submit a written report on teaching

effectiveness to the professional file and the individual not later than December 15<sup>th</sup>. The written report of the peer review committee shall include, but not be limited to, a report on the individual's performance in the following areas: content mastery; quality and design of curriculum materials used and developed; evaluation policies and procedures utilized; availability to students; student supervision; maintenance of high academic standards; and personal commitment to improvement. The collection of data for the peer review is a continuous process and will extend over the total of the probationary period. The process of peer review is observational and descriptive rather than evaluative in nature, although the report may reach some formative conclusions.

3. Teaching Portfolio. The individual to be reviewed will develop a teaching portfolio. The portfolio should include a statement of teaching philosophy and artifacts for each teaching area (a-e) (see PPM 8-11.IV.E.2). Other things that might be included, if referenced in the professional file narrative summaries, are: examples of graded student work such as projects, presentations, evidence of assessment techniques such as exams, assignments, quizzes and rubrics; and syllabi. The teaching portfolio need to be made available to the Peer Review Committee prior to the peer review.

Clarification of Ratings for Teaching: A candidate shall be rated good (minimum rating in channels B, D, & E) if he/she is consistently rated by students and peers as good and if the candidate provides evidence addressing teaching areas a - e.

## **Category II: Scholarship**

Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the individual's effectiveness as a professor. While the faculty member is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below prior to the sixth year review, the individual must submit evidence of significant professional activity. The evidence should indicate ongoing scholarly endeavors since arriving at Weber State University. The quality and quantity of effort and the results obtained are the standards of measurement.

Evidence of Scholarship Includes:

- a. Refereed publications, such as articles in refereed journals, articles in professional periodicals.
- b. Non-peer reviewed publications, such as books, book reviews, published monographs, or other professionally reviewed written material.
- c. Professional presentations, such as papers presented at international, national, regional, or state conferences or workshops.
- d. Projects, such as grants, action research, teaching innovations and developments, or other long-term professional associations with a public school, a service agency, or other field-based setting appropriate to the individual's discipline.
- e. Professional improvement, such as additional degrees beyond the terminal degree, formal post-graduate study, documentation of additional training, additional or increased expertise through self-study, conference attendance, development of new courses and/or programs, significant modifications to existing courses or programs.

f. Other activities, which are appropriate to the category.

Clarification of Rating for Scholarship: A candidate shall be rated satisfactory (minimum rating in channels C and E) if he/she demonstrates a pattern of scholarly work which includes activities from a minimum of three areas. In order for the candidate to be rated good in this area, he/she must meet the requirements for a satisfactory rating and

a) for the interim review, provide evidence of a regional and/or national refereed publication since employment began at Weber State University

b) for the final tenure review, provide evidence of a regional and/or national refereed publication since the interim review.

### **Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service**

Professional service is defined as those activities which provide professionally related value to the community, the institution, or professional organizations. An individual is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of successful administrative and/or professionally-related service.

Evidence of Service Includes:

a. Leadership positions in professional organizations.

b. Membership in professional organizations.

c. Professionally-related community activities such as speech making, or serving on community boards.

d. Committee assignments at the department, college, or university levels.

e. Service publications such as newsletters, newspaper and popular magazine articles, and media interviews.

f. Service at professional conferences, workshops and seminars.

g. Administrative assignments within the university.

h. Student advisement activities or serving as an advisor to a student professional organization.

i. Developmental activities which are service in nature, such as consulting.

j. Other relevant professional service.

Clarification of Rating for Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service: A candidate shall be rated satisfactory (minimum rating in channels A and D) if he/she accepts and performs in a professional manner duties in at least three areas (a – i), including at least one assignment in area d.