

Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education

TENURE DOCUMENT

Approved by Faculty Senate: April 16, 2015

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 PPM 8.11).

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, collegiality, and ethics specified in PPM 9-4 through 9-8 and described in category IV.

Categories of Formal Review

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

Category I: Teaching

Category II: Scholarship

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

Category IV: Professional Behaviors/Collegiality/Ethics

Competencies in categories I, II, and III are rated from unsatisfactory to excellent. Credentials/Probationary Period and Category IV are rated as met or unmet.

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 behaviors, collegiality, and ethics.

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:

	Credentials/ Probationary Period	Category I Teaching	Category II Scholarship	Category III Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service	Category IV Professional Behaviors/ Collegiality/Ethics
A	Met	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Met
B	Met	Good	Good	Good	Met
C	Met	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good	Met
D	Met	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory	Met
E	Met	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent	Met

The faculty member is responsible to update the professional file and autobiographical form 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 candidate's credentials/probationary period, teaching, scholarship, and service activities, as well as adherence to professional behaviors, collegiality, and ethics. The faculty member should determine which category to include student oriented research projects and grants and their work will be evaluated in that category. The candidate should include narrative summaries throughout the professional file. The candidate should create a support file for artifacts that are referenced in the autobiographical form as evidence.

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 (3rd 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.

Unmet: Evidence of not meeting the Credentials/Probationary Period or Professional Behaviors/ Collegiality/Ethics shall automatically disqualify a faculty member from tenure.

Met: A candidate shall be rated as having met the criteria if there is no evidence at the Program, Department, College, and/or Institutional level otherwise.

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), undergraduate and graduate research mentoring and grants when tied to a course taught or mentored individually (note that professional presentations and publications may be included in scholarship when the faculty member has actively participated in the outcome, i.e. it is not predominately student generated work), field work or field trips, online, and community engaged learning.
- e. Professional behaviors, collegiality, and ethics: attendance at classes, appropriate preparation, prompt feedback and availability to students, delivery of appropriate course content per catalog and program needs, willingness to teach share of difficult courses and to engage and work collegially with department and program faculty, staff, and 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, program/department comparison data, and comment on areas of improvement and concern.
2. Peer Review Committee Evaluation. A candidate's peer review must be completed during the academic year prior to the year of the formal tenure evaluation (3rd or 6th year). The peer review committee will be appointed by October 1st 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 portion of their professional file, observe several classroom sessions, be available to talk with students from the classes observed, and submit a written report on teaching to the

professional file and the individual not later than March 1st. 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; personal commitment to improvement; participation in assessment of learning outcomes when needed; and collegiality. 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 file. The individual to be reviewed will develop the teaching section of their professional file. The file should include a statement of teaching philosophy and artifacts for each teaching area (a-e) (see PPM 8- 11.IV.E.2 and the autobiographical form). 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 file needs to be made available by February 15th to the Peer Review Committee.

Clarification of Ratings for Teaching: A candidate shall be rated good (minimum rating in channels B, D, & E) if he/she are 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 achieved with professional, collegial, and ethical behaviors 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; undergraduate, graduate, community-engaged, and 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 (a-f). 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 in a reputable outlet (non-predatory) since employment began at Weber State University
- b. for the final tenure review, provide evidence of a regional and/or national refereed publication in a reputable outlet (non-predatory) 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. WSU committee assignments at the department, college, or university levels.
- e. Service publications such as newsletters, newspaper and popular magazine articles, and media interviews.
- f. Professional service supporting conferences, workshops and seminars, and/or reaching out to external communities and constituencies.
- 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 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 – j), including at least one assignment in area d.

Category IV: Professional Behaviors/Collegiality/Ethics

University faculty members have a unique role in exemplifying professional behaviors, collegiality, and ethics as they work and cooperate with those around them for a common purpose. Faculty members are responsible to themselves and to their students, colleagues, profession, community, and ultimately the University in engaging in collegiality, professionalism, and ethics. The manner in which faculty members go about their job duties should adhere to the standards of Professional Behaviors as specified in PPM 9-4 through 9-8, uphold personal, professional, and academic integrity, and be compatible with the program, department, college, and institution’s mission, as well as short and long-term goals.

Collegiality is often best evaluated at the program and department levels. Those who are rated as “unmet” for category IV (professional behaviors, collegiality, and ethics) are ineligible for tenure at Weber State University. Weber State values academic freedom and simple disagreement is not considered non-collegial behavior. It is not tied to sociability or likability. The following descriptions are meant to be some examples and non-examples and do not limit those involved in ranking and tenure ratings and judgments of faculty peers that will carry weight with the Promotion

and Tenure Committees.

- a. Professional, collegial, and ethical behaviors may include:
 - i. respecting differing views and voices
 - ii. encouraging and promoting professionalism with peers, students, and staff; and
 - iii. representing and supporting the mission and goals of Weber State University; and
 - iv. other professional, collegial, and ethical behaviors not listed here.
- b. Unprofessional, non-collegial, and unethical behaviors may include:
 - i. communicating verbal, physical, or other threats to co-workers and students;
 - ii. disruption or non-engagement in the mission and goals of Weber State University;
 - iii. demeaning the work of others;
 - iv. avoidance and/or non-engagement in professional interactions with co-workers or students;
 - v. Unethical behaviors related to publication or dissemination of scholarly work; or
 - vi. other unprofessional, non-collegial, and unethical behaviors not listed here.

Clarification of Rating for Professional Behavior/Collegiality/Ethics:

A candidate shall be rated as having met the criteria if there is no substantial evidence of unprofessional, non-collegial, and/or unethical behaviors as documented in the Program Director, Department Chair, College Dean, and/or Human Resources personnel file.