

Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education

TENURE DOCUMENT

Approved by Faculty Senate on March 20, 2025

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.

Review Process

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, 8- 26).

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.
2. Be in the sixth year of the probationary period for the final tenure review.

** For early tenure, candidates must be recommended by their department chair or dean and meet the criteria for early tenure and early promotion as outlined in PPM-8-11 V.C.*

Professional Portfolio

Candidates are responsible for updating their professional electronic portfolio according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13) and organizing their file using the approved autobiographical form. This portfolio should clearly document the candidate's teaching and teaching philosophy, scholarship, and administrative and/or professionally related service activities. Candidates should include brief narrative summaries throughout the portfolio and include supporting artifacts that are referenced in the narrative summaries. Activities and artifacts not included in the professional portfolio will not be taken into consideration for evaluation

Peer Review

Every candidate for promotion or tenure review shall undergo peer review. ***Peer review for tenure must be completed during the academic year prior to the year of formal review.*** The peer review committee will be selected in collaboration with the department chair by October 1st of the peer review year.

The purpose of the peer review is to facilitate the evaluation process primarily through evidence-gathering and review. Peer review promotes a more accurate understanding of teaching effectiveness by observing teaching and reviewing and assessing documentation provided by the candidate demonstrating teaching effectiveness. The peer reviewers should observe at least two examples of teaching/classes and may also review materials regarding the candidates' scholarship and service activities. Peer reviewers interpret this information in terms of department and college expectations and summarize, without rating, the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the designated areas. The summary of the peer review is a required artifact in the candidate's professional portfolio and will be evaluated by the department Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee, the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee, the Dean and others as described in the Dated Guidelines for the Ranking Tenure Review process (PPM 8-12).

Categories of Formal Review

To assist and guide candidates preparing for tenure evaluations, the competencies to be considered are in four categories: 1) Teaching, 2) Scholarship, 3) Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service, 4) Professional Behaviors/ Ethics. Although most activities will fall within one area or another, aspects of some activities may be described in different areas. For example, aspects of undergraduate research may be described in Teaching (mentoring activities), Scholarship (conference presentations or publications), and Service (BIS supervision).

Evaluation Summary

1. Competencies in each of the categories are rated from Unsatisfactory to Excellent. Credentials/Probationary Period and Professional Behaviors/Ethics are rated as Met or Unmet.
2. Each committee and administrator in the review process will interpret information presented by the candidate under review in terms of the 1) expectations of the college, 2) specific professional duties expected of the individual and 3) overall pattern of professional behaviors/ethics.
3. At each level of review, a formal written evaluation summary prepared by each review committee and administrator will be provided to the candidate and department chair and submitted to the professional file in the Dean's office. The summary will include the rationale for the ratings. The pattern of ratings must meet or exceed one of the channels described below:

	Eligibility	Teaching	Scholarship	Administrative/ Professional Service	Professional Behaviors/ 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

4. The candidate under review is responsible to update their professional electronic portfolio with supporting evidence according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13) and organized according to the approved autobiographical form. The candidate must include narrative summaries that support their argument for being granted tenure throughout the professional digital portfolio. The candidate must include artifacts as evidence and should link artifacts in the portfolio.

Ratings

The ratings are to reflect the faculty member's academic career trends rather than a single year's efforts. The ratings mean that the evidence describing the quality and quantity of the candidate's professional efforts support a continuing level of performance judged by the evaluators as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good, or Excellent.

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. Candidates should act on recommendations provided by each committee and administrator and demonstrate improvements with evidence in their next review. A candidate's recent work at other institutions, while it may be taken into consideration, is not weighed as heavily as work at Weber State University. *Ratings assigned for a formal interim (3rd year) review reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's work and progress towards tenure at that point and should be based on reasonable expectations for a third-year faculty member.*

Rating Definitions

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 performance.

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. In as much 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/Ethics shall automatically disqualify a candidate from tenure.

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

Definitions of Categories and Criteria

Teaching

Teaching is defined as the processes or behaviors related to organizing and delivering content; evaluating and facilitating learning; and in general, developing knowledge in students (see PPM 8-11.D, 2a-c, 8-11.E;).

Evidence of teaching includes the following elements from the autobiographical form. Candidates must address a-k & o.

- a. Teaching Experience. For each experience provide the institution, position and description, and dates.
- b. Other employment or academic experience which has contributed significantly to your position at Weber State University. For each experience provide the institution, position and description, and dates.
- c. List of courses taught. For each course provide the title, institution and dates.
- d. Development of teaching through travel, participation in conferences, workshops, seminars, short courses, etc. Include dates and explain how you have improved your teaching through participation in each.
- e. Subject Knowledge/Subject Matter Mastery. Candidates shall demonstrate that they possess the current knowledge and/or skills necessary to provide up-to-date instruction for the courses they teach. (see PPM 8-11, D,2, a).
- f. Pedagogy. Candidates shall demonstrate an acquaintance with the pedagogy of their disciplines. They should demonstrate knowledge of the issues surrounding the pedagogical approach they choose and articulate their purposes for their choices. They should also demonstrate a continuing effort to improve instruction. (see PPM 8-11,

- D,2, b).
- g. Teaching innovations and/or developments. Not merely updates, include dates.
 - h. Employment of engaged learning strategies such as service-learning, community based research, undergraduate research, etc. Include dates.
 - i. Assessment of Student Learning. Candidates must demonstrate that they assess students' learning with valid, reliable assessment methods and tools. (see PPM 8-11, D,2, c)
 - j. Student Evaluations. Please summarize your student evaluations from all courses taught. Identify trends and progress across semesters. Describe what has been done well and any areas for improvement. If applicable, discuss how your student evaluations were used to improve the quality of teaching and student learning. Provide a link to your course evaluations. (See PPM 8-11 IV, D.IV.G.).
 - k. Peer Review. Summarize the feedback received from Peer Evaluations and how you have used the feedback to improve your teaching. Provide peer evaluation letter(s).
 - l. Development of new courses and/or programs within a college as well as significant modifications of existing courses or programs.
 - m. List scholarships, awards, and other honors received in recognition of teaching. Include dates.
 - n. Other teaching activities germane to your position. Include dates.
 - o. Teaching Philosophy.

Clarification of Ratings for Teaching: A candidate shall be rated Good (minimum rating in channels B, D, & E) if they are consistently rated by peers as good, and if the candidate provides evidence of additional valuable accomplishments in multiple areas above (a-o). To be eligible for tenure the candidate must have a minimum rating of Good in this category to be considered acceptable.

Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the individual's effectiveness as a professor. The evidence should indicate ongoing scholarly endeavors since arriving at Weber State University and articulate a clear research agenda. The quality and quantity of effort achieved with professional and ethical behaviors and the results obtained are the standards of measurement.

Evidence of scholarship includes:

- a. Peer- reviewed publications, such as articles in refereed journals, articles in professional periodicals, chapters in refereed books (all authorship positions recognized).
- b. Scholarship, research, and/or creative works not subjected to peer-review.
- c. Unpublished manuscripts, thesis, dissertation, and within institution reports, community-based research, such as technical reports or evaluation.
- d. Professional presentations at international, national, regional, or state conferences or annual meetings.
- e. Papers and/or addresses to community groups. This includes presentations you and your students give to the community organization and for whom community-based research was conducted. Discuss the specific purpose of the presentation, who was in

- attendance, and how the research has been utilized by the community organization. f. Creative productions, e.g., painting, music, theater, etc.
- g. Development of technically oriented improvements or inventions that have a significant impact at the regional and/or national level.
- h. Research projects such as grants; undergraduate, graduate, community--engaged, and action research; pedagogical research.
- i. Post-terminal degree professional education and/or 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.
- j. Meaningful connections between scholarship and teaching.
- k. Other scholarly activities. Describe and include dates.

Clarification of Rating for Scholarship: A candidate shall be rated Good (minimum rating channel A, B, and D) based on the following for the formal interim and final tenure reviews. The faculty member is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed above but must demonstrate a pattern of scholarly work which includes activities from multiple areas (a-k) and

- for the interim review, provide evidence of a regional and/or national peer reviewed publication in a non-predatory outlet since employment began at Weber State University or negotiated years toward tenure prior to employment, or a submitted publication and evidence of a clear research agenda;
- for the final tenure review, provide evidence of two regional and/or national peer-reviewed publications in a non-predatory professional outlet since employment.

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 Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

includes: a. University committee work and projects; departmental, college, university, administrative, academic, senate, committee assignments, etc.

b. Academic or nonacademic administrative performance as program director, department chair, director of substantial grant, or center director.

c. Membership in or positions held in professional organizations.

d. Outreach and service to schools and professionally-related organizations. e. Speech-making to community (nonprofessional) groups in the candidate's expertise.

f. Consulting and/or work experience.

g. Work with students to promote success; such as student success initiatives. h. Other professionally related activities or service best described as public relations for the university that benefitted the university exclusive of area e.

Clarification of Rating for Professionally Related Service: A candidate shall be rated Good (minimum rating in channels B, C, and E), if he/she accepts and performs in a

professional manner the duties in at least three areas (a-h), including assignments in more than one level (ranging from program to university) in area a.

Professional Behaviors/Ethics

No evidence is submitted by the candidate for this section, although it is part of the review process. University faculty members have a unique role in exemplifying professional behaviors/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 professionalism and ethics. The way faculty members go about their job duties should adhere to the standards of Professional Behaviors as specified in PPM 9-3 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. Weber State values academic freedom and simple disagreement is not considered unprofessional behavior.

Professional Behaviors/Ethics include:

- a. Responsibilities to self and profession
- b. Responsibilities to students and colleagues (i.e., encouraging and promoting professionalism with peers, students, and staff, respecting differing views and voices, being timely and available).
- c. Responsibilities to the institution and community (i.e., representing and supporting the mission and goals of Weber State University)

Clarification of Rating for Professional Behavior/Ethics: A candidate shall be rated as having Met or Not Met based on evidence in the faculty personnel file housed in the Dean's office. It is the responsibility of the department and college ranking tenure evaluation committee chairs to review the hard copy files in the Dean's office for such evidence.