

*Approved by Faculty Senate October 8, 2020*  
*Approved by Trustees November 11, 2020*

POLICY ON TENURE  
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY

Revisions sent out for approval 8/28/2020

POLICY ON TENURE

A. PREAMBLE

This tenure document has been designed to aid in the evaluation of candidates seeking tenure in departments within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (COSBS). Standards are set to ensure that only those faculty members who exhibit a high overall level of performance receive a positive tenure recommendation. Diversity within the standards accommodates faculty members with different backgrounds, talents, and professional accomplishments. In the tenure process, a candidate's total professional career will be considered, including performance at other institutions of higher education. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the committees with pertinent information related to his or her teaching, scholarship, and service to make a tenure recommendation.

B. INSTRUCTIONS TO TENURE COMMITTEES AND CANDIDATE

Department and college tenure committees are responsible for evaluating the performance of tenure candidates. A committee must provide candidates substantial evidence for, and explanation of, ratings of their teaching, scholarship, and service, and detailed recommendations for improvement. A committee may request additional information from a candidate or seek clarification of information provided by a candidate, but is not obligated to do so; candidates are responsible for ensuring the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their dossiers.

In the third-year review, committees and administrators will rate candidates in each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service) according to the standards (excellent to unsatisfactory) necessary for achieving tenure, and explicate in their letters to the candidates what actions are necessary in each area of evaluation to achieve tenure according to the channels.

In the sixth-year review, committees and administrators making tenure evaluations of candidates undergoing a sixth-year review must select one of the following recommendations and address in specific terms the recommendation in a letter to candidates:

- Recommend tenure not be granted.
- Recommend tenure be granted.

C. REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL EVALUATION

To be recommended for tenure, the candidate must:

- have a terminal degree as outlined in the Weber State University Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM) 8.6 and 8.11,
- meet the standards of one of the tenure channels and provide evidence of appropriate performance, and
- adhere to professional standards of behavior as outlined in PPM 9.3 through 9.8.

#### D. CATEGORIES FOR TENURE EVALUATION

Three categories are delineated as areas of evaluation for tenure consideration: teaching, scholarship, and service. 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). Similarly, the activities of clinical faculty may be categorized as Service to the community (seeing patients) or the discipline (clinical supervision), Teaching (using case studies), and Scholarship (conference publications or presentations). Within each area, the faculty member being considered for tenure shall be rated as excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Each category for evaluation is to be rated as noted under the section on ratings.

#### E. TEACHING

Effective teaching or instruction is the most important duty of faculty members at Weber State University. Deficiencies in teaching cannot be compensated for by exceptional performance in the other areas. Teaching is simply defined as any transfer of relevant knowledge or skills from faculty to students, irrespective of context, medium, process, or outcomes (e.g., whether or not it results in a grade). Teaching activities include, but are not limited to: classroom instruction, laboratory sections, field work or field trips, on-line instruction, and a variety of advisory, supervisory, or sponsorship roles including service or community-based learning, undergraduate research, student clubs and organizations, events, and programs. All forms of teaching a faculty member performs, and all preparatory activities in service of teaching, will be given consideration by the Rank and Tenure Committee based on their merits. However, it is the candidate's responsibility to document the quality and effectiveness of their teaching or any related preparatory activities.

Teaching is an ongoing activity that involves the evaluation of faculty performance by students, peers, and responsible administrators. Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, but is not limited to, Student Course Evaluations, Self Evaluation, and Peer Review. In addition, the principle of high-impact student engagement in teaching is highly valued at the University and in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Candidates are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of the application of high-impact teaching practices.

Department, college, and/or university-approved student course evaluation results are an important source of evidence of faculty teaching quality. Candidates must be evaluated in all

courses (including online courses, laboratory sections, field classes, and the like) every semester. Data acquired from these student evaluations may be summarized . Other teaching assessments may also be used to assess teaching, including ones used for departmental or general education assessment. Furthermore, it is incumbent on candidates to explain how the course evaluation data reflect their teaching effectiveness.

A faculty member's own critical self-evaluation of his or her teaching in a Teaching Profile is also an important source of evidence of their teaching effectiveness. Candidates should provide evidence that they are competent in the three different elements of teaching: Subject Knowledge (evidence of the candidate's knowledge and/or skills necessary to provide up-to-date instruction for the courses they teach), Pedagogy (evidence of knowledge of the issues surrounding the pedagogical approach they choose and demonstration of the evolution of and purposes for their choices), and Assessment of Student Learning (candidates must demonstrate that they assess students' learning with valid, reliable assessment methods and tools which are tied to course and department student learning outcomes).

PPM (8-11 IV E 3) requires that at least every three years, the teaching performance of tenure-track faculty be evaluated by a peer review committee (comprised of at least three department and non-departmental members, one of which must be the department chair). The Peer Review Committee provides information about the candidate's teaching performance to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

#### F. SCHOLARSHIP

The candidate is expected to produce scholarship. All types of scholarship will be given consideration by the Rank and Tenure Committee based on their merit. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the significance, impact, and quantity of their scholarship. Significant scholarship is judged as such by peers, and impactful scholarship influences and informs policy- and decision-making in relevant groups/institutions. A candidate producing notably significant or impactful scholarship may require fewer items to receive a given rating than would otherwise be required. Evaluation committees and candidates are encouraged to obtain independent evaluation of scholarly work from within or outside of the university to assist in establishing the relative merits of the candidate's scholarship. The following list of scholarly work is not exhaustive.

- Publication of books or articles or chapters subject to peer review and formal acceptance processes. It is the candidate's responsibility to make the case that a particular publication is peer-reviewed, to establish the significance of the publishing forum, and to document the extent of his or her contributions to a jointly authored publication.
- Unpublished works that are currently undergoing the peer-review process.
- Peer-reviewed grants that are in and of themselves scholarly work.
- Service as editor or assistant editor of a scholarly journal that involves the production of scholarly work.
- Delivery of scholarly papers or posters at academic meetings.
- Publication of book reviews.

- Non-peer reviewed scholarly products such as unpublished manuscripts, self-published works, research reports, and publications for general audiences.
- Community-based research reports or presentations.

#### G. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

The candidate is expected to provide professionally-related service. All levels of service, whether at the institutional, community, or professional levels, will be given consideration based on their merits by the committee. Service to the institution is expected of all faculty. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the quality, quantity, and significance of these activities, and any leadership roles that they may have fulfilled.

Institutional service is provided at the university, college, and departmental levels, the bulk of which typically is reflected by committee-based work. Leadership on such committees is not strictly defined as serving as chair, but as providing significant contributions in achieving service goals. Leadership will be weighted more heavily than committee membership, as will committee assignments which are more demanding. Administrative roles such as program coordinator or student club advisor also constitute university/institutional service activities.

Service to the community must be professional in nature and utilize the candidate's area(s) of academic expertise. Community service may include activities such as speech-making in the area of the candidate's expertise, membership on boards, consulting, publishing in the popular press, advising to avocational groups, and participating in seminars or workshops. Service to the community that is professional (discipline-based) in nature is highly valued and should be reflected as such in the evaluation for tenure. Likewise, the principle of high-impact student engagement and learning as a part of professional service is highly valued at the University and in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Candidates are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of activities that engage students in high-impact service.

Service to the profession includes activities such as acting as a reviewer of scholarly publications, chairing sessions or acting as a discussant at scholarly meetings, serving as an officer of a professional organization, and any other activities that contribute to one's profession in a meaningful way.

#### H. ADHERENCE TO PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences endorses the statement of "Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Standards of Behavior" contained in PPM 9-3 through 9-8. Candidates for tenure shall be evaluated against those ethical canons and standards of behavior. A general indication of the faculty member's adherence to those ethical principles and standards of behavior shall be noted on the Tenure Evaluation Report, with a "yes" or "no" response. Letters indicating the findings of the evaluative committees, chairs, and dean shall, if necessary, indicate strengths and weaknesses in this regard.

#### I. DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

Minimum degree requirements are outlined in PPM 8-6 and 8-11.

## J. RATINGS

### Excellent

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated excellent when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been an outstanding teacher, there is substantial evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, and there is evidence that the candidate has made substantial and beneficial innovations to course material and teaching methods.

#### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated excellent with the publication of one peer-reviewed book or three peer-reviewed articles/chapters, and evidence of additional, ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed article.

#### Service

The candidate will normally be rated excellent when he/she performs a variety of demanding service activities, provides leadership, and exhibits significant impact in his or her areas of service.

### Good

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated good when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been teaching above the level of competence, there is some evidence the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, there is evidence that the candidate has made some worthwhile innovations to course material and teaching methods, and that he/she has addressed and reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

#### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated good with the publication of two peer-reviewed articles/chapters, and evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed article.

#### Service

The candidate will normally be rated good when he/she performs a variety of service activities, provides leadership, or exhibits significant impact in his or her areas of service.

### Satisfactory

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been teaching at a level of competence, there is little evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, there is evidence that the candidate has made few innovations to course material or teaching methods, and that he/she has taken action to address any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

#### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory with the publication of one peer-reviewed article/chapter, and a record of ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed article.

#### Service

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when he/she provides minimal leadership and exhibits minimal impact in his or her areas of service.

#### Unsatisfactory

##### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated unsatisfactory when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been lacking competence as a teacher, when there is minimal evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, when there is minimal evidence that the candidate has made innovations to course material and teaching methods, and when the candidate has neither addressed nor reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

##### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated unsatisfactory when he/she fails to meet the standards for satisfactory noted above.

##### Service

The candidate will normally be rated unsatisfactory when he/she fails to meet the standards for satisfactory noted above.

#### K. TENURE CHANNELS

**Preliminary/third-year review:** Candidates are evaluated according to college tenure criteria in order to ensure a positive trajectory toward tenure. However, candidates are not expected to be tenurable at third-year review. The point of the third-year review is to establish whether the candidate is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward tenure, and to identify what remedial action candidates may need to make in order to be tenured.

Tenure /sixth-year Review: Five channels exist for the candidate to follow and be considered for tenure. A candidate must meet or exceed all parts of one channel in order to meet the requirements for tenure.

CHANNEL	TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
I	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory
II	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good
III	Good	Good	Good
IV	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory
V	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent

#### L. TIMETABLE FOR TENURE ACTIONS

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences will adhere to the dated guidelines for the tenure process found in PPM 8-12.

#### M. EFFECTIVE DATE

This revised policy on tenure will be effective for all tenure-track faculty members who begin their service after the approval of the policy by the Board of Trustees.

### APPENDIX

#### POLICY ON POST-TENURE REVIEW COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Adopted December 5, 2013 WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY

#### I. PREAMBLE

This post-tenure review document has been designed to aid in the review of faculty after earning tenure in the departments within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (COSBS). After earning tenure, faculty shall be reviewed every five years for the duration of their careers. The post-tenure review is not a re-adjudication of tenure, but an assessment only of performance during the previous five years of employment. The review shall follow the guidelines as specified in WSU PPM 8-11, Section II (Evaluation of Faculty Members, Post-Tenure Review) and Regents Policy R481(Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post- Tenure Review). The post-tenure review uses a process for

evaluating faculty performance that differs from that used for the granting of tenure. This process recognizes the academic independence earned by the faculty member. Throughout the review process, the tenured faculty member undergoing post-tenure review shall be presumed to have ratings that are either at or above Good in teaching and Satisfactory in service and scholarship; the burden shall be on the reviewers, based on the evidence provided by the tenured faculty member, to justify the reason(s), if any, as to why the faculty member should be given a lower rating in any category.

The post-tenure review evaluates faculty in all areas of their professional activity including teaching, scholarship, service, and adherence to professional ethics. Post-tenure comes with expectations that faculty remain engaged and productive members of their disciplines and of the greater university community. In the area of service, tenured faculty are expected to be engaged department, college, university, and community citizens who use their knowledge and experience to provide leadership, to serve meaningfully on committees, to mentor colleagues, and to engage with their professional peers and with the broader public. These expectations can best be summarized with the term “good campus and community citizenship.” In addition, tenured faculty members are expected to teach well and remain actively engaged in scholarship relevant to their disciplines and areas of specialization. This policy recognizes that tenure is a necessary and vital guarantee of intellectual freedom. Tenure also functions as an investment in the future of the institution and in the common good that the institution serves. The post-tenure review process acts as a measure of the success of this investment.

## II. INSTRUCTIONS TO THE REVIEWERS AND FACULTY UNDER REVIEW

Post-tenure review shall be based on the COSBS or Departmental Annual Reviews and the faculty member’s short narrative summary. The initial post-tenure review will occur five years after the faculty member has received tenure, with subsequent reviews occurring every five years thereafter and covering only the five-year period since the previous post-tenure review. For the review, the faculty member will (1) assemble his or her Annual Reviews from the preceding five years, (2) append a cover sheet (see Attachment 1), and (3) include the short narrative summary. The summary should address teaching, scholarship and service achievements. For the purposes of the post-tenure review, the faculty member must meet the requirements for a Satisfactory rating for scholarship, and service and a Good rating for teaching as specified in PPM 8-11, Section IV.I (Descriptions and Clarifications of Ratings).

All faculty members subject to post-tenure review shall be notified by the Dean by September 15 of the calendar year of the scheduled review as per the timetable outlined in Section IV below. In the fall semester following the fifth anniversary of the original award of tenure or promotion to Full Professor, and every five years thereafter, the faculty member will submit the above documentation to his or her reviewing party and schedule a formal review. The review will follow the timetable outlined in Section IV below. Tenured faculty will fall into one of three categories:

1. Tenured but not fully promoted. The faculty member will meet with his or her department Chair for the formal review. In lieu of a review by his or her Chair, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once the review is completed, the department Chair or college committee Chair will forward the results to the Dean for oversight of the review process. A faculty member who undergoes review for promotion to Full Professor during the fifth academic year of his or her post-tenure review cycle is exempt from undergoing a separate post-tenure review for that cycle. The ratings for the promotion review will substitute for the compilation of the previous five Annual Reviews. Even if a faculty member does not meet a channel for promotion, the ratings could still indicate a positive post-tenure review, using the criteria described above. If a faculty member undergoes review for promotion to Full Professor during a year in which he or she is not scheduled for a post-tenure review, that process will nevertheless be equivalent to a post-tenure review, and the faculty member's five-year post-tenure review cycle will begin anew.

2. Tenured and fully promoted. The faculty member will meet with his or her department Chair for the formal review. In lieu of a review by his or her Chair, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once the review is completed, the department Chair or college committee Chair will forward the results to the Dean for oversight of the review process.

3. Tenured department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans. The department Chair/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean will meet with the Dean for the formal review. In lieu of a review by the Dean, the department Chair/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once the review is completed, the Dean or college committee Chair will forward the results to the non-reviewing party (either the Dean or college committee Chair) for oversight of the review process.

### III. ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING POST-TENURE REVIEW

In 2014-15, WSU created a program called the Performance Compensation Plan (PCP). This plan allows tenured faculty members who have held the rank of full professor for at least five years to apply for a permanent raise.

The application process requires that eligible faculty members provide a detailed report of their teaching, scholarship and service over the most recent five academic years. Criteria for the Performance Compensation Plan mirror university requirements for promotion from associate professor to professor. The faculty member's department chair and dean review the application and each makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost makes the final determination of award.

Because the standard for Performance Compensation is higher than that of the post-tenure review, a faculty member who applies for the PCP shall be considered to have passed her/his five-year post-tenure review if the department chair and the dean both make a positive

recommendation to the provost. A faculty member who applies for PCP, but does not receive positive reviews from the department chair and/or dean, will not automatically be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review. However, if the department chair and the dean agree that the faculty member meets the requirements for a successful post-tenure review according to the criteria for that process, the dean will write a letter indicating that fact, and the faculty member will be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review. If the department chair and/or dean do not support the PCP application, but the provost awards her/him Performance Compensation, the faculty member will be deemed to have met the post-tenure review standards.

When a faculty member is awarded Performance Compensation, the post-tenure review cycle will be reset to five academic years forward from the academic year of the PCP award. If a faculty member who seeks Performance Compensation does not receive the PCP award based on a review of the application, and not as a result of a shortage of funds for that year, and is not deemed to have satisfied post-tenure review by the department chair and dean as noted in the above paragraph, she/he will undergo post-tenure review at the designated time according to CSBS post-tenure review policy. If a faculty member applies for Performance Compensation during the same academic year as a scheduled post-tenure review and does not receive the PCP award based on a review of the application, and not as a result of a shortage of funds for that year, she/he will be asked to submit required documentation for the post-tenure review to the appropriate reviewing party as specified in the CSBS post-tenure review policy two weeks before the end of that academic year. This delayed post-tenure review will be completed within two weeks of the revised deadline and results will be forwarded to the appropriate non-reviewing party (the dean or the chair of the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee) for oversight of the review process.

#### IV. REMEDIAL ACTIONS

If the faculty member does not meet the standards of the post-tenure review, he or she is responsible for remedying the deficiencies and both the University and College are expected to assist through developmental opportunities as stated in PPM 8-11, Section II.D. The faculty member will work with his or her department Chair or, in the event that he or she is acting as a department Chair, with the Dean to establish a plan that addresses the deficiencies specified in the unfavorable review. This plan may include consulting with a peer-review committee that is mutually agreeable to the faculty and Chair or Dean, as described in PPM 8-11, Section IV.E.3. The plan must specify what steps should be taken to address the deficiencies to the satisfaction of the Chair or Dean and the faculty member. The plan must follow the timetable outlined in Section IV below, and the Dean must approve the remediation plan. The faculty member under review must provide evidence of progress towards meeting the requirements of the plan and the post-tenure standards. This progress will be monitored each year in the Annual Reviews. A follow-up review, in accordance with the procedures described in Section II above, will occur two fall semesters after the unfavorable review. If the follow-up review determines that progress is not being made, the faculty member will be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee during the subsequent spring semester. The Committee will forward its

findings to the Dean, who will make the final recommendation. A favorable review at this stage of the remediation process will satisfy the post-tenure review until the next scheduled review in three years (maintaining the overall five-year rotation). An unfavorable review by the Dean at this stage will be referred to the Provost.

## V. TIMETABLE FOR POST-TENURE ACTIONS

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Post-Tenure Review will follow the timetable below and should be completed prior to the spring semester. If the faculty member elects to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluating Committee, he or she must notify his or her Chair or Dean by the date noted below.

Post-Tenure Timetable (action must occur by these deadlines):

September 8: The department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, identifies the names of faculty scheduled for post-tenure review.

September 15: The Dean notifies faculty members up for post-tenure review.

September 22: Faculty members wishing to be reviewed by their College Ranking Tenure Evaluating Committee must notify their Chair and Dean by this date.

October 15: The faculty member must submit his or her materials for review to the appropriate reviewing party.

November 15: The faculty member must meet with the reviewing party to undergo a formal review.

November 22: The reviewing party must complete the review and submit to the oversight review party. When the Dean serves as the reviewing party, the oversight review party will be the Chair of the College Ranking Tenure Evaluating Committee. In all other cases, the Dean will serve as the oversight review party.

December 1: The non-reviewing party must complete his or her oversight review.

December 7: A meeting must be held between the Chair or Dean and any faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory review in order to work out a plan of action or remediation.

December 15: The Dean must approve the plan of action or remediation.

## VI. EFFECTIVE DATE

This policy on post-tenure review will be effective for all tenured faculty members after the approval of the policy by the Weber State University Faculty Senate.

ATTACHMENT 1

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES POST-TENURE REVIEW COVER SHEET

Faculty Name:

Department:

Date of Tenure Decision:

Date of Post-Tenure Interview:

Based on the evidence provided, the faculty member HAS SATISFIED the requirements outlined in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Post-Tenure Review Policy.

Based on the evidence provided the faculty member HAS NOT SATISFIED the requirements outlined in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Post-Tenure Review Policy. A summary of the reasons why the faculty member has received an unsatisfactory post-tenure review is attached.

College Dean:  
Signature

Department Chair or College Ranking Tenure  
Committee Chair:  
Signature

Faculty Member:  
Signature  
(Implies acknowledgement, not necessarily agreement)