

Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions

TENURE DOCUMENT

Last Approved by Faculty Senate 12/9/21

APAFT Review: 11/10/21

Approved by the WSU Board of Trustees 3/22/22

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to outline the procedures, criteria, and performance standards used to evaluate candidates for tenure in the Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions (DCHP). Diversity within the criteria and performance standards accommodates each department and the School of Nursing and all faculty members who may have different backgrounds, talents, and professional interests. Faculty members may use these criteria and performance standards as a guide in achieving tenured status. The following requirements have been set to assure that only candidates who exhibit high performance levels shall receive tenure. These requirements meet or exceed the University's expectations for tenure (see PPM 8.11). Changes to this document shall be approved by two thirds vote of the salaried faculty voting in the DCHP, submitted through the dean to the APAFT Committee for analysis and recommendation to the Faculty Senate. Upon the approval of the Faculty Senate, the provost and Board of Trustees, the changed document will be considered adopted.

Review Process

The normal probationary period for a faculty member in a tenure-track appointment is six years, with a formal interim review in the third year, and a formal tenure review in the sixth year. The normal time in rank for promotion from assistant to associate professor is also 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 faculty member who fails to achieve tenure cannot advance in rank (see PPM 8.11).

In addition, in the second year of a faculty member's probationary period, the department chair will do an assessment of the candidate's progress. This assessment may be done with or without the assistance of a department committee, at the sole discretion of the department chair. The faculty member shall be evaluated in the same categories and be rated using the same criteria as in this document. There is no evaluation beyond the department level (see PPM 8.11).

It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide evidence of appropriate performance. During the process, the review committees may seek clarification, including but not limited to requesting the candidate to appear before them. The candidate also has the right to request an appearance before the review committees.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

The Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions (DCHP) is committed to improving diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout the college and values efforts by faculty to help achieve this goal. DCHP faculty are strongly encouraged to incorporate these values into their teaching, scholarship, and/or service. In addition, faculty should highlight their efforts toward this goal, and the results, in the appropriate section of their review documentation. The various reviewing entities will look favorably upon meaningful efforts to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion in our student body, faculty, and staff, to better support the communities we serve.

Eligibility

To be eligible for tenure in the DCHP, candidates must:

1. Hold a tenure track appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or full

professor (see PPM 8-1).

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. If at the time of initial academic appointment a faculty member has less than a Master's degree or has prior academic experience, up to two years of teaching in that position may be credited toward fulfilling part of the normal six year probationary period (see PPM 8-11). Any time credited towards the probationary period will be specifically noted in the candidate's employment contract.
3. Adhere to "Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Standards of Behavior" (see PPM 9-4 through 9-8).
4. Have earned an appropriate degree and have attained applicable professional certification or license, if any, as stated below (see PPM 8.11):

For the Department of Athletic Training: Research-based doctorate in Athletic Training or a related discipline. Current athletic training professional certification and license.

For the Department of Dental Hygiene: Master's Degree in this field or related discipline and current license, in addition to recognized professional certification or license within the assigned teaching discipline in the primary area of responsibility.

For the Department of Emergency Care & Rescue: Master's Degree in this field or a terminal degree in a related health science or education discipline and current professional certification, license or equivalent within a related emergency medicine organization in the primary area of responsibility.

For the Department of Health Administrative Services: Research-based doctorate in this field or related discipline and current professional certification or license, if applicable, within the assigned teaching discipline in the primary area of responsibility.

For the Department of Health Sciences: Doctorate in health sciences or a related health science discipline.

For the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences: Doctorate or Master's Degree in this field or related discipline, and current professional certification or license within the assigned teaching discipline in the primary area of responsibility.

For the School of Nursing: (Doctorate or Master's degree in this field, current unencumbered RN or APRN license, and three years in the discipline of primary responsibility.

For the Department of Physician's Assistant Medicine: Advanced degree in this field or related discipline, and current certification and licensure commensurate with training.

For the School of Radiologic Sciences: Master's Degree in this field or related discipline and current active status with the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists.

For the Department of Respiratory Therapy: (1) Master's Degree in this field or related discipline or (2) Master's Degree and three other certifications recognized by the NBRC or American Association of Sleep Medicine (i.e., RRT, CPFT, RPFT, ACCS, NPS, AE-C, SDS, RPsgT), and active member of the American Association for Respiratory Care, and current professional license (RCP) within the assigned teaching discipline in the primary area of responsibility.

Professional File

Candidates are responsible for updating their electronic professional files according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13). This file 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 professional file. Candidates may add hyperlinks to evidence in the professional file for items that are referenced in the narrative summaries.

Activities completed in the past three years will be reviewed for the third-year review and activities completed in the past six years will be reviewed for tenure, unless otherwise noted in the candidate's employment contract.

Competencies and Ratings

Acknowledging that some faculty members take an integrated approach to teaching, scholarship and service, it may be appropriate to recognize contributions in more than one category (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) for a particular activity if evidence in a candidate's professional file demonstrates how the activity applies to multiple categories. (see PPM 8-11, III, D). It is the responsibility of the candidate to clearly articulate in their professional file how different facets of an activity apply to different categories (teaching, scholarship, and/or service).

The competencies to be considered for tenure review fall into four categories:

Category I: Teaching

Category II: Scholarship

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates are rated in each category of the three categories (Teaching, Scholarship, and Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service) from unsatisfactory to excellent. The ratings are to reflect the candidate's academic career span 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.

Category IV: Professional Behaviors/Collegiality/Ethics

Candidates are rated in this category as either met/not met as describe in more detail later in this document.

Evaluation Summary

A written evaluation summary including the rationale for the ratings in each category and a recommendation regarding tenure will be submitted to the candidate with a copy to the dean according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13). The pattern of ratings must meet or exceed one of the channels described below for a positive tenure recommendation.

Channel	Teaching	Scholarship	Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service
A	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory
B	Good	Good	Good
C	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good
D	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory
E	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent

The third-year 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 they evaluate priorities in preparation for the final tenure review. A candidate's recent work at other institutions, while it may be taken into consideration, it is not weighted as heavily as work at Weber State University.

At the third-year, interim review, candidates must earn a minimum of good in teaching, and satisfactory in both scholarship and service. See Channel A below in the Third-Year Review Minimum Requirements.

Third-Year Review Minimum Requirements

Channel	Teaching	Scholarship	Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service
A	Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Categories and Evaluation 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.IV.E). Although the candidate's academic freedom in the choice of teaching methods is specifically recognized, the candidate will be evaluated on the basis of overall effectiveness in the teaching of the subject at the appropriate level for the course. In all cases such instruction should be consistent with the approved course syllabi, lead to fulfilling the department curriculum objectives, and fulfill faculty responsibilities to students (see PPM 9-5). While the same rating channels are used for both formal interim and final reviews in this category, ratings assigned for the interim review reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's progress towards tenure and should be based on reasonable expectations for a third year faculty member.

Evidence of performance in teaching includes:

- a. 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.
- b. 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). This includes content areas, comprehensiveness of content, currency of content, and objectivity of coverage. Clinical practice (paid or unpaid) can be used to demonstrate the candidate's subject matter mastery.
- c. Pedagogy/Course Design. 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 (e.g. instructional goals and objectives, content coverage, appropriate teaching methods, and appropriate assessment methods). They should also demonstrate a continuing effort to improve instruction. Candidates may also include a narrative and/or feedback from students and/or peers explaining how the faculty member cultivates an inclusive atmosphere for students. (see PPM 8-11, D,2, b). Delivery of teaching, e.g., methods (lecture, discussion, labs, distance learning, etc.), skills (speaking, explaining), and aids (handouts, AV, etc), the use of active learning strategies to foster student engagement, and interprofessional education activities. Also includes adaptations made to accommodate students' needs and/or special situations (independent studies, campus closures, etc.)
- d. Teaching innovations and/or developments. Not merely updates, include dates.
- e. Employment of engaged learning strategies such as laboratory sessions, simulations, field work, field trips, service-learning, community-based research, undergraduate research, study abroad, etc. Include dates.
- f. Assessment of student learning. Candidates must demonstrate that they assess students' learning with valid, reliable assessment methods and tools (e.g., tests (multiple choice, essay, oral, etc.), papers, projects, simulations, practicum, and grading practices). (see PPM 8-11, D,2, c). Candidates must also demonstrate how they use assessment outcomes to improve student learning.
- g. Student Evaluations. Please summarize your Weber State University student evaluations

completed since your last promotion. Data acquired from these student evaluations should be summarized in this section. It is incumbent on candidates to reflect upon their course evaluation data and use them as part of their efforts to improve their teaching effectiveness. 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., and your College tenure document). A faculty member's student evaluations should not be compared to another faculty member's student evaluations and may not be used as the only source of evidence of instructional effectiveness.

- h. 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).
- i. Development of new courses and/or programs within a college as well as significant modifications of existing courses or programs.
- j. Advisement and availability to students, e.g., office hours and informal contact.
- k. Teaching Philosophy. Provide your statement of Teaching Philosophy

Documents for the determination of rating in this category are peer review, student evaluations, teaching portfolio, and other items addressing the performance level in areas a–g above.

1. **Peer Review.** A candidate's peer review must be completed during the fall semester of the academic 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 candidate's work will be selected. If the candidate and the chair cannot agree on the makeup of the committee, the decision will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean.
2. **Student Evaluations.** The faculty member will submit student evaluations for each course. Data acquired from these student evaluations should be summarized by the candidate. It is incumbent on candidates to reflect upon their course evaluation data and use them as part of their efforts to improve their teaching effectiveness. A faculty member's student evaluations should not be compared to another faculty member's student evaluations and may not be used as the only source of evidence of instructional effectiveness. (see PPM 8-11).
3. **Teaching Portfolio.** Each candidate will develop a teaching portfolio, which is the teaching section of the autobiographical from within the professional file. The portfolio should include a summary of teaching performance and a statement of teaching philosophy. Supporting documents, such as projects, presentations, evidence of assessment techniques, and syllabi, which are referenced, should be hyperlinked within the appropriate section in the professional file.

Definitions of Ratings for Teaching

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

Good: The candidate will be rated good if teaching 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 implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels. Candidates shall be rated good (minimum rating in channels B, D and E) if they are consistently rated by students and peers as good and if the candidate provides evidence of additional valuable accomplishments in one or more areas a–h above.

Satisfactory: The candidate will be rated satisfactory if teaching duties required of all faculty members are performed in an acceptable manner. Satisfactory means adequate and should not imply undesirable or below average endeavor. To be eligible for tenure in DCHP, all candidates must have a minimum rating of "Good" in this category. A rating of Satisfactory in Teaching would not qualify as adequate

progress toward tenure.

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

Category II: Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the individual's effectiveness as a professor. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide documentation of the significance, impact, and quality of scholarly activities. A candidate is not expected to perform equally in all areas listed below based on the candidate's individual strengths in scholarship activities. For all collaborative/group work, the candidate will explain their role and contributions in the project and final product including how authorship was determined.

A candidate may include as evidence the following scholarship activities:

- a. Publications, such as books and/or articles in refereed regional or national journals. (Non-reviewed publications should be included in the category III.)
- b. Peer-reviewed external grants and/or granted patents.
- c. Presentation of professional papers at international, national, or regional conferences, or workshops. (Conferences or workshops in which the candidate had only supporting roles, such as introducing a speaker or a topic or chairing a session should be listed in category III.)
- d. Developmental projects, such as university-funded proposals, classroom and/or clinical research, ongoing professional clinical practice or other long-term professional association with a health care organization, service agency, or other field-based settings appropriate to the candidate's discipline. (Activities that are service in nature should be listed in category III.)
- e. Professional improvement, such as additional degrees beyond the terminal degree, formal post-graduate study, and/or certification of advanced training.
- f. Published book reviews, published monographs, opinion papers, or other professionally reviewed written material.
- g. Supervision of student research that results in a presentation or student report/publication.
- h. Research on community engaged learning pedagogy to improve teaching and learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).
- i. Community research involving collaboration with community partners.
- j. Other scholarly activities not listed above.

Definition of Ratings for Scholarship: . The rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent will be determined based on the following for the formal interim and final tenure reviews. For additional reviews (4th and 5th year), the rating assigned shall reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's progress. **Note:** While each candidate is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed above, **one peer-reviewed publication such as books and/or articles in refereed regional or national journals, plus other scholarship is required for a satisfactory or higher rating in the formal final tenure review.**

a. Excellent. Candidates may be rated excellent if they meet the basic expectations defined above AND provide evidence of more than one (1) refereed publication at the regional and/or national levels, (2) substantial publication, such as a textbook, (3) approved scholarly grants from regional and/or national levels, or (4) combination of these since the date of their last promotion AND evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence that their scholarly activity is deserving of an excellent rating.

b. Good. Candidates may be rated good if they meet the basic expectations defined above AND provide evidence of (1) a regional and/or national refereed publication, (2) a substantial publication, such as a textbook, OR (3) a substantial quantity of other scholarly activities defined in this document since the date of their last promotion AND evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence that their scholarly activity is deserving of a good rating.

c. Satisfactory. Candidates may be rated satisfactory if they meet the basic expectations defined above AND provide sufficient evidence of creating, publicizing, and presenting original disciplinary-specific work

admissible by academic and/or professional peers. Evidence of presenting papers or relevant topics in a professional setting, developing courses and/or programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise shall be viewed positively. A positive rating in all of these indicated activities should not be necessary to receive a satisfactory rating in this area.

To receive a rating of Satisfactory, the candidate must:

- By the third year review, have a peer-reviewed (referred) publication or a plan for publication to include all of the following: 1) name of journal that article will be submitted to (or book publisher); 2) topic or title of article or book; 3) an abstract explaining the project; 4) project timeline, and 5) date it will be submitted to the publisher.
- By the sixth year review, have a minimum of one (1) peer-reviewed (referred) publication.

d. Unsatisfactory. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they fail to meet the basic expectations defined above OR provide little or no evidence of creating, publicizing, and presenting original disciplinary-specific work admissible by academic and/or professional peers. Little or no evidence of presenting papers or relevant topics in a professional setting, developing courses and/or programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise would be viewed negatively.

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

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

Evidence of Service Effectiveness

Candidates should consult PPM 8-11. IV.G. for detailed information about evaluation criteria. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the quality, quantity, and significance of their service activities, and any leadership roles that they may have fulfilled. For service outside the institution, candidates are encouraged to provide independent evaluation of the extent and significance of their activities. For all activities, the candidate should decide how to categorize service activities that overlap with those of Teaching and Scholarship (see those sections above).

A candidate may include as evidence the following administrative and/or professionally related service activities:

- a. Membership and positions held in professional organizations. Leadership positions and primary contributor roles will be weighted more heavily than membership or attendance.
- b. Professionally related community activities including volunteer clinical service, community healthcare, disaster services, reducing healthcare disparities, etc.
- c. Committee assignments at the department, college, or university levels.
- d. Non-reviewed publications, e.g., newsletters, newspaper and popular magazine articles, and media interviews.
- e. Assistance with professional conferences, workshops, and seminars, such as serving as a conference organizer, session moderator, etc.
- f. Administrative assignments within the college and or university.
- g. Developmental activities which are service in nature, e.g. consulting and work experience.
- h. Outreach to external communities and constituencies, such as government agencies, businesses, private for-profit, and not-for-profit organizations.
- i. Activities such as speech-making in the area of expertise, membership on boards, consulting, publishing in the popular press, advising for avocation groups, and participating in seminars and workshops.

- j. Student Advising and/or other Student Success Activities. Student advisement activities and/or informal mentoring that assists students in achieving their educational potential, including culturally relevant support for underrepresented students, such as advising cultural clubs, student organizations, and students who are not part of the faculty member's discipline, but occur based on affinity identity.
- k. Mentoring and/or training faculty related teaching, scholarship, and/or professional service
- l. Other administrative and/or professionally related service not listed above.
- m. Administrative and/or professionally related service activities including membership/involvement in the organizations recognized by each respective department are considered desirable for service related activities.

Definition of Rating for Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service: The rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent will be determined based on evidence provided in the candidates file for the formal interim and final tenure reviews. For additional reviews (4th and 5th year), the rating assigned shall reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's progress. Significant service in one area is sufficient for a rating of excellent if the candidate has served in a leadership role that led to a substantial positive outcome.

1. Ratings

a. Excellent. Candidates shall be rated excellent in service if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND provide leadership within the department, college, University or academic community, on a major project, committee or activity in which their work significantly influenced development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs improved operations or organizational changes. The candidate's being recognized locally, regionally, and/or nationally for work in extra University activities usually serving in a working position of leadership in appropriate associations and organizations is evidence of significant service work in the academic community.

Candidates may be rated excellent in administration if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND set ambitious goals and achieve most of them. Candidates should also consistently be rated excellent by their immediate superiors and subordinates in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a positive intellectual climate, procuring and allocating resources competently, and facilitating the operation of the organization in setting up and achieving objectives.

b. Good. Candidates shall be rated good in service if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND their leadership within the department, college, University, or academic community is recognized as stronger than average or if their influence in the development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs, improved operations, or organizational changes is recognized as considerably above average.

Candidates shall be rated "good" in administration if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND set ambitious goals and achieve many of them. Candidates should also be consistently rated as good by their immediate superiors and subordinates in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a positive intellectual climate and procuring and allocating resources competently.

c. Satisfactory. Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in service if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND accept and perform in an acceptable manner those duties constituting an average share of the work load in the department, college, University, or academic community.

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in administration if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated satisfactory by their immediate superiors and subordinates.

d. Unsatisfactory. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in service if they fail to meet the basic expectations defined in this document OR unreasonably decline to participate on departmental, college, or University committees, task forces, or advisory groups when asked. Refusal to serve in any capacity in their professions and/or being passive in interest and action in any of the above shall also be viewed negatively.

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in administration if they fail to meet the basic expectations defined in this document OR fail to perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently

rated by their immediate superiors and subordinates as unsatisfactory.

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 coworkers and students;
 - ii. disruption or non-engagement in teaching, scholarship, and service;
 - 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.

DCHP Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty of the Dumke College of Health Professions (DCHP) shall be reviewed by their department chair; or dean if functioning as chair, on or before March 15 at least every five years after the receipt of tenure. The schedule of reviews will be established by the department chair in consultation with the dean.

As a basis for these reviews, faculty members must provide their chair a self-report of their activities (outlined in the annual faculty performance evaluation and goal setting document), since their last review covering the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Administrative responsibilities can be considered in lieu of teaching, if appropriate. In addition, the chair shall include the faculty members' student evaluations as part of the evaluation process since their last review.

Per PPM 8-11, the department chair shall provide a written report of the review to their faculty with a copy to the dean for inclusion in the faculty members' professional file by April 15 of the year of the review. All faculty undergoing review have the right to provide a written response to the dean which must be completed on or before May 1.

Remedial Actions Based on Post-Tenure Review

If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is found to not be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of their discipline, they are responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and both the University and College are expected to assist through developmental opportunities. A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action governed by due process pursuant to the standards described in PPM 9-9 through 9- 17.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

The application process requires that faculty provide a detailed report of their teaching, scholarship and service over the most recent five years. In order for the faculty member to be eligible for the raise, the faculty member's record must be sufficient so that the faculty member would again earn promotion to full professor. The department chair and dean evaluate that record and write letters indicating whether it would qualify the faculty for promotion to professor. The provost makes the final decision on which university faculty are awarded raises.

Faculty who apply for the PCP shall be considered to have passed their five-year post tenure review if the chair and the dean both state in their letters that the faculty member has met the standard for the raise.

Faculty who apply for PCP but do not receive positive reviews from the chair and/or dean will not automatically be deemed to have undergone a post-tenure review. However, if the chair and the dean agree that the faculty member meets the requirements for a successful post-tenure review according to the standard criteria, the dean will write a letter indicating that fact, and the faculty member will be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review.

Even if the chair and/or dean do not support the PCP application, the faculty member will be deemed to meet the post-tenure review standards if the provost awards them a PCP. The lack of support regarding post-tenure review from the chair and/or dean shall not be deemed a failure of the faculty member to pass a post-tenure review. Instead, those faculty who do not receive post-tenure review support from the chair and dean will undergo reviews at their designated times according to the other sections of this post-tenure review document. If the designated year of review is the current academic year, the post-tenure review must occur before the end of that academic year.