

POLICY ON TENURE AND PROMOTION
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND EDUCATION WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY
Approved by Faculty Senate

POLICY ON TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. PREAMBLE

This tenure document has been designed to aid in the evaluation of candidates seeking tenure in departments within the College of Social Sciences and Education (CSSE). Standards are established to ensure that only faculty members who consistently demonstrate a high overall level of performance receive a positive tenure recommendation. Diversity within the standards accommodates faculty members with different backgrounds, skills, 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 teaching, scholarship, and service to make a tenure recommendation.

B. INSTRUCTIONS TO TENURE COMMITTEES AND CANDIDATES

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 usual time in rank for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is six years. **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](#).

Department and college tenure committees are responsible for evaluating the performance of tenure candidates. A committee must provide candidates with **substantial evidence** for, and an explanation of, ratings of their teaching, scholarship, and service from their hiring date at Weber State University (including their total professional career), as well as 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 professional files.

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. During the third-year interim review, committees and administrators will evaluate candidates in accordance with college tenure criteria to ensure a positive trajectory toward tenure. However, candidates are not expected to be tenurable at the third-year interim review. The purpose of the third-year interim review is to determine whether the candidate is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward tenure

and to identify any remedial actions the candidate may need to take to be tenured. Ratings assigned for a formal third-year interim 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. In preparation for their sixth-year review, candidates should act on recommendations provided by each committee and administrator, and demonstrate improvements with evidence in their next review.

During 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.

Note: 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 5.3.1.1.3](#)).

C. ELIGIBILITY

To be recommended for tenure, the candidate must:

- have a terminal degree as outlined in [PPM 8.11 4.2.1](#),
- meet the standards of one of the tenure channels and provide evidence of appropriate performance, and
- adhere to professional ethics as outlined in [PPM 9.3 through 9.8](#).

Eligibility requirements are rated as **Met or **Unmet** based on evidence in the faculty personnel file housed in the Dean's office.

Unmet: Evidence of not meeting the Eligibility criteria 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.

It is the responsibility of the department and college ranking tenure committee to review the professional file, maintained by the Dean's office, in addition to the tenure file produced by the candidate.

D. PEER REVIEW

Every candidate for promotion or tenure review shall undergo peer review. The **peer review committee** will consist of three members, and it will be selected in collaboration with the Department chair by October 1. Potential candidates for promotion or tenure are notified by the Dean of their opportunity to form their peer review committee a year in advance of their tenure review year.

Peer review promotes a more accurate understanding of teaching effectiveness by observing teaching and reviewing the documentation provided by the candidate, which demonstrates the effectiveness of their teaching (e.g., teaching section of the professional portfolio, Canvas design, and actual teaching). The peer reviewers should collectively observe at least three examples of teaching/classes, review materials provided by the candidate, and interpret this information in terms of department, school, and college expectations. They will then summarize, without rating,

the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the designated areas in an official letter. 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](#)).

E. PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO AND AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL FORM

The candidate under review is responsible for updating their approved **autobiographical form** and their professional **electronic portfolio** with supporting evidence according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see [PPM 8-12](#) and [8-13](#)). The electronic portfolio needs to be organized according to 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. 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 electronic portfolio.

F. 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 category or another, aspects of some activities may be described in more than one category. 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 can be categorized as Service to the community (treating patients) or the discipline (providing clinical supervision), Teaching (utilizing case studies), and Scholarship (presenting at conferences or publishing in academic journals).

Within each category, 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. 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.

Note: During the **third-year interim review**, which is formative in nature, within each category, the faculty member being provided the interim review shall be rated as **Satisfactory Progress Towards Tenure** or **Unsatisfactory Progress Towards Tenure**.

G. TEACHING

Teaching is defined as the complex process of facilitating student learning and developing their knowledge and academic skills. Teaching encompasses a range of activities, both inside and outside the classroom, that support student success at Weber State and encourage the professional development of students, including behaviors related to organizing and delivering content, evaluating and facilitating learning, and generally developing knowledge in students (see [PPM 8-11, 5.4](#)). Effective teaching is the most important duty of faculty members at Weber State

University. Deficiencies in teaching cannot be compensated for by exceptional performance in other categories.

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, fieldwork or field trips, online instruction, and various advisory, supervisory, or sponsorship roles, such as service or community-based learning, undergraduate research, student clubs and organizations, events, and programs. The Rank and Tenure Committee will consider, based on their merits, all forms of teaching a faculty member performs and all preparatory activities in the service of teaching. However, it is the candidate's responsibility to document the quality and effectiveness of their teaching, as well as any related preparatory activities. Candidates should refer to the current approved autobiographical form for guidance on the elements of teaching that they need to include.

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. Additionally, the principle of [High-Impact Educational Experiences \(HIEE\)](#) in teaching is highly valued at the University and within the College of Social Sciences and Education. Candidates are therefore 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 for evaluating 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 evaluate teaching, including those used for departmental or general education evaluations. Furthermore, it is incumbent on candidates to explain how the course evaluation data reflect their teaching effectiveness as well as how they drew from course evaluation data to continuously improve the quality of their courses.

A faculty member's own critical self-evaluation of teaching, as documented in their Professional Portfolio, 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).

H. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is defined as the activities that contribute to the profession and enhance an individual's effectiveness as a professor. The evidence should indicate a pattern of ongoing scholarly endeavors, including prior to and/or since arriving at Weber State University, and articulate a clear research agenda. The quality and quantity of effort, as well as the results obtained, are the standards of

measurement. Candidates should refer to the current approved autobiographical form for examples and evidence of scholarship that they need to include.

The Rank and Tenure Committee will consider, based on their merits, all forms of scholarship, including the quantity of publications, quality of journals, impact of articles or textbooks on the discipline, and other relevant factors, as performed by a faculty member. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the significance and impact of their scholarship. The scholarship includes peer-reviewed publications, such as journal articles, law review articles, research reports, monographs, book chapters, conference proceedings, and externally peer-reviewed grants. Scholarship also includes service as an editor or assistant editor of a scholarly journal, which involves producing scholarly work, delivering scholarly papers or posters at academic meetings, and publishing book reviews. The scholarship includes publications that have received final acceptance, with the understanding that a given article may be applied to only one review period ([see PPM 8-11, section 5.5, for examples](#)). It is the candidate's responsibility to make the case that a particular publication is peer-reviewed or has undergone a formal acceptance process, is a significant or impactful work, and/or constitutes a significant contribution to a jointly authored document.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Professional service is defined as those activities that 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 in the autobiographical form. However, the Rank and Tenure Committee will consider, based on their merits, all forms and levels of service, including departmental, college, university, community, and professional services, performed by a faculty member.

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, as well as any leadership roles they may have fulfilled. Leadership is not strictly defined as serving as chair, but rather as making significant contributions to achieving service goals. Leadership will be weighted more heavily than committee membership, as will committee assignments, which are more demanding in nature. Administrative roles, such as program coordinator, director, 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. Weber State University and the College of Social Sciences and Education highly value service to the community that is professional (discipline-based), as well as high-impact educational experiences (HIEE) with students. 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.

J. ADHERENCE TO PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

The College of Social Sciences and Education endorses the statement of "Professional Ethics" 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 letters,

with a “Met” or “Unmet” response. Letters indicating the findings of the evaluative committees, chairs, and dean shall, if necessary, indicate strengths and weaknesses in this regard. 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, their students, colleagues, profession, community, and ultimately the University in engaging in professionalism and ethics. 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)

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 committee to review the professional file, maintained by the Dean's office, in addition to the tenure file produced by the candidate.

K. DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

Minimum degree requirements are outlined in [PPM 8-6](#) and [8-11](#).

L. RATINGS

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

EXCELLENT

Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated excellent when evaluations by peers indicate that they have consistently been an outstanding teacher, there is substantial evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or peer 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 as excellent upon publication of one peer-reviewed book, or three refereed publications (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, law reviews, and similar, as listed in the annual faculty review form), along with evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. Candidates for which creative works are most germane shall be rated excellent if they have three or more juried/refereed creative works. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. However, in the case of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate, department, and college to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to regional or national refereed publications. Notably significant or impactful scholarship, other than peer-reviewed scholarship, may substitute for one peer-reviewed

publication (see [PPM 8-11 5.5](#))

Service

The candidate will normally be rated as excellent when they perform a variety of demanding service activities, provide leadership, and exhibit a significant impact in all service areas specified in the autobiographical form. The candidate will normally be rated excellent when they perform a variety of demanding service activities at any level (i.e., department, college, university, community, profession), provides leadership at any level of service on a committee or project, and/or exhibits significant impact from their contributions at any level of service (e.g., the development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs, improved operations, or organizational changes). If a faculty member receives course release for their service, it is their responsibility to demonstrate how they have gone above and beyond basic requirements or expectations.

GOOD

Teaching

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

Clarification of Ratings for Teaching: The candidate must have a minimum rating of Good in this category to be considered tenure-eligible.

Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated as good with the publication of two refereed publications (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, law reviews, and similar, as listed in the annual faculty review form), as well as evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed publication. However, in the cases of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate, department, and college to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to a regional or national refereed publication.

Service

The candidate will normally be rated good for performing a variety of service activities, providing leadership, or exhibiting significant impact in all service areas specified in the autobiographical form. A candidate shall be rated Good if they accept and perform in a professional manner the duties in at least three areas of the autobiographical form, including assignments in more than one level (ranging from program to university) in area a) of the autobiographical form. Candidates shall be rated good in service if 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.

SATISFACTORY

Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when evaluations by peers indicate that they have consistently been teaching at a level of competence, there is little evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or peer feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, there is evidence that the candidate has made few innovations to course material or teaching methods and 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 publication and a record of ongoing scholarly activity. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of refereed publications. Evidence of candidates completing some formal education and/or work experience, which would support their keeping current in the discipline, should be viewed as positive. Evidence of having presented papers, delivered speeches, written grant proposals, etc., shall be viewed positively. A positive rating in all of the indicated activities should not be necessary to receive a satisfactory rating in this area.

Service

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when providing minimal leadership or exhibiting minimal impact in all service areas specified in the autobiographical form. Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in service if they accept and perform in an acceptable manner those duties constituting an average share of the workload in the department, college, University, or academic community.

UNSATISFACTORY

Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated unsatisfactory when evaluations by peers indicate that they have consistently been lacking competence as a teacher when there is minimal evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or peer 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. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they are consistently rated by students and peers as inadequate and/or make no effort to develop new materials, new methods, or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they have no publications and/or have made no visible effort to write for publication. Candidates for which creative works are most germane shall be rated unsatisfactory if they have no creative works and/or have made no visible effort to engage in creating works. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of refereed publications. A lack of record of completing a formal education program or work experience that would help the candidate stay current in the discipline would also be viewed negatively, as would the absence of evidence of presenting papers, making speeches, developing courses and/or

programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise.

Service

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in service if they unreasonably decline to participate in 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.

I. TENURE CHANNELS

Tenure/Sixth-Year Review: Five channels exist for candidates 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

J. TIMETABLE FOR TENURE ACTIONS

The College of Social Sciences and Education will adhere to the dated guidelines for the tenure process found in [PPM 8-12](#).

K. 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.