

Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions

TENURE DOCUMENT

Approved by Faculty Senate Date TBD
APAFT Review: 11/17/15

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.

Eligibility

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

1. 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 Dental Hygiene: 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 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: Research-based 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 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, 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.

2. Hold a tenure track appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor (see PPM 8-1).
3. 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).
4. Adhere to "Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Standards of Behavior" (see PPM 9-4 through 9-8).

Professional File

Candidates are responsible for updating their 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 create an appendix in the professional file for items that are referenced in the narrative summaries.

Competencies and Ratings

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

Category IV: Professional Behaviors/Collegiality/Ethics

Candidates are rated in each category 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.

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 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 she/he evaluates 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.

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. Subject matter mastery, e.g., content areas, comprehensiveness of content, currency of content, and objectivity of coverage.
- b. Curriculum development, e.g., courses' fit with other courses, course revisions, and new courses developed.
- c. Course design, e.g., instructional goals and objectives, content coverage, appropriate teaching methods, and appropriate assessment methods.
- d. Delivery of teaching, e.g., methods (lecture, discussion, labs, distance learning, etc.), skills (speaking, explaining), and aids (handouts, AV, etc).

- e. Assessment of student learning, e.g., tests (multiple choice, essay, oral, etc.), papers, projects, practicum, and grading practices.
- f. Use of assessment outcomes to improve student learning.
- g. Advisement and availability to students, e.g., office hours and informal contact.
- h. Community engagement activities include, but are not limited to: classroom and laboratory sections, field work or field trips, on-line instruction, and a variety of advisory, supervisory, or sponsorship roles including community engaged learning, undergraduate research, student clubs and organizations, events, and programs.

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.** Each department will obtain student evaluations for all courses taught by the candidate and provide to the candidate department averages for similar courses (see PPM 8-11). While the department is responsible for providing summaries of these evaluations to the individual, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide interpretation of the evaluations, and comment on areas of improvement and concern.
3. **Teaching Portfolio.** Each candidate will develop a teaching portfolio for 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, may be placed in an appendix to the professional file.

Definitions of Ratings for Teaching

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

Satisfactory: The candidate will be rated satisfactory if 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.

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.

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.

Clarification of Ratings for Teaching: A candidate shall be rated good (minimum rating in channels B, D and E) if she/he is 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. **To be eligible for tenure in DCHP all candidates must have a minimum rating of “Good” in this category, a rating of Satisfactory would not qualify as adequate progress toward tenure.**

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.

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. Maintenance of a peer reviewed professional clinical practice. (Clinical practice which includes mandated clinical practice hours, continuing professional education and participation in and documentation of quarterly peer reviews should be listed in this area; other clinical/work related activities should be included in category III.)
- 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 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, certification of advanced training, and/or increased expertise through self-study.
- f. Published book reviews, published monographs, opinion papers or other professionally reviewed written material.
- g. Research on community engaged learning pedagogy to improve teaching and learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).
- h. Community research involving collaboration with community partners.
- i. Other scholarship 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.

While each candidate is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed above, the basic expectations are defined as **one “substantive,” peer-reviewed publication plus other scholarship is required for a satisfactory or higher rating in the formal final tenure review.**

- By the third year review, the candidate must either have a peer-reviewed (referred) publication or a plan for publication to include: name of journal that article will be submitted to; topic of article; and date it will be submitted to the publisher.
- By the sixth year review, the candidate must have a minimum of one (1) peer-reviewed (referred) journal article, as first-author or second author.

a. 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. No record of completing a formal continuing education program or a work experience which would help the candidate keep current in the discipline shall also be viewed negatively, as would 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.

b. 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 a candidate completing some formal continuing education and/or work experience which would help the candidate keep current in the discipline shall be viewed positively. 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.

c. 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 his/her scholarly activity is deserving of a good rating.

d. 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 his/her scholarly activity is deserving of an excellent rating.

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

The basic expectation for administrative and/or professionally related service is defined as those activities which provide professionally related value to the community, the institution (department, college, and university), 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.

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 speech making.
- 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. Participation in professional conferences, workshops and seminars.
- 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, and 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. Other administrative and/or professionally related service not listed above.

Administrative and/or professionally related service activities in the organizations listed below are considered desirable for service related activities:

Departmental Professional Organizations

Dental Hygiene: ADHA, UDHA

Emergency Care & Rescue: IAFC, IAFF, NAEMSE, NAEMSP, NAEMT

Health Sciences: appropriate to clinical specialty/profession

Health Administrative Services: AHIMA, AUPHA, HFMA, ACHE, UHIMA, HIMSS, MGMA

Medical Laboratory Sciences: ASCLS, ASCP

Nursing: AANP, AACN, ANA, CCRN, Critical Care/OR Nurses, NLN, NCSBN, Sigma Theta Tau International, UNA, UNOL

Radiological Sciences: AIUM, ARRT, ARDMS, ASRT, ASTRO, SDMS

Respiratory Therapy: AARC, AASM, USRC

Professionally Related Service Organizations (i.e., American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, Habitat for Humanity, Red Cross, etc.)

Community-level Service

Departmental-level Committee Assignment

College-level Committee Assignments

University-level Committee Assignments

Faculty Senate

Definition of Rating for 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.

1. Ratings

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

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 the mission and goals of Weber State University;
 - iii. demeaning the work of others;
 - iv. avoidance and/or non-engagement in professional interactions with co-workers or students;
 - v. Unethical behaviors related to publication or dissemination of scholarly work; or
 - vi. other unprofessional, non-collegial, and unethical behaviors not listed here.

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

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 his or her discipline, he or she is 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.