Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions

TENURE DOCUMENT

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 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 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: 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 a health science or a related health science discipline.

For the School of Nursing: (1) Doctorate or a terminal degree in this field or related discipline, current unencumbered RN or APRN license, and three years in the discipline of primary responsibility or (2) Master's degree in Nursing and current unencumbered RN or APRN license if teaching only in the licensed practical nursing (LPN) and/or associate degree (AD) level nursing programs.

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 three categories:

Category I: Teaching

Category II: Scholarship

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

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

~~While the same rating channels are used for both formal interim and final reviews, 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.~~ 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.

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 Revi ew 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.

<u>**Definitions of Ratings for Teaching**</u>

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–g above.

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 evidence of successful scholarly activities. A candidate is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below.

A candidate can accrue points for 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. Other scholarship activities not listed above.

Depending on the level of candidate's contribution, the maximum points for specific scholarship activities are:

Entire Textbook publication - 22 points
Chapter in textbook publication - 12 points
Peer-reviewed, academic journal publications - 12 points
Completion of Doctoral Degree - 10 points
Presentation at a national conference - 10 points
Professional peer reviewed practice - 10 points
Current professional practice at a Joint Commission Accredited Hospital - 8 points
Poster/Podium Presentation at International/National academic conferences - 8 points
Poster/Podium Presentation at Regional or State academic conferences - 6 points
Peer-reviewed State/Regional publication - 5 points
Development projects (funded projects, clinical research) - 3 points
Peer-reviewed proceedings' publication - 2 points
Presentation at local conference - 2 points
Professional improvement (post-graduate study, certifications, advanced training) - 1 point (5 points max)
Other scholarship activities not listed above (The candidate must justify the activity as being scholarship) - 1 point (5 points max)

Definition of Ratings for Scholarship: The candidate's scholarship will be scored based on the above point system ~~and a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent will be determined based on the following scale~~. A candidate will accumulate points during the entire probationary period. The rating

of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent will be determined based on the following two scales for the formal interim and final tenure reviews. For additional reviews (4th or 5th year), the rating assigned shall reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's progress between the two scales. While each candidate is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed above, note that a peer reviewed publication plus other scholarship is required for a satisfactory or higher rating in the formal final tenure review.

Formal Interim (3rd Year) Review Scale			
Unsatisfactory	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Excellent**
No plan for producing a peer reviewed publication or scholarship activities with a total of 14 or fewer points.	A plan for producing a peer reviewed publication + scholarship activities with a total of 15-19 points.	Substantial work toward producing a peer reviewed publication + other scholarship activities with a total of 20-24 points.	One peer reviewed publication + other scholarship activities with a total of 25 or more points.

Formal Final (6th Year) Review Scale			
Unsatisfactory	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Excellent**
No peer reviewed publication or scholarship activities with a total of ~~19~~ 24 or fewer points.	One peer reviewed publication + other scholarship activities with a total of ~~20-24~~ 25-29 points.	One peer reviewed publication + other scholarship activities with a total of ~~25-29~~ 30-34 points.	One peer reviewed publication + other scholarship activities with a total of ~~30~~ 35 or more points.

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.

A candidate can accrue points for 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. Other administrative and/or professionally related service not listed above.

The points for specific administrative and/or professionally related service activities are:

Departmental Professional Organizations
Clinical Laboratory Sciences: ASCLS, ASCP

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
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

Elected or appointed national leadership position - 25 points
Elected or appointed state or regional leadership position - 20 points
Current Professional Organization membership - 3 points

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

Elected or appointed national leadership position - 15 points
Elected or appointed state or regional leadership position - 10 points
Elected or appointed local leadership position - 8 points
Continuing Membership and active participation – 3 points

Community-level Service

Speech making to community groups - 5 points
Conference/Workshop participation - 3 points
Consulting/Work experience - 2 points
Non-reviewed publications (Newspaper, newsletter, magazine articles, media interviews) - 2 points
Conference/Workshop attendance - 1 point

Departmental-level Committee Assignment

Committee Chairperson (including being a member) - 5 points (10 points maximum during the probationary period)
Committee member - 2 points (6 points maximum during the probationary period)
Administrative assignments/projects - 3 points

College-level Committee Assignments

Committee Chairperson (including being a member) - 8 points
Committee member - 3 points
Administrative assignments/projects - 3 points

University-level Committee Assignments

Committee Chairperson (including being a member) - 10 points
Committee member - 5 points
Administrative assignments/projects - 3 points

Faculty Senate

Executive Committee member (including Faculty Senate membership and university-level committee liaison) - 10 points
Elected member of faculty senate - 5 points

Other administrative and/or professionally related service not listed above (Th e candidate must justify the activity as being service) - 1 point (5 points max)

Definition of Rating for Professionally Related Service: The candidate's administrative and/or professionally related service will be scored based on the above point system ~~and a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent will be determined based on the following scale~~. A candidate will accumulate points during the entire probationary period. The rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent will be determined based on the following two scales for the formal interim and final tenure reviews. For additional reviews (4th or 5th year), the rating assigned shall reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's progress between the two scales.

Formal Interim (3rd Year) Review Scale			
Unsatisfactory	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Excellent**
Service activities with a total of 14 or fewer points.	15-19 points	20-24 points	Service activities with a total of 25 or more points.

Formal Final (6th Year) Review Scale			
Unsatisfactory	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Excellent**
Service activities with a total of ~~19~~ 24 or fewer points.	~~20-24~~ 25-29 points	~~25-29~~ 30-34 points	Service activities with a total of ~~30~~ 35 or more points.