

JOHN B. GODDARD SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS

TENURE DOCUMENT

[rev by APAFT]

This tenure document is designed to aid in the equitable evaluation of candidates seeking tenure in departments within the John B. Goddard School of Business & Economics. Standards are set to assure that only those faculty who exhibit high performance levels receive a positive tenure recommendation. Diversity within the standards accommodates faculty members with different backgrounds, talents and professional interests.

To those who will evaluate candidates, this document serves as a basis for writing a thorough analysis of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses, rather than resorting to a conventional checklist.

It is important that a candidate's total professorial career be considered, including performance at Weber State University and other institutions for which the candidate has been given credit towards years to tenure. All candidates, excluding those who qualify for temporary suspension of the timetable per PPM 8-13, must be reviewed at all levels in the third and sixth years independent of position or negative recommendations.

Minimum Degree requirements:

Candidates for tenure in the John B. Goddard School of Business and Economics must meet the minimum degree requirements contained in PPM 8-11.

Adherence to Professional Ethics:

Candidates for tenure in the John B. Goddard School of Business and Economics must meet the faculty responsibilities and standards for ethical behavior specified in PPM 9-3 through 9-8.

Performance Channels:

To be recommended for tenure, a candidate must provide evidence of appropriate performance to satisfy one of the following channels.

<u>CHANNEL</u>	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Scholarship</u>	<u>Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service</u>
A	Satisfactory	Good	Good
B	Satisfactory	Excellent	Satisfactory
C	Good	Satisfactory	Good
D	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
E	Good	Good	Satisfactory

A candidate may not meet the requirements for tenure by fulfilling parts of more than one channel, although it is clear that they will meet the requirement if they exceed the ratings for a particular channel.

RATINGS

The candidate for tenure will be evaluated in each of the above categories and a rating of inadequate, satisfactory, good, or excellent shall be determined and interpreted relative to the candidate's department and school peers.

A general description of each of these ratings, which shall serve as a guide to the evaluation committees, is as follows:

Inadequate: This rating shall be given to a candidate who does not meet the requirements to be rated at least satisfactory.

Satisfactory: The candidate will be rated satisfactory if normal duties required of all faculty members are performed in an acceptable manner. The candidate must complete assigned duties and share in unassigned workload in the department, school, and university. A rating of satisfactory does not indicate undesirable or below average endeavor.

The candidate will be rated satisfactory in the teaching category when rated consistently as satisfactory by students and peers. Evaluation committees should recognize that student evaluations of teaching reflect many factors including the type of course taught, class sizes, grades assigned, and factors not under the control of the candidate.

The candidate will be rated as satisfactory in the scholarship category upon evidence of satisfactory performance in Area A and at least satisfactory performance in Area B.

The candidate will be rated satisfactory in the service category when the candidate is performing at a level judged to be average in the acceptance and performance of significant service duties.

Good: The candidate will be rated good if normal duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in an above average or more than satisfactory manner. The rating of good in any category indicates a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels.

The candidate will be rated good in the teaching category if ranked consistently above average by students and peers. Evaluation committees should recognize that student evaluations of teaching reflect many factors including the type of course taught, class sizes, grades assigned, and factors not under the control of the candidate.

The candidate will be rated good in the scholarship category upon evidence of good performance in Area A and satisfactory or good performance in Area B.

The candidate will be rated good in the service category when the candidate is performing at a level judged to be above average in the acceptance and performance of significant service duties.

Excellent: The candidate will be rated excellent if normal duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in an outstanding manner. The rating of excellent in any category indicates a substantial degree of achievement above those considered appropriate for a good rating.

The candidate will be rated excellent in the teaching category if rated consistently outstanding or well above average by students and peers. Evaluation committees should recognize that student evaluations of teaching reflect many factors including the type of course taught, class sizes, grades assigned, and factors not under the control of the candidate.

The candidate will be rated excellent in the scholarship category upon evidence of (1) excellent performance in Area A and at least satisfactory performance in Area B, or (2) good performance in Area A and excellent performance in Area B.

The candidate will be rated excellent in the service category when the candidate is performing at a level judged to be outstanding in the acceptance and performance of significant service duties.

DEFINITIONS OF CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES

Three categories are delineated as evaluative areas for tenure consideration: (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarship, and (3) Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service. Within each category the faculty member being considered for tenure shall be rated as excellent, good, satisfactory or inadequate.

TEACHING: Teaching is normally defined as instruction conducted under the auspices of Weber State University. Candidates should be evaluated on the basis of all teaching conducted under the auspices of Weber State University. When candidates are given credit towards years to tenure based on teaching at other institutions of higher education, their teaching record at other institutions will be evaluated as part of the candidate's tenure evaluation. Teaching activities include formal instruction and activities directly related to student learning including the mentoring of student research, student projects, and co-op education.

When evaluating a candidate's teaching, committee members will consider the preparation and use of teaching materials such as course syllabi, assignments, websites, readings, bibliographies, computer programs, and other materials primarily intended for instructional use.

SCHOLARSHIP: Scholarship normally includes peer reviewed journal articles, published research reports, monographs, conference proceedings, externally peer reviewed grants as well as other activities. Articles which have been accepted for publication are included. The scholarship category is reserved for scholarly output as opposed to writing activity. Minimum expectations for scholarly activities will be consistent with the mission statement of the GSBE, which is attached to this document.

Scholarly activity may be interpreted broadly as discipline based research, contributions to practice, or pedagogical research. Not all scholarly activities will result in peer-reviewed journal publications. Peer review is defined as a review that occurs prior to publication by academic peers or practitioners which provides an author with critical and constructive feedback. Although scholarship may be interpreted rather broadly, it shall normally be limited to those activities which go beyond mere maintenance of professional credentials and/or staying current in the literature of the candidate's discipline.

Scholarly activities are classified into two categories A and B. Area A activities are of primary importance and area B activities are of secondary importance.

In general, the more important the publication(s), the fewer necessary to qualify for a given rating in the scholarship category. A large number of poor quality activities could not qualify one for meeting the ranking criterion of significant achievement in Areas A or B. In all cases it is to be understood that the ratings are to be based on the candidate's relative standing in relation to departmental and school peers. Finally, because those rating a candidate must rate the

scholarship category not only as to number, but also as to importance and quality of activities, they must possess substantial familiarity with those activities. The candidate for tenure may also present to the Tenure Committee(s) an evaluation of the quality and importance of scholarship from qualified people outside of the department or school.

Area A (Primary Importance)

Peer reviewed journal publications. This activity will qualify as one of primary importance in all cases where evidence of peer review is provided and the article appears in journal article form. Articles that satisfy this category must be publically available.

Generally, articles which appear in journals that are of limited distribution or in journals with little impact will be viewed as less significant than articles which appear in significant regional and national journals. Impact may be measured in a variety of ways including journal reputation, distribution, and frequency of citation. Peer-reviewed journal articles with a single author may be viewed as more significant than journal articles with multiple co-authors.

AREA B (Secondary Importance)

Those activities listed in Area A which were not used or not deemed to qualify as of primary importance may qualify in Area B. Examples of this type of activity include research monographs, scholarly books, book chapters, textbooks, textbook chapters, refereed conference proceedings, presentations at meetings, presentations at research seminars, publications in trade journals and in-house journals, book reviews, written cases with instructional material, instructional software, publically available assessment material or course development material, and successful grant applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR PROFESSIONALLY RELATED SERVICE: Service can be broken into three categories: service to the university, service to the profession, and service to the community. These categories may overlap.

Service to the university may take place at the university, school, or departmental level. This may be evidenced by the acceptance, membership, and performance on committees. Chair positions on such committees will be weighted more heavily than mere committee membership, as will committee assignments which are more demanding. Service to the university is expected of all faculty.

Service to the community must be professional in nature and utilize the candidate's area of academic expertise. Service to the community may include activities such as speech making

in the area of the candidate's expertise, membership on boards, consulting, popular publications, and participation in professional seminars or workshops.

Service to the profession may include activities such as acting as a reviewer or editor for scholarly publications, chairing, or acting as a discussant in scholarly meetings, membership on thesis or dissertation committees, or any other activities that contribute to the profession.

As in the category of scholarship, not all service activities are equally important. Although determination is to be made separately in each case, the evaluation committee shall be guided by the understanding that national service is more important than regional, school committee service is more important than departmental committees, and speeches to statewide audiences are more important than local speeches to local clubs.

Common Sense and Professional Approach:

It is clear that no document of criteria and procedures can substitute for professional evaluations by one's peers, guided by common sense in the process. It is incumbent upon the committee members to obtain as much pertinent information concerning the candidate with respect to the categories considered as is possible and prudent, within the framework of due process and fairness. When in doubt concerning certain informational inputs, the committee should seek clarification, including, but not limited to requesting the candidate to appear before the committee.

This document is to serve as the essential path toward selection of the most qualified candidates for tenure. Tenure is earned by strong academic achievement, not by filling boxes and jumping through artificial hoops.

**JOHN B. GODDARD SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
TENURE EVALUATION REPORT**

NAME: _____ DEPARTMENT: _____

SCHOOL: John B. Goddard School of Business & Economics

DATE(S): _____
 Department School Dean Provost

Criteria	Department Committee				School Committee				Dean				Provost			
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Inadequate	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Inadequate	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Inadequate	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Inadequate
Teaching																
Scholarship. Professional activities such as research and other contributions to knowledge, leadership in professional organizations, active pursuit of professional competence, and evidence of professionally-related experience.																
Service to the institution , i.e., service on department, school or university committees and task forces, student advisement, other types of recognition, and professionally related service.																
Adherence to Professional Ethics	Yes ?	No ?			Yes ?	No ?			Yes ?	No ?			Yes ?	No ?		