

College of Arts and Humanities

TENURE AND POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

The purpose of this document is twofold: to aid reviewers in the evaluation of candidates seeking tenure in departments within the Telitha E. Lindquist College of Arts and Humanities and to establish criteria for post-tenure review. Its primary method is to provide guidelines to ensure as objective evaluation as possible.

TENURE REVIEW

Standards have been set to assure that faculty who exhibit high performance levels in Teaching, Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity, and Service receive a positive tenure recommendation. Diversity within the standards accommodates faculty members with different backgrounds, talents, and professional interests. Additional clarification can be found in the tenure document for the Department of Performing Arts. The departments of Communication, English, Foreign Languages, and Visual Arts do not have their own tenure documents.

It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide all levels of review with pertinent information with respect to the categories considered. When in doubt concerning information provided, reviewers should seek clarification, including, but not limited to, consulting department tenure documents, in departments where such documents are available and requesting the candidate to appear before them. In all cases, due process, procedure, reasonableness, and fairness should be followed.

To be recommended for tenure a candidate must:

(1) Have an earned terminal degree in the discipline of primary responsibility. The recognized and accepted terminal degrees in the College of Arts & Humanities include:

- Ph.D.
- D.M.A.
- D.A.
- Ed.D.
- M.F.A. in all studio areas of the Visual Arts
- M.F.A. in all creative areas of Dance and Theatre
- M.F.A. for the area of creative writing in English
- M.F.A. for the area of digital media in Communication

Degree requirements shall be interpreted as requiring a degree from an institution accredited by an institutional accrediting agency that is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education or the foreign equivalent of such a degree. Equivalence of foreign degrees shall be evaluated by the regular faculty of the academic department and will be reviewed and approved by the college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Foreign degrees may be accepted as terminal degrees with documented evidence of equivalency and approval by the discipline as evidenced by its general acceptance in other universities and upon approval by the department and the Dean. In the event the terminal degree is not in the candidate's discipline, a terminal degree in a closely related discipline (as approved in writing by the Provost, in consultation with the Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom, and Tenure Committee and the Dean) shall be required.

(2) Provide evidence of appropriate performance in the following categories. In order to receive a positive recommendation for progress toward tenure or to be recommended for tenure, a candidate

must fulfill the requirements of at least one of the following channels. For each category, the listed ratings within each channel are the minimum ratings necessary for a positive recommendation.

Channel	Teaching	Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity	Service
I	Excellent	Good	Adequate
II	Good	Good	Good
III	Excellent	Adequate	Good
IV	Good	Excellent	Adequate

(3) Must adhere to professional standards of behavior as outlined in PPM Sections 9-4 through 9-8.

DEFINITIONS OF CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES

Candidates for tenure will be evaluated in the following three categories: (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity, and (3) Service. Within each category the faculty member being considered for tenure shall be rated as excellent, good, adequate, or inadequate.

(1) Teaching

Teaching is defined as instruction conducted under the auspices of Weber State University. Teaching embraces activities related to instruction and learning that occur inside and outside the classroom, including community-engaged teaching, international experiences, and other diverse modalities and settings. Teaching activities may include, but are not limited to the following: instruction; advising, supervision, guiding, and mentoring; developing learning activities; sustaining teaching effectiveness; and community-engaged teaching.

Teaching performance will be evaluated by students, peers, and administrators. The teaching category will also include the preparation and use of teaching materials intended for instructional use. Candidate should demonstrate their accomplishments as teachers and their continual efforts to improve their teaching.

Candidates will be evaluated on the basis of their individual full-load requirements.

(2) Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity

Publication as a form of scholarly activity includes formally published professional work which has been subject to editorial review and formal acceptance processes. Research reports and published articles that have been peer reviewed and accepted will also be included.

Creative activities must be interpreted rather broadly because of the diversity of disciplines within the college. Creative activities include artistic works, musical compositions and performances, theatrical productions, radio and television works, creative writing, and any other such creative projects deemed worthy of consideration by the individual departments. Specific limitations or parameters will be defined by department tenure documents, in departments where such documents are available. In these documents it is essential that the performance or artistic areas of the college define categorical boundaries for their individual disciplines. In departments without tenure documents it will be incumbent on the candidate to not only demonstrate an appropriate degree and quality of creative activity but also demonstrate promise for sustained achievement in the field.

Professional activity may be interpreted rather broadly as professional and scholarly activities that are of a nature that do not typically culminate in publications. Membership in professional organizations shall generally be considered as "service." However, important positions within professional organizations are to be considered favorably within this category. Involvement in workshops at regional or national levels should also be considered. Professional activities should include continuing formal post-graduate education that goes beyond mere maintenance of one's credentials within the discipline or field, development of entirely new fields or areas of expertise which prove of benefit to both the candidate and the department, presentation of professional papers at scholarly meetings, as well as funded research. Research may be interpreted rather broadly, but normally shall 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.

Classifications to be included under scholarly/creative/professional activity are as follows in their order of importance. (Area A is more important than Area B.)

•Area A (Primary Importance)

Publication of specific research or theoretical work in the form of a book or monograph.

Publication of articles subject to review and formal acceptance processes.

Textbook publications. The key to including textbooks under publication lies in the fact that good textbooks improve teaching effectiveness not only of the author, but more importantly, for others in the profession.

Publication, performance, and exhibition may also take the form of electronic presentation.

Creative projects are generally disseminated through public performances, concerts, exhibitions, presentations, and readings. It is understood that quality in a creative area is judged most often by subjective means that may vary greatly. It is not the purpose of this document to define the judging criteria. Specific criteria are the responsibility of the departments involved.

Important positions in significant academic associations. This activity will qualify as one of primary importance when it is combined with significant professional activity in the field of academic interest to the association.

Consulting in the field of expertise. This activity will qualify as one of primary importance when such activities are non-routine and of significant importance.

Organizing and presenting seminars, workshops, and conferences in one's field of expertise. This activity will qualify as one of primary importance when such activities are of significant importance.

Research which does not result in publication will normally not be considered in Area A. When such research activities are significant, however, they may be included in Area A.

Other professional activities not specifically identified herein shall be evaluated by the committee within the implied guidelines established in this document. Candidates should consult with the department chair and dean to establish legitimacy and appropriateness for tenure evaluation purposes.

•Area B (Secondary Importance)

Activities not deemed to qualify in Area A may qualify in Area B.

Delivery of scholarly papers at academic meetings, subsequently published in a Proceedings Volume. Although of lesser importance than papers that face formal acceptance review processes, including papers delivered at meetings and subsequently published in academic journals, papers published in Proceedings are significant. Again, Proceedings of national meetings are normally of greater importance than locally sponsored meetings of local interest. There may be exceptions that could qualify Proceedings to be included in Area A; candidates will need to provide justification.

Delivery of scholarly papers at academic meetings. Although a paper may not have been subsequently published, the oral delivery to one's peers at academic meetings is a form of publication to be included in this criterion. A presented paper not subsequently published, however, is of lower importance than a published article. As a general rule, papers that have been selected for presentation in a formal evaluation and review process are more important than papers "accepted" sight unseen by the meeting organizers.

Publications for readers other than academic community. Publication of books which popularize material from one's academic field for readers normally outside that academic field and applied trade publications are included in this publication classification.

Grant work and associated output. Significant professional development may take place through research/creative projects. Successful grant work, however, is typically placed within the service category. To be considered in the scholarly/creative/professional activity category, the funded project will normally meet the requirements of subsequent publication/presentation of results. If the results are subject to formal review and acceptance, similar to those attending academic journal acceptance, the publication/presentation may be considered as equivalent, subject to determination of quality and importance.

Research reports, monographs, working papers, etc., not subject to formal academic review and acceptance may qualify in Area B, as determined by the evaluation committee.

Other professional activities not specifically identified herein shall be reviewed by the evaluation committee within the implied guidelines established in this document. Candidates should consult with the department chair and dean to establish legitimacy and appropriateness for tenure evaluation purposes.

(3) Professional Service

Service includes such activities as: speech making in the area of the candidate's expertise; consulting; committee work; popular publications; university, college, department, community and professional workshops or seminars; participation in executive development; assumption of duties and projects relating to operation of the department, college, and university, and participation in similar professional activities. Attendance at professional meetings, active membership in professional societies, and similar activities enhance the reputation of the college beyond the "maintenance of professional credentials," which accrues directly to the candidate. The criterion is that service must utilize in a professional way the candidate's area of academic expertise. Service to the university through committee assignment is apparent. Chair positions on such committees will be weighted more heavily than committee membership. Service activities can be of primary, secondary, or tertiary

importance. Although determination will be made separately in each case, the evaluation committee shall be guided by the understanding that national service is more important than regional, university service is more important than college service, college service is more important than department service, and speeches to statewide audiences are more important than those to local clubs.

RATINGS

Candidates for tenure will be evaluated in the following three categories: (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity, and (3) Service, noted on the Channel table on page 2. A rating of excellent, good, adequate, or inadequate, shall be determined and interpreted relative to the candidate's discipline, department, and peers. All levels of review should refer to department tenure documents in departments where such documents are available for department criteria and examples of activities appropriate for tenure.

The following general description of the ratings shall serve as a guide to the evaluation committees:

•Excellent: The candidate will be rated excellent if normal duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in an outstanding manner.

The candidate will be rated excellent in the **TEACHING** category if rated consistently outstanding or well above good by students, peers, and administrators.

The candidate will be rated excellent in the **SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE/ PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY** category upon evidence of (1) excellent performance in Area A, or (2) a minimal rating of adequate performance in Area A combined with excellent performance in Area B.

The candidate will be rated excellent in the **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE** category if rated consistently outstanding by peers and administrators.

•Good: A rating of good in any category means the candidate has demonstrated a substantial degree of achievement above adequate levels of performance.

The candidate will be rated good in the **TEACHING** category if rated consistently better than adequate by students, peers, and administrators.

The candidate will be rated good in the **SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE/ PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY** category upon evidence of (1) good performance in Area A, or (2) excellent performance in Area B, or (3) adequate performance in Area A, combined with good performance in Area B.

The candidate will be rated good in the **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE** category when the candidate is performing at a level judged by peers and administrators to be above average significant duties.

•Adequate: The candidate will be rated adequate 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, college, and university.

The candidate will be rated adequate in the **TEACHING** category when rated consistently adequate by students, peers, and administrators.

The candidate will be rated adequate in the **SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE/ PROFESSIONAL**

ACTIVITY category upon evidence of (1) adequate performance in Area A, or (2) good performance in Area B.

The candidate will be rated adequate in the **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE** category when significant activities and performance levels indicate that the candidate is doing the bare minimum.

•**Inadequate:** Shall be given to a candidate who does not meet the minimum requirements of the adequate category

ADHERENCE TO PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

The College of Arts and Humanities endorses the statement of "Professional Responsibilities, Ethics, and Standards of Behavior" contained in the Weber State University Policy and Procedures Manual, Sections 9-4 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 Report, with a "yes" or "no" response. If the response is "no" then there must evidence to support that decision. Letters indicating the findings of the evaluation committees and the dean shall indicate strengths and weaknesses in this regard.

POST-TENURE REVIEW (Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 8-11)

PURPOSE

The post-tenure review shall be based on criteria separately defined from the award of tenure with the following intent:

1. Demonstrating the tenured faculty member's growth and development in the discipline;
2. Communicating to the faculty member specific areas in need of improvement related to performance in scholarship, teaching, and service, and
3. Enhancing each individual's future productivity.

PROCEDURES

After tenure is granted, faculty will be evaluated every five years or more often at the discretion of the department chair or dean or at the request of the faculty member. The post-tenure review is for the most recent five years, or the time period since the last formal review. Within the College of Arts and Humanities post-tenure review will evaluate the following professional activities:

1. Teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative evaluation;
2. The quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity, and
3. Service to the profession, school, and community.

Dated Guidelines and Process for Faculty Members Undergoing Post-Tenure Review

To occur by:	(Please note: dates will be adjusted yearly for weekends and holidays.)
Oct 15	The department chair or dean will notify the faculty member of the upcoming post-tenure review.
Oct 15	Deadline for a faculty member to initiate a request for a Post-Tenure Review.
Dec 1	Deadline for the department chair and faculty member to jointly select a

	three-member team for peer evaluations.
Feb—Tuesday following Presidents' Day Holiday	The faculty member under review submits an updated vitae (or the College of Arts & Humanities Annual Faculty Reports) and any other pertinent artifacts to their department chair.
Mar 2	The faculty member under review and the department chair receives the findings (in writing) of the team for peer evaluations.
Mar 16	The faculty member under review may submit a written response concerning the findings of the team for peer evaluations to their department chair.
Mar 16	The faculty member under review may request, in writing, an optional interview with the department chair to discuss the faculty member's teaching, scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity, and service.
Mar 31	Deadline for the department chair to interview the faculty member under review if the interview was requested by Mar 16th.
Apr 10	Deadline for the department chair to submit the post-tenure review report to the faculty member under review.
Apr 17	Deadline for the faculty member under review to request, in writing, an optional meeting with the department chair to discuss the report.
Apr 30	Deadline for the department chair to submit the post-tenure review report to the dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file.
May 15	Deadline for the faculty member under review to submit a written response concerning the post-tenure review report to the dean.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, student evaluations shall be administered and compiled by an impartial third party. Each tenured faculty member shall have student evaluations administered in at least two courses each year. The two courses to be evaluated will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. If the faculty member and the chair cannot come to agreement on which two courses should be evaluated by the students, the choice of courses to be evaluated will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean after consultation with the faculty member and the chair. The results of those evaluations shall be seen by the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries of these evaluations will be kept on file in the offices of the chair and the dean.

PEER EVALUATIONS

Peer evaluation involves seeking feedback from informed colleagues for the purposes of improving the faculty member's teaching practice (formative assessment) and/or evaluating it (summative assessment). There are many possible components to peer evaluations, such as observing classroom teaching, evaluating and giving feedback on course design and assessment practices, and reviewing examples of student products. Formative evaluations, if done well, can help improve teaching and inform summative decisions.

The team for peer evaluations will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. Faculty members under review are encouraged to submit teaching materials to the review team. The peer evaluation review for the College of Arts and Humanities will be limited to three pages of comments and observations. The results of those evaluations shall be provided to the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries of these evaluations will be kept on file in the offices of the chair and the dean.

REMEDIAL ACTIONS BASED ON POST-TENURE REVIEW

Tenured faculty members are expected to maintain the requirements they fulfilled to earn tenure, as noted by the channels in the chart below. Failure to maintain the requirements will result in a rating of “inadequate” in teaching, in scholarly/creative/professional activity and/or in service.

Channel	Teaching	Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity	Service
I	Excellent	Good	Adequate
II	Good	Good	Good
III	Excellent	Adequate	Good
IV	Good	Excellent	Adequate

If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is not found to 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. The faculty member, the department chair, and the College dean must mutually decide upon a timeline for remediation. A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action governed by due process pursuant to the standards described in the Policy and Procedures Manual, Sections 9-9 through 9-16.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

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

Faculty who apply for the PCP shall be considered to have passed their five-year post tenure review if they receive peer evaluation (see Peer Evaluations outlined above) **and** the chair and the dean both state in their letters that the faculty member has met the standard for the raise.

Faculty who apply for PCP but do not receive positive reviews from the chair, dean, and/or provost will not be deemed to have undergone a post-tenure review. Those faculty will undergo reviews at their designated times according to the other sections of this post-tenure review document.