Purpose

The purpose of this document is to outline the performance standards, criteria and the procedures used to evaluate faculty members (candidates) for tenure in the Weber State University (WSU) Dental Hygiene Department (DH). These standards for tenure review will provide guidance in the tenure process for dental hygiene faculty members. Diversity within the standards accommodates faculty members with different backgrounds, talents, and professional interests. The following standards meet or exceed the expectations of the Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions (DCHP) and WSU.

Although a candidate's total professional career will be considered, including performance at WSU and other institutions of higher education, it is necessary for the candidate to provide evidence of continued professional growth throughout the probationary period.

Eligibility

To be eligible for a recommendation for tenure in the Dental Hygiene Department, candidates must:

1. have attained an earned Master’s Degree in their field or related discipline, plus current professional certification or license or equivalent in a health profession (see PPM 8-11);
2. hold the rank of instructor-specialist, assistant professor, associate professor or higher (see PPM8-1);
3. have satisfied the normal probationary period of six years. If at the time of initial academic appointment, a faculty member has less than a Master’s degree, the time served prior to achieving the Master’s degree will not be considered as fulfilling part of the normal six year probationary period. Tenure may not be granted to anyone who has held a tenure track appointment (at WSU or other accredited institutions of higher education) for less than three years;
4. have a formal review at the third and sixth years during the probationary period. It is acceptable and recommended that additionally, a two year review occur under the direction of the department chair to assist the faculty member in the tenure process. 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's teaching, scholarship, and service will be evaluated. The department chair will send the written assessment to the faculty member and the dean of DCHP. This assessment will be included in the faculty member’s professional file. If desired, the faculty member may submit a letter of clarification to their professional file; and
5. have met or exceeded the DCHP Faculty Computer Literacy Standard.
Content of Formal Review

The candidate is responsible for updating their professional file and reviewing policies related to the process prior to the initiation of the review. In the third and sixth years of review, the candidate is required to place in their professional file a brief report that includes a statement of teaching philosophy and a summary of scholarship and professional activities, and professionally related service. A separate file containing supporting documentation should be maintained by the candidate. This file (or portfolio) should be available for review by the peer and review committees (see PPM 8-13).

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 candidate to provide evidence of appropriate performance. During the process, the reviewers may seek clarification, including but not limited to requesting the candidate to appear before the committee.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship and Professional Activities</th>
<th>Professionally Related Service</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A candidate’s evaluation in each category must meet or exceed standards in any one channel to meet the requirements for tenure; a candidate may not meet the requirements by fulfilling parts of more than one channel. The candidate need not select any specific channel.

*Listings under channels are not all inclusive. Potential additions may be added as the profession evolves. The candidate may submit, for peer consideration, other items under the channels they deem equitable under teaching, scholarship and professional activities, and professionally related service.*

Definition of Categories and Criteria

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. This category includes formal classroom, clinic or laboratory instruction, on line or other media class delivery and student activities directly related to classroom, clinic, laboratory or online or other media instruction (see PPM 8-11). Teaching is also development and teaching of clinical simulation activities which parallel actual clinical activities and problems, as well as developing and teaching on-line and outreach independent study courses. To be evaluated in the teaching category and to have the year count towards the probationary period, a faculty member must teach a minimum of 12 credit hours per year or its equivalent as determined by the director/chair and the dean. Teaching in the classroom and/or clinical setting is the faculty member’s primary responsibility. Excellence in the classroom and clinical setting is a department expectation.
The faculty member will be evaluated in each of the following areas:

1. Subject matter mastery, i.e., content areas, comprehensiveness of content, currency of content, and objectivity of coverage.
2. Curriculum development, e.g., courses' fit with other courses, course revisions, and new courses developed.
3. Course design, e.g., instructional goals and objectives, content coverage, appropriate teaching methods, and appropriate assessment methods.
4. Delivery of teaching, e.g., methods (lecture, discussions, labs, distance learning, etc.), skills (speaking, explaining), and aids (handouts, AV, technology enhanced, etc.).
5. Assessment of student learning, e.g., tests (multiple-choice, essay, oral, etc.), papers, projects, clinical, practicum, and grading practices.
6. Use of assessment outcomes to improve student learning.
7. Advisement and availability to students, e.g., office hours and informal contact.

Documentation of performance in the category of teaching will come from a peer review, student evaluations and the faculty member’s teaching portfolio, statement of teaching pedagogy and the self-evaluation of the candidate to be reviewed.

Peer Review. Every candidate seeking tenure will undergo peer review. Peer review may also occur before the formal review as part of a mentoring process designed to cultivate the faculty member’s potential in an atmosphere separate from evaluation (see PPM 8-11, 1 a. 3). A notebook/binder is prepared and presented to the peer reviewers where they can peruse the contents that give examples of course materials and course syllabi, sample examinations, course work, faculty statements regarding teaching techniques and documentation of teaching, at length. Also, if desired, a peer review of a classroom session may take place.

Student Evaluations. In an attempt to chart ongoing theory and/or clinical teaching performance, each academic year every faculty member will have student evaluations administered and compiled by an impartial third party in at least two of the courses faculty member teaches (see PPM 8-11, 2.a.1).

Faculty Statement. Faculty will develop a statement of teaching pedagogy and contributions to teaching excellence which includes their teaching philosophy and a summary of scholarship, professional activities, and professionally related service activities. Faculty should make documentation of these items available through the development of a faculty portfolio.

Definition of Ratings for Teaching: The faculty member will be evaluated in each of the above categories and a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent will be determined. A general description of each of these ratings, which will serve as a guide to the evaluation committees, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Less than 3.0  
Teaching Pedagogy  
Unacceptable  

3.0 to 3.6  
Teaching Pedagogy  
Demonstrates expected level of contribution  

3.7 to 4.3  
Teaching Pedagogy  
Demonstrates above average achievement  

4.4 to 5.0  
Teaching Pedagogy  
Demonstrates teaching excellence  

Candidates shall be rated good (minimum rating in Channel C) if they are consistently rated by students and peers as good, relative to other faculty members, and if the candidate provides evidence of having developed new materials, new methods, or other innovative techniques to improve teaching performance.

Scholarship and Professional Activities: Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and/or increase the candidate=s effectiveness as a teacher. Grant-funded research and subsequent publication of the research in a peer reviewed journal has traditionally served as the academic standard for demonstrating scholarship. Submitted manuscripts that have met the rigor of approval by professional peers and are subsequently published are recognized as significant contributions to the profession. While the faculty member is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below prior to the sixth year review, the candidate must submit evidence in area 1; evidence in areas 2-6 can be used to augment a candidate=s file in the area of scholarship.

1. Publications, such as books and/or articles in refereed regional or national journals. (Non-reviewed publications should be included in the category of service.) For example: published, refereed works, printed within a professional journal (published research in the Journal of Dental Hygiene, Journal of Dental Education, Journal of Geriatric Nursing, for example)

2. Presentation of professional papers at international, national, regional or state conferences or workshops. (Conferences or workshops in which the candidate has only supporting roles, such as introducing a speaker or a topic or chairing a session should be listed in the category of service). For example: presentations to local, state, regional or national professional groups (presentation/workshops at the Utah Dental Hygienists= Association annual or semi-annual meetings, presentation at the American Dental Hygienists= Association meeting, etc) A professional groups@ and/or poster presentation or table clinic presentation at local, state, regional or national meeting.

3. Developmental projects, such as funded proposals, classroom and/or clinical research.

4. Professional improvement such as formal post-graduate study or certification of advanced training.

5. Published book reviews, published monographs, letters to the editor, opinion papers or other professionally reviewed written material.

6. Other activities which are appropriate to the category.

Definitions for Rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities: The faculty member will be evaluated in each of the above categories and a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent will be determined. The quality and quantity of effort and the results obtained are the criteria for evaluation. A general description of each of these ratings, which will serve as a guide to the evaluation committee, is as follows:
Candidates shall be rated satisfactory (minimum rating in Channel B) if they meet the minimum requirement of one publication in a refereed journal.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to examine this document, the DCHP document and the WSU document to assist them in designing their long term plan for practicing and demonstrating scholarship.

Professionally Related Service: Service is defined as those activities which provide professionally related value to the community, the institution or professional organizations. A candidate is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below.

1. Membership and positions held in professional organizations. Leadership positions and primary contributor roles will be weighted more heavily than membership or attendance. For example: member of the American Dental Hygienists’ Association, member of American Association of Dental Educators, member of the American Dental Association, serve as an officer in the professional organization etc.

2. Professionally-related community activities such as boards, speech making etc. For example: speech making to community groups; Boy Scout groups, church groups, Anon-professional@ groups, committee assignments in community groups, professional groups, or other volunteer groups. Participation in service to the community as a volunteer (Board of Directors for Donated Dental Services Clinic, advisor to Head Start Program, etc.)

3. Committee assignments at the department, college or university levels.

4. Non-reviewed publications such as newsletters, newspaper and popular magazine articles and media interviews.

5. Participation in professional conferences, workshops and seminars.

6. Administrative assignments within the college.

7. Developmental activities which are service in nature such as consulting and work experience.

8. Other professional service.

Definitions for Rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities: Candidates shall be rated satisfactory (minimum rating in channel A) if they accept and perform in a satisfactory manner those duties constituting an expected share of the work load in the department, college, university or community.

Adherence to Professional Ethics: The Dental Hygiene Department supports the statement of "Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Standards of Behavior" contained in the WSU Policy and Procedures Manual, Section 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 in the evaluation reports, with a “yes” or “no” response. If a no response is given, letters indicating the findings of the evaluative committees, chairperson, and dean shall indicate weakness in this regard. If a finding of unsatisfactory professional ethics is rendered by the College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, the candidate shall have the opportunity to request an expedited hearing by the University Faculty Board of Review to appeal the finding. The Board of Review shall conduct a hearing and produce a decision based on findings of fact. A copy of the Board of Review’s decision shall be returned to the College Committee and their finding shall be available for the dean’s review.