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) Department of Clinical Laboratory Sciences (CLS). These standards for tenure review will provide guidance in the tenure process for clinical laboratory science 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 Department of Clinical Laboratory Sciences, candidates must:

1. have attained the Master’s of Science in Medical Technology, or a Master’s of Science or Doctorate Degree in the medical science, health professions, or related discipline, plus current professional certification, license, or equivalent, within the candidate’s primary area of responsibility (see PPM 8-11);
2. hold the rank of instructor-specialist, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor (see PPM 8-1); and
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 could 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 (3) 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 professional activities, and professionally related 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.

Workload

CLS faculty members seeking tenure are expected to teach as required by WSU policy or its equivalent as determined by the department chair (including administrative assignment as determined by the department chair). This is the CLS department definition of a full-time CLS faculty member.

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>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</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, and student activities directly related to classroom instruction, 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 (see PPM 8-11). Teaching excellence is a department expectation and is the faculty member’s primary responsibility.

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 or its equivalent as determined by the department chair and the dean.

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.
8. Development and use of clinical simulation activities in laboratory sessions which parallel actual activities typical of the contemporary health care environment.

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 shall undergo peer review. Peer review may also occur prior to the formal review as part of a mentoring process designed to cultivate the candidate’s potential in an atmosphere separate from evaluation (see PPM 8-11, 2.a.3).

Student Evaluations. In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, each year each faculty member shall have student evaluations administered and compiled by an impartial third party in at least two of the courses the 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 teaching philosophy and a summary of scholarship and
professional activities, and professionally related service. 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 Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Satisfactory Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Good Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Excellent Student Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3.0</td>
<td>3.0 to 3.6</td>
<td>3.7 to 4.3</td>
<td>4.4 to 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy Unacceptable</td>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy Demonstrates expected level of contribution</td>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy Demonstrates above average achievement</td>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy Demonstrates teaching excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates shall be rated good (minimum rating in Channel C, D, or E) 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, new clinical laboratory simulations, or other innovative techniques to improve teaching performance.

Scholarship and Professional Activities: Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher. 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 of professional activity in areas 1, 2, and 3; evidence of involvement in activities identified in areas 4 through 7 can be used to augment a candidate's file in the area of scholarship and professional activities.

1. Refereed/peer reviewed Publications, such as books and/or articles in refereed regional or national journals. (Non-reviewed publications should be included in the category of service.)
2. Presentation of professional papers at international, national, regional, or state conferences or workshops. (Conferences, round table presentations, or workshops in which the candidate had only supporting roles, such as serving as a moderator or introducing a speaker or a topic or chairing a session should be listed in the category of service.)
3. Developmental projects, such as funded proposals, action research, teaching innovations and developments, to include clinical simulation activities.
4. Clinical practice that brings new content/skills into the program’s course content, other long-term professional associations with a health care organization, a service agency, or other field-based setting appropriate to the candidate's discipline. Examples of this requirement include educational or clinical research, current clinical practice in a health care laboratory which is subject to CLIA/HCFA regulation, and which is CAP/JCAHO accredited, or field-based programs or health promotion development projects, research, and continuing consultation or in-service activities. (Projects that are problem-solving in
nature should be listed in this category, and activities that are service in nature should be listed in the service category. The candidate must furnish specific outcome information regarding current clinical practice as a function of professional activity, otherwise it should be listed in the service category).

5. Professional improvement, such as additional degrees beyond the terminal degree, formal post-graduate study, certification of training, attending professional workshops, or additional expertise through self-study, and periodic clinical site visits to observe or participate in current clinical laboratory practices for the purpose of implementation of such practices into the classroom and teaching laboratories.

6. Published book reviews, published monographs, or other professionally reviewed written material.

7. Other activities which are appropriate to the category.

Definitions for Rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities: To be rated as Excellent in this area, the candidate must accrue minimum of 20 performance points, to include at least one (1) refereed national publication. A rating of Good in this area requires a minimum of 15 performance points, to include a refereed publication in a national journal. A rating of Satisfactory (minimum rating in Channel B) requires evidence of publication in refereed national journal and a total of 12 performance points. Performance less than this will be rated as Unsatisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 points and no National Publication</td>
<td>Minimum of 12 points including National Publication</td>
<td>Minimum of 15 points including National Publication</td>
<td>Minimum of 20 points including National Publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance point schedule is as follows:

- Publication in a refereed, national journal - 10 points - (at least one required for tenure)
- Writing a textbook, national publisher - 10 points
- Writing a textbook chapter - 5 points
- Presentation of professional paper or 1-hour workshop international, national, or regional profession meeting - 3 points (2 points state level)
- Presentation of professional paper or 3-hour workshop international, national, or regional profession meeting - 5 points (4 points state level)
- Round Table presentation at professional meeting - 1 point
- Development and implantation of a clinical lab simulation exercise or teaching innovation - 2 points
- Engaging in graduate studies for a Masters or Doctoral degree - 3 points per course
- Active research participation - 2 points
- Published book review or manuscript review for a national publisher - 2 points
- Clinical Practice in CAP/JCAHO accredited lab (25 hours/year) - 3 points
- Clinical site training visits (24 hours) - 1 point
- Clinical Workshops (2.5 contact hours) - 0.25 points
Professionally Related Service: Professionally related 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.
2. Professionally-related community activities including speech making.
3. Committee assignments at the program/department, college or university levels.
4. Non-reviewed publications, e.g., 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, e.g. consulting and work experience which does not bring new skills or course content into the program’s curriculum.
8. Other professional service.

Definitions for Ratings for Professionally Related Service: The candidate for tenure will be evaluated in each of the above categories and a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent shall be determined and interpreted relative to the candidate’s department and college peers. As noted previously, the candidate will be provided with written examples of department and college expectations relative to the ratings in the second year review process.

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

**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 (minimum rating in Channel A) if they accept and perform in a satisfactory manner those duties constituting an expected share of the workload in the department, college, university or community.

**Good:** The candidate will be rated good if normal duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in a more than satisfactory manner. Inasmuch as satisfactory implies commendable and desirable levels of achievement, a rating of good in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels.

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

**Adherence to Professional Ethics:** The CLS department endorses as a minimum standard 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, chairpersons, 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 findings shall be available for the Dean’s review.