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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) Health Administration Services Department (HAS). These standards for tenure review will provide guidance in the tenure process for health administration services 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 Health Administrative Services Department, candidates must:

1. have attained and earned Doctorate in their field or related discipline, and maintain, as appropriate to their teaching responsibilities, the following:
   a. current professional certification;
   b. current license;
   c. recent professional experience in health care;
2. hold the rank of associate professor or higher;
3. have satisfied the normal probationary period of six years; and
4. have met or exceeded the DCHP Faculty Computer Literacy Standard.

If at the time of initial academic appointment, a faculty member has less than a Doctorate degree, the time served prior to achieving the Doctorate degree could be considered as fulfilling part of the normal six year probationary period if other criteria as stipulated in this document are met during that time. 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.

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 to develop students’ professional skills in health services administration, health information management, or health promotion and their related disciplines; facilitating and evaluating student learning; and in general managing student learning experiences effectively. Teaching includes that done in formal classroom, clinical or laboratory settings; in internet-based settings; or in other instructional media such as independent study courses, conferences, or workshops.

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 (see the criteria on the current peer review summary), student evaluations (see the criteria on the current student evaluation summary) and the provision of other information by the candidate to be reviewed within the context of the college-maintained professional file.

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 the faculty member teaches (see PPM 8-11, 2.a.1).

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 Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Peer Review Satisfactory Student Evaluations 3.0 to 3.6</td>
<td>Peer Review Good Student Evaluations 3.7 to 4.3</td>
<td>Peer Review Excellent Student Evaluations 4.4 to 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations Less than 3.0</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) 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 professional discipline and increase the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher. While the
facultymemberis 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. The quality and quantity of effort and the
results obtained are the criteria for evaluation. It is the expectation that each candidate will
submit evidence of activity in either area 1 or area 2 in each segment of the formal review
process (i.e. during the first 4 years and during the final 3 years of the probationary period).

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.)
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.
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, opinion papers or other professionally
reviewed written material.
6. Other activities which are appropriate to the category.

Definition of Ratings 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of activity in scholarship or professional activities</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed) + evidence of additional activities</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed) + evidence of additional activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professionally Related Service: Professional 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 such as boards, speech making 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 Professionally Related Service: Candidates shall be rated satisfactory (minimum rating in channel A) if they accept and perform in an acceptable manner those duties constituting an average share of the work load in the department, college, university or community. "Average" among Health Administrative Services faculty has included service at the state and national levels in professional organizations, service on both college and university level committees, and administrative assignments within the college and department.

Adherence to Professional Ethics: The Health Administrative Services 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 shall be evaluated against those standards.

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.