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 Radiologic Sciences (RS). These standards for tenure review will provide guidance in the tenure process for radiologic 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 Radiologic Sciences, candidates must:

1. have attained a Master’s Degree plus have a current active status with the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (see PPM 8-11);
2. hold the rank of instructor-specialist, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor (see PPM 8-1);
3. have satisfied the normal probationary period of six years (see Formal Faculty Reviews); and
4. have met or exceeded the DCHP Faculty Computer Literacy Standard.

Workload

Radiologic sciences faculty members seeking tenure are expected to teach as required by university policy or its equivalent as determined by the department chair (including administrative assignments as determined by the department chair). This is the department’s definition of a full-time radiologic sciences faculty member.

Formal Faculty Reviews

A candidate is formally reviewed in the third and sixth years of their probationary period.
In the second year of a candidate’s progress toward tenure, the department chair will complete an assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure. This evaluation will include specific responses in relationship to the department and college expectations identified in this document and the DCHP tenure document. This assessment may be done with or without the assistance of a department committee at the sole direction of the department chair. The candidate’s teaching, scholarship and professional activities, professionally related service, and adherence to professional ethics will be evaluated. The chair will send the written assessment to the candidate and the DCHP Dean. This assessment will also be included in the faculty member’s professional file. If desired, the faculty member may submit a letter of clarification to their professional file.

The second year evaluation process does not progress beyond the program/department level. When faculty members in the second year of progress toward tenure are to either be evaluated in that year for promotion or have requested an additional review, the director/chair may choose to use the above mentioned evaluation in place of the second year assessment of progress toward tenure (see PPM 8-11).

In the third and sixth years of the probationary period, the candidates must be reviewed at all levels as outlined in the WSU Policy and Procedures Manual (see PPM 8-11).

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 process or behaviors related to organizing and delivering knowledge; evaluating and facilitating learning; and overall, transmitting content to students. The radiologic sciences faculty members’ primary responsibility includes teaching in the formal classroom, clinic or laboratory instruction, and student activities directly related to classroom instruction, development of teaching of clinical simulation activities which parallel actual clinical activities and problems, as well as developing and teaching technology enhanced, outreach, and independent study courses. Teaching excellence is a department expectation and is the faculty member’s primary responsibility.

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 comes from a peer review, student evaluations, and the faculty member's portfolio and statement of teaching pedagogy.

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, 2.a.3).

Student Evaluations. In an attempt to chart ongoing theory and/or clinical teaching performance, each year each 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).
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 Unsat.</td>
<td>Peer Review Satisfactory</td>
<td>Peer Review Good</td>
<td>Peer Review Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations Less than 3.0</td>
<td>Student Evaluations 3.0 to 3.6</td>
<td>Student Evaluations 3.7 to 4.3</td>
<td>Student Evaluations 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) 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. Grant-funded research and subsequent publication of the research in peer reviewed journals 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. With this standard in mind, the Department of Radiologic Sciences recognizes scholarship in two categories:

1. Contribution to professional knowledge; and
2. Contribution to radiologic sciences practice.

These categories are not mutually exclusive and may overlap in their definition but they provide practice based radiologic sciences faculty with options related to demonstration of professional scholarship. The description of these categories is not meant to be encompassing or limiting.

**Definitions for Rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities**: The faculty member’s demonstration of scholarship will be evaluated 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 Unsat.</td>
<td>Peer Review Satisfactory</td>
<td>Peer Review Good</td>
<td>Peer Review Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations Less than 3.0</td>
<td>Student Evaluations 3.0 to 3.6</td>
<td>Student Evaluations 3.7 to 4.3</td>
<td>Student Evaluations 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>
The performance point schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Academic Publications</th>
<th>Professional Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed) + other activities to equal 22 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed) + other activities to equal 27 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-reviewed, academic journal publications - 12 points
Refereed State/Regional publication - 5 points
Entire Textbook publication - 22 points
Chapter in textbook publication - 12 points
Peer-reviewed proceedings' publication - 2 points
Completion of Radiologic Sciences Research - 10 points
Completion of Doctoral Degree - 10 points
Completion of a Post-Doctoral project or concentrated study (course work must be equivalent to 5000 level or above) - 2-12 points
Completion of a Post-Masters internship, project or concentrated study (course work must be equivalent to 5000 level or above) - 2-12 points
Presentation at national professional radiologic sciences conferences - 4 points
Presentation at state/local professional radiologic sciences conferences - 2 points

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 candidate 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: Professional related service is defined as those activities which provide professionally related value to the community, WSU, DCHP, Department of Radiologic Sciences, or professional organizations. A faculty member is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below.

**Definition of Ratings for Professionally Related Service:** The faculty member’s demonstration of professionally related service will be evaluated 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>Ratings</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professionally Related Service points may be accrued by the following activities:

Professional Radiologic Sciences Organization (i.e., ASRT, AIUM, SDMS, ASTRO, ARRT, ARDMS)
Elected or appointed national leadership position - 25 points
Elected or appointed state or regional leadership position - 20 points Organization membership - 3 points

Professionally Related Organizations (Red Cross, Habitat for Humanity, American Heart Association, American Cancer Society)

Elected or appointed national leadership position - 15 points
Elected or appointed state or regional leadership position - 10 points
Elected or appointed local leadership position - 8 points
Membership and active participation - 1-5 points

Faculty Senate

Executive Committee member - 5-10 points
Elected member of faculty senate - 5 points

University level committee assignments

Committee Chairperson - 10 points
Committee member - 5 points
Administrative assignments/projects - 1-5 points

College level committee assignments

Committee Chairperson - 8 points
Committee member - 3 points
Administrative assignments/projects - 1-5 points

Radiologic Sciences department committee assignment

Committee Chairperson - 5-10 points
Committee member - 3 points
Administrative assignments/projects - 1-5 points

Representing the Profession in the Community

Publications in newsletters and popular magazines - 1-5 points
Professional presentations to general public - 1-5 points
Professionally related media interviews - 1-5 points
Paid or volunteer radiologic sciences consulting (e.g., community clinics, screening, patient education) - 1-5 points

Conferences
Participation in professional conferences - 1-5 points  
Participation in professional workshops - 1-5 points  
Participation in professional seminars - 1-5 points

Development

Designing and implementing activities, programs, written material intended to impact the health of individuals, families, or groups in the community - 1-5 points  
Designing an implementing activities, programs, written material intended to recruit individuals into the radiologic sciences profession - 1-5 points

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory (minimum rating in Channel A) if they accept and perform in a satisfactory manner those duties constituting and expected share of the work load in the department, college, university, or community.

Adherence to Professional Ethics: The Department of Radiologic Sciences 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.