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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) Respiratory Therapy Program (RT). These standards for tenure review will provide guidance in the tenure process for respiratory therapy 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 Respiratory Therapy Program, candidates must:

1. have attained the Master’s Degree in their field, or a related discipline, plus current professional certification within the candidate’s primary area of responsibility (see PPM 8-11)
2. hold the rank of instructor-specialist, instructor or higher; (see PPM 8-1);
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 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 years (see Formal Faculty Reviews); and
4. have met or exceeded the DCHP Faculty Computer Literacy Standard.

Workload

Respiratory therapy faculty members seeking tenure are expected to teach a minimum of 24 credit hours per year as defined by WSU policy. Equivalent responsibilities will be determined by the program director, which may include administrative assignments or other WSU assignment(s).

Formal Faculty Reviews
A candidate is formally reviewed in the third and sixth years of their probationary period.

It is acceptable and recommended that a two year review occur under the direction of the program director to assist the faculty member in the tenure process. This assessment may be done with or without the assistance of a program committee at the sole discretion of the program director. The candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service shall be evaluated. The program director shall send a written assessment to the candidate and the DCHP Dean and shall submit the report for inclusion in the candidate’s professional file. If desired, the candidate may submit a letter of clarification to their professional file.

In addition to conducting an assessment of the candidate’s progress, the program director will mentor the candidate in the tenure process by providing them with written examples of program and college expectations relative to the ratings identified in this document. The director shall send a copy of the mentoring guidance to the candidate’s dean and shall submit a copy for inclusion in the candidate’s 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>
</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 teaching, clinic or laboratory instruction, on-line courses independent study course, teaching at conferences or workshops and student activities directly related to classroom instruction. (see PPM 8-11). Teaching in the classroom, laboratory 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.
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 seeing tenure shall undergo peer review. Peer review may also occur prior to formal review as part of a mentoring process designed to cultivate the candidate’s potential in an atmosphere separate from evaluation. The peer review process shall include at least two random (unannounced) classroom observations by each member of the candidates peer review committee. (see PPM 8-11, 2.a.3)
Student Evaluations. To assess ongoing teaching performances, every 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 their teaching philosophy and a summary of scholarship, 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 Unsatisfactory Student Evaluations Less than 3.0</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>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>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate or no attempts to improve teaching performance</td>
<td>Documented efforts to improve teaching performance</td>
<td>Documented substantial efforts to improve teaching performance</td>
<td>Documented continuous improvement in teaching performance</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 and increase the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher. Scholarship and professional activities include:

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 sessions 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 settings appropriate to the candidate’s discipline. Examples of this
requirement include educational or clinical research, current clinical practice in respiratory care facility which is accredited by JCAHO, 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, or additional or increased expertise through self-study and/or maintaining clinical competence through employment at a JCAHO accredited hospital or medical center.

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

7. Other activities that appropriate to this category.

Definitions for Rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities: The faculty member’s demonstration of scholarship and professional activities 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>&lt;20 points</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed) + other activities to equal 22 points</td>
<td>1 (one) publication (refereed) + other activities to equal 27 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance point schedule is as follows:

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 Care research (including publication) - 10 points
Completion of Doctoral Degree - 10 points
Poster/Podium Presentation at International/National academic respiratory conferences - 10 points
Poster/Podium Presentation at Regional or State academic respiratory conferences - 6 points
Current professional practice at a JCAHO Accredited Hospital - 10 points
Presentation at local/state/national Allied Health profession conference - 2-10 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 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: Faculty shall be encouraged to participate in a variety of administrative roles, professional activities, and service to the university, college and department. The following list of activities and points awarded is provided as a guideline, and may be amended by a majority vote of the full-time faculty. Activities which are not included on the list are to be considered and a point value agreed upon by the Department Ranking and Tenure Committee.

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 alone.
2. Membership on professional related boards/committees, secondary school presentations and public education concerning respiratory health.
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 department and college.
7. Appointments to local, state and national professional organizations/boards.
8. Development activities which are service in nature, e.g., consulting and work experiences. Professionally-related community activities including speech making.

Definitions for Ratings for Professional Related Service: Professional related service is defined as those activities which provide professionally related value to the community, the institution, or professional organizations.

To be rated as making satisfactory progress towards tenure, a faculty member should accrue a minimum of 12 points per year. This allows an individual faculty member to adjust professional commitments annually, but establishes a minimum acceptable contribution level. The following guidelines are provided as targets for TOTAL points accrued at the formal review intervals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>2nd year review</th>
<th>3rd year review</th>
<th>6th year review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>36 points</td>
<td>72 points</td>
<td>126 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44 points</td>
<td>88 points</td>
<td>154 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>56 points</td>
<td>112 points</td>
<td>196 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Professional Organizations (i.e., AARC, USRC)

Organizational membership - 1 point
Committee member, USRC - 2 points (3 for chair)
Board Member, USRC - 4 points
Officer, USRC - 5 points
Committee Member, AARC - 4 points (6 for chair)
BOD/Officer, AARC - 8 points

Professionally Related Organizations (e.g., ALA, AHA, CR Foundation)

Membership - 1 point
Committee member of related organization - 2 points (3 for chair)
Community/Civic Board/Committee - 1 points
Professional Licensing Board member (DOPL) - 8 points (10 for chair)

University Level

Committee Member (Standing Committee, Administrative Committee, Ad Hoc Committee, Task Force) - 4 points (8 for chair)
Faculty Senate - 4 points
Senate Executive Committee - 10 points

College Committees

Curriculum and General Education committee member - 4 points (6 for chair)
Ranking and Tenure committee member - 4 points (6 for chair)
Marriott Development committee member - 3 points (4 for chair)
Marriott Research committee member - 2 points (3 for chair)
D. Wade Mack committee member - 2 points (3 for chair)
Technology committee member - 4 points (5 for chair)
AdHOC College committee member - 4 points (6 for chair)

Departmental Committees and Service

Peer Review in department - 2 points (4 for chair)
Ranking and Tenure committee member - 2 points (4 for chair)
AdHOC Department committees - 2 points (4 for chair)
Advising - 1 point per 4 students
AAS - 2 points per 4 students
AS - 3 points per 4 students BS

Department Administrative Service

Chair/Program Director - 12 points
Director of Clinical Education - 8 points
Student Services Coordinator - 6 points
Distance Learning Coordinator - 6 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 Respiratory Therapy 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.