

POLICY ON TENURE  
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY  
Approved by Faculty Senate, 10/8/2020

POLICY ON TENURE

A. PREAMBLE

This tenure document has been designed to aid in the evaluation of candidates seeking tenure in departments within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (COSBS). Standards are set to ensure that only those faculty members who exhibit a high overall level of performance receive a positive tenure recommendation. Diversity within the standards accommodates faculty members with different backgrounds, talents, and professional accomplishments. In the tenure process, a candidate's total professional career will be considered, including performance at other institutions of higher education. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the committees with pertinent information related to his or her teaching, scholarship, and service to make a tenure recommendation.

B. INSTRUCTIONS TO TENURE COMMITTEES AND CANDIDATE

Department and college tenure committees are responsible for evaluating the performance of tenure candidates. A committee must provide candidates substantial evidence for, and explanation of, ratings of their teaching, scholarship, and service, and detailed recommendations for improvement. A committee may request additional information from a candidate or seek clarification of information provided by a candidate, but is not obligated to do

- meet the standards of one of the tenure channels and provide evidence of appropriate performance, and
- adhere to professional standards of behavior as outlined in PPM 9.3 through 9.8.

#### D. CATEGORIES FOR TENURE EVALUATION

Three categories are delineated as areas of evaluation for tenure consideration: teaching, scholarship, and service. Although most activities will fall within one area or another, aspects of some activities may be described in different areas. For example, aspects of undergraduate research may be described in Teaching (mentoring activities), Scholarship (conference presentations or publications), and Service (BIS supervision). Similarly, the activities of clinical faculty may be categorized as Service to the community (seeing patients) or the discipline (clinical supervision), Teaching (using case studies), and Scholarship (conference publications or presentations). Within each area, the faculty member being considered for tenure shall be rated as excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Each category for evaluation is to be rated as noted under the section on ratings.

#### E. TEACHING

Effective teaching or instruction is the most important duty of faculty members at Weber State University. Deficiencies in teaching cannot be compensated for by exceptional performance in the other areas. Teaching is simply defined as any transfer of relevant knowledge or skills from faculty to students, irrespective of

semester. Data acquired from these student evaluations may be summarized. Other teaching assessments may also be used to assess teaching, including ones used for departmental or general education assessment. Furthermore, it is incumbent on candidates to explain how the course evaluation data reflect their teaching effectiveness.

A faculty member's own critical self-evaluation of his or her teaching in a Teaching Profile is also an important source of evidence of teaching effectiveness.



Minimum degree requirements are outlined in PPM 8-6 and 8-11.

## J. RATINGS

### Excellent

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated excellent when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been an outstanding teacher, there is substantial evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, and there is evidence that the candidate has made substantial and beneficial innovations to course material and teaching methods.

#### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated excellent with the publication of one peer-reviewed book or three peer-reviewed articles/chapters, and evidence of additional, ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed article.

#### Service

The candidate will normally be rated excellent when he/she performs a variety of demanding service activities, provides leadership, and exhibits significant impact in his or her areas of service.

### Good

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated good when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been teaching above the level of competence, there is some evidence the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, there is evidence that the candidate has made some worthwhile innovations to course material and teaching methods, and that he/she has addressed and reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

#### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated good with the publication of two peer-reviewed articles/chapters, and evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed article.

0 1 72.024 142.22 Tm0 g0 G[ 0 1 72.024 142.22 Tm0 g0 G[ 0 1 72.024 142.22 un2 0 611 0 0)3(er)Pt1Qq0.000

### Satisfactory

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been teaching at a level of competence, there is little evidence that the candidate used student evaluations and/or other student feedback to improve teaching effectiveness, there is evidence that the candidate has made few innovations to course material or teaching methods, and that he/she has taken action to address any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

#### Scholarship

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory with the publication of one peer-reviewed article/chapter, and a record of ongoing scholarly activity. Notably significant or impactful scholarship may substitute for one peer-reviewed article.

#### Service

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when he/she provides minimal leadership and exhibits minimal impact in his or her areas of service.

### Unsatisfactory

#### Teaching

The candidate will normally be rated unsatisfactory when evaluations by peers indicate that he/she has consistently been lacking competence as a teacher

Tenure /sixth-year Review: Five channels exist for the candidate to follow and be considered for tenure. A candidate must meet or exceed all parts of one channel in order to meet the requirements for tenure.

CHANNEL	TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
I	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory
II	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good
III	Good	Good	Good
IV	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory
V	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent

L. TIMETABLE FOR TENURE ACTIONS

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences will adhere to the dated guidelines for the tenure process found in PPM 8-12.

M. EFFECTIVE DATE

This revised policy on tenure will be effective for all tenure-track faculty members who begin their service after the approval of the policy by the Board of Trustees.

APPENDIX

POLICY ON POST-TENURE REVIEW COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES On tenure will be effective for CICICICIC

Tenure, Termination, and Post- Tenure Review). The post-tenure review uses a process for evaluating faculty performance that differs from that used for the granting of tenure. This process recognizes the academic independence earned by the faculty member. Throughout the review process, the tenured faculty member undergoing post-tenure review shall be presumed to have ratings that are either at or above Good in teaching and Satisfactory in service and scholarship; the burden shall be on the reviewers, based on the evidence provided by the tenured faculty member, to justify the reason(s), if any, as to why the faculty member should be given a lower rating in any category.

The post-tenure review evaluates faculty in all areas of their professional activity including teaching, scholarship, service, and adherence to professional ethics. Post-tenure comes with expectations that faculty remain engaged and productive members of their disciplines and of the greater university community. In the area of service, tenured faculty are expected to be engaged department, college, university, and community citizens who use their knowledge and experience to provide leadership, to serve meaningfully on committees, to mentor colleagues, and to engage with their professional peers and with the broader public. These expectations can best be summarized with the term “good campus and community citizenship.” In addition, tenured faculty members are expected to teach well and remain actively engaged in scholarship relevant to their disciplines and areas of specialization. This policy recognizes that tenure is a necessary and vital guarantee of intellectual freedom. Tenure also functions as an investment in the future of the institution and in the common good that the institution serves. The post-tenure review process acts as a measure of the success of this investment.

## II. INSTRUCTIONS TO THE REVIEWERS AND FACULTY UNDER REVIEW

Post-tenure review shall be based on the COSBS or Departmental Annual Reviews and the faculty member’s short narrative summary. The initial post-tenure review will occur five years after the faculty member has received tenure, with subsequent reviews occurring every five years thereafter and covering only the five-year period since the previous post-tenure review. For the review, the faculty member will (1) assemble his or her Annual Reviews from the preceding five years, (2) append a cover sheet (see Attachment 1), and (3) include the short narrative summary. The summary should address teaching, scholarship and service achievements. For the purposes of the post-tenure review, the faculty member must meet the requirements for a Satisfactory rating for scholarship, and service and a Good rating for teaching as specified in PPM 8-11, Section IV.I (Descriptions and Clarifications of Ratings).

All faculty members subject to post-tenure review shall be notified by the Dean by September 15 of the calendar year of the scheduled review as per the timetable outlined in Section IV below. In the fall semester following the fifth anniversary of the original award of tenure or promotion to Full Professor, and every five years thereafter, the faculty member will submit the above documentation to his or her reviewing party and schedule a formal review. The review will follow the timetable outlined in Section IV below. Tenured faculty will fall into one of three categories:

1. Tenured but not fully promoted. The faculty member will meet with his or her department Chair for the formal review. In lieu of a review by his or her Chair, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once the review is completed, the department Chair or college committee Chair will forward the results to the Dean for oversight of the review process. A faculty member who undergoes review for promotion to Full Professor during the fifth academic year of his or her post-tenure review cycle is exempt from undergoing a separate post-tenure review for that cycle. The ratings for the promotion review will substitute for the compilation of the previous five Annual Reviews. Even if a faculty member does not meet a channel for promotion, the ratings could still indicate a positive post-tenure review, using the criteria described above. If a faculty member undergoes review for promotion to Full Professor during a year in which he or she is not scheduled for a post-tenure review, that process will nevertheless be equivalent to a post-tenure review, and the faculty member's five-year post-tenure review cycle will begin anew.

2. Tenured and fully promoted. The faculty member will meet with his or her department Chair for the formal review. In lieu of a review by his or her Chair, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once the review is completed, the department Chair or college committee Chair will forward the results to the Dean for oversight of the review process.

3. Tenured department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans. The department Chair/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean will meet with the Dean for the formal review. In lieu of a review by the Dean, the department Chair/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once the

review is completed, the Dean or college committee Chair will forward the results to the non-reviewing party (either the Dean or college committee Chair) for oversight of the review process.

### III. ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING POST-TENURE REVIEW

In 2014-15, WSU created a program called the Performance Compensation Plan (PCP). This plan allows tenured faculty members who have held the rank of full professor for at least five years to apply for a permanent raise.

The application process requires that eligible faculty members provide a detailed report of their teaching, scholarship and service over the most recent five academic years. Criteria for the Performance Compensation Plan mirror university requirements for promotion from associate professor to professor. The faculty member's department chair and dean review the application and each makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost makes the final determination of award.

Because the standard for Performance Compensation is higher than that of the post-tenure review, a faculty member who applies for the PCP shall be considered to have passed her/his five-year post-tenure review if the department chair and the dean both make a positive recommendation to the provost. A faculty member who applies for PCP, but does not receive positive reviews from the department chair and/or dean, will not automatically be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review. However, if the department chair and the dean agree that the faculty member meets the requirements for a successful post-tenure review according to the criteria for that process, the dean will write a letter indicating that fact, and the faculty member will be deemed to have passed a post

two fall semesters after the unfavorable review. If the follow-up review determines that progress is not being made, the faculty member will be reviewed by the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee during the subsequent spring semester. The Committee will forward its findings to the Dean, who will make the final recommendation. A favorable review at this stage of the remediation process will satisfy the post-tenure review until the next scheduled review in three years (maintaining the overall five-year rotation). An unfavorable review by the Dean at this stage will be referred to the Provost.

#### V. TIMETABLE FOR POST-TENURE ACTIONS

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences It304 Tf1cw2 08.4 Tf g3d4 Tm0 g0 G[ )TJ. Behavioral Se



