



2. professor (see PPM 8-1).

Activities completed in the past three years will be reviewed for the third-year review and activities complete

## Third-Year Review Minimum Requirements

<b>Channel</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service</b>
A	Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

completed since your last promotion. Data acquired from these student evaluations should be summarized in this section. It is incumbent on candidates to reflect upon their course evaluation data and use them as part of their efforts to improve their teaching effectiveness. Identify trends and progress across semesters. Describe what has been done well and any areas for improvement. If applicable, discuss how your student evaluations were used to improve the quality of teaching and student learning. Provide a link to your course evaluations. (See PPM 8-11 IV, D.IV.G., and your College tenure document). A faculty

evaluations and may not be used as the only source of evidence of instructional effectiveness.

- h. Peer Review. Summarize the feedback received from peer evaluations and how you have used the feedback to improve your teaching. Provide peer evaluation letter(s).
- i. Development of new courses and/or programs within a college as well as significant modifications of existing courses or programs.
- j. Advisement and availability to students, e.g., office hours and informal contact.
- k. Teaching Philosophy. Provide your statement of Teaching Philosophy

Documents for the determination of rating in this category are peer review, student evaluations, teaching portfolio, and other items addressing the performance level in areas a g above.

1. **Peer Review.**

academic year of the formal tenure evaluation (3rd or 6th year). The Peer Review Committee will be appointed by October 1st of the peer review year by the department chair. The committee members will be chosen by the candidate in consultation with the chair. The peer review committee may be the department Ranking Tenure Review Committee (see PPM 8-15). If the peer review committee is not the department Ranking Tenure Review Committee then a minimum

and the chair cannot agree on the makeup of the committee, the decision will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean.

2. **Student Evaluations.** The faculty member will submit student evaluations for each course. Data acquired from these student evaluations should be summarized by the candidate. It is incumbent on candidates to reflect upon their course evaluation data and use them as part of their efforts to improve

anotfaculty member instructional effectiveness. (see PPM 8-11).

3. **Teaching Portfolio.** Each candidate will develop a teaching portfolio, which is the teaching section of the autobiographical from within the professional file. The portfolio should include a summary of teaching performance and a statement of teaching philosophy. Supporting documents, such as projects, presentations, evidence of assessment techniques, and syllabi, which are referenced, should be hyperlinked within the appropriate section in the professional file.

### **Definitions of Ratings for Teaching**

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

**Good:** The candidate will be rated good if teaching duties required of all faculty members are performed consistently in a more than satisfactory manner. Good implies commendable and desirable levels of achievement. A rating of good implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels. Candidates shall be rated good (minimum rating in channels B, D and E) if they are consistently rated by students and peers as good and if the candidate provides evidence of additional valuable accomplishments in one or more areas a h above.

**Satisfactory:** The candidate will be rated satisfactory if teaching duties required of all faculty members

progress toward tenure.

**Unsatisfactory:** This rating shall be given to a candidate who does not meet the minimum requirements of the satisfactory category.

## Category II: Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the individual's effectiveness as a professor significance, impact, and quality of scholarly activities. A candidate is not expected to perform equally in scholarship activities. For all collaborative/group work, the candidate will explain their role and contributions in the project and final product including how authorship was determined.

A candidate may include as evidence the following scholarship activities:

- a. Publications, such as books and/or articles in refereed regional or national journals. (Non-reviewed publications should be included in the category III.)
- b. Peer-reviewed external grants and/or granted patents.
- c. Presentation of professional papers at international, national, or regional conferences, or workshops. (Conferences or workshops in which the candidate had only supporting roles, such as introducing a speaker or a topic or chairing a session should be listed in category III.)
- d. Developmental projects, such as university-funded proposals, classroom and/or clinical research, ongoing professional clinical practice or other long-term professional association with a health care organization, service agency, or other field-based settings appropriate to the candidate's discipline. (Activities that are service in nature should be listed in category III.)
- e. Professional improvement, such as additional degrees beyond the terminal degree, formal post-graduate study, and/or certification of advanced training.
- f. Published book reviews, published monographs, opinion papers, or other professionally reviewed written material.
- g. Supervision of student research that results in a presentation or student report/publication.
- h. Research on community engaged learning pedagogy to improve teaching and learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).
- i. Community research involving collaboration with community partners.
- j. Other scholarly activities not listed above.

**Definition of Ratings for Scholarship:** . The rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent will be determined based on the following for the formal interim and final tenure reviews. For additional reviews (4th and 5th year), the rating assigned shall reflect the committee's judgment of the candidate's progress. **Note:** While each candidate is not expected to be equally active in all areas listed above, **one peer-reviewed publication such as books and/or articles in refereed regional or national journals, plus other scholarship is required for a satisfactory or higher rating in the formal final tenure review.**

**a. Excellent.** Candidates may be rated excellent if they meet the basic expectations defined above AND provide evidence of more than one (1) refereed determination

admissible by academic and/or professional peers. Evidence of presenting papers or relevant topics in a professional setting, developing courses and/or programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise shall be viewed positively. A positive rating in all of these indicated activities should not be necessary to receive a satisfactory rating in this area.

To receive a rating of Satisfactory, the candidate must:

- By the third year review, have a peer-reviewed (referred) publication or a plan for publication to include all of the following: 1) name of journal that article will be submitted to (or book publisher); 2) topic or title of article or book; 3) an abstract explaining the project; 4) project timeline, and 5) date it will be submitted to the publisher.
- By the sixth year review, have a minimum of one (1) peer-reviewed (referred) publication.

**d.**

- j. Student Advising and/or other Student Success Activities. Student advisement activities and/or informal mentoring that assists students in achieving their educational potential, including culturally relevant support for underrepresented students, such as advising cultural clubs, student organizations, occur based on affinity identity.
- k. Mentoring and/or training faculty related teaching, scholarship, and/or professional service
- l. Other administrative and/or professionally related service not listed above.
- m.



rated by their immediate superiors and subordinates as unsatisfactory.

#### **Category IV: Professional Behaviors/Collegiality/Ethics**

University faculty members have a unique role in exemplifying professional behaviors, collegiality, and ethics as they work and cooperate with those around them for a common purpose. Faculty members are responsible to themselves and to their students, colleagues, profession, community, and ultimately the University in engaging in collegiality, professionalism, and ethics. The manner in which faculty members go about their job duties should adhere to the standards of Professional Behaviors as specified in PPM 9-4 through 9-8, uphold personal, professional, and academic integrity, and be compatible with the and long-term goals.

Collegiality is often best evaluated at the program and department levels. Those who are rated as

State University. Weber State values academic freedom and simple disagreement is not considered non-

If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is found to not be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of their discipline, they are responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and both the University and College are expected to assist through developmental opportunities. A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action governed by due process pursuant to the standards described in PPM 9-9 through 9- 17.

### **ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING POST-TENURE REVIEW**

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

The application process requires that faculty provide a detailed report of their teaching, scholarship and service over the most recent five years. In order for the faculty member to be eligible for the raise, the member would again earn promotion to full professor. The department chair and dean evaluate that record and write letters indicating whether it would qualify the faculty for promotion to professor. The provost makes the final decision on which university faculty are awarded raises.

Faculty who apply for the PCP shall be considered to have passed their five-year post tenure review if the chair and the dean both state in their letters that the faculty member has met the standard for the raise.

Faculty who apply for PCP but do not receive positive reviews from the chair and/or dean will not automatically be deemed to have undergone a post-tenure review. However, if the chair and the dean agree that the faculty member meets the requirements for a successful post-tenure review according to the standard criteria, the dean will write a letter indicating that fact, and the faculty member will be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review.

Even if the chair and/or dean do not support the PCP application, the faculty member will be deemed to meet the post-tenure review standards if the provost awards them a PCP. The lack of support regarding post-tenure review from the chair and/or dean shall not be deemed a failure of the faculty member to pass a post-tenure review. Instead, those faculty who do not receive post-tenure review support from the chair and dean will undergo reviews at their designated times according to the other sections of this post-tenure review document. If the designated year of review is the current academic year, the post-tenure review must occur before the end of that academic year.