COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

TENURE DOCUMENT

I.   Introduction

The College of Science Tenure Document supplements the basic tenure policies of Weber State University as outlined in the WSU Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM) Sections 8 and 9. Candidates and evaluators are expected to know and comply with the University policies relating to tenure as well as with the requirements and explanations given in the COS document.

The purpose of tenure and the procedure employed in its being granted to eligible faculty are identified in PPM 8-11 to PPM 8-27. Faculty are expected to become thoroughly versed with this portion of the PPM, as well as with Section 9 dealing with Academic Freedom, Rights, Responsibilities, and Due Process.

II.   Criteria

Candidates would normally be teaching faculty who are expected to have at least half-time teaching responsibilities but who could have other assignments agreed to, in writing, by the Department Chair and the Dean. The basic minimum degree requirement is the attainment of the earned Ph.D. in the discipline of primary responsibility. Exceptions involving a closely related discipline or another doctorate must be considered carefully by the various evaluators at the time of hiring and be approved in writing at that time. The probationary period is explained in PPM 8- 23 and 8-24. Candidates who are given credit towards tenure through service at other institutions shall provide evidence of those external institutional accomplishments within their general application.

The four specific criteria upon which evaluation of the candidate is made appear below. Additional details of each criterion can be found in PPM 8-11. Candidates should clarify their roles, their responsibilities and the extent of their own work in all activities. The nature of some activities is such that it is hard either to classify them or to judge them. For example, directing student research involves teaching but may also involve significant scholarship by a candidate. Similarly, a funded grant may qualify as scholarship or as service. In like manner, evaluators may not be familiar with the workload connected with some committees. Candidates should try to classify their work but should be aware that evaluators may reclassify it based on the available evidence.

Keeping current on new developments in the candidate's discipline, areas of specialization, and areas of curricular responsibilities is expected. The candidate must provide evidence of continued professional development while at Weber State University. The quality and significance of these activities as well as the quantity should be documented by the candidate and considered by the evaluators. See PPM 8-11 for more details. The normal expectation is that the majority of the required teaching, scholarship, and service contributions be accomplished after

the candidate has arrived at WSU. Exceptions could include contractual agreements made at the time of hiring and years granted towards tenure for work done elsewhere.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The College of Science is committed to improving diversity, equity, and inclusion in mathematics and the natural sciences, and values efforts by faculty to help achieve this goal. Faculty of the College of Science are strongly encouraged to incorporate these values into their teaching, scholarship, and/or service. In addition, faculty should highlight their efforts toward this goal, and the results, in the appropriate section of their review documentation. The various reviewing entities will look favorably upon meaningful efforts to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion in our student body, faculty, and staff, to better support the communities we serve.

A.   Teaching

Effective teaching is the most important duty of faculty members at Weber State University. Teaching is defined as the facilitation of learning irrespective of context or process and incorporates activities that occur inside and outside the classroom. Teaching includes instruction in both the knowledge and the skills associated with a particular discipline. Teaching is an ongoing activity that involves continual development, including collaboration with peers and exploration of new teaching approaches designed to improve student learning outcomes.

Teaching may include, but is not limited to, the following activities:

- Providing classroom, laboratory, field-based, and online instruction
- directing and mentoring student research, either individual or embedded course-based undergraduate research (CURES)
- fostering community-engaged learning experiences
- student guidance or professional preparation
- improving and developing course(s)
- developing appropriate assessment instruments
- implementing active learning environment in the classroom
- utilizing other high impact teaching practices

The candidate's teaching competency and effectiveness will be systematically evaluated by students, peers, and administrators. A high degree of success in effectively teaching current and accurate information and in assessing the student's mastery of the course materials is required, using methods appropriate to the courses taught, recognizing the candidate's academic freedom in the choice of teaching methods. The candidate will be evaluated on the basis of overall effectiveness in the teaching of the subject at the appropriate level for the course. Instruction should be consistent with the approved course syllabi, lead to fulfilling the department curriculum objectives, and fulfill faculty responsibilities to students (PPM 9-5). See PPM 8-11 for more details.

All forms of teaching, and all preparatory activities in service of teaching, will be given consideration by the evaluators based on their merits. However, it is the candidate's responsibility to document the quality and effectiveness of their teaching or preparatory activities. In addition, the candidate should decide how to categorize teaching activities that overlap with those of Scholarship and Service (see those sections below).

A.1. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates should consult the PPM (PPM 8-11.IV.E.) for detailed information about evaluation criteria. Candidates should demonstrate their accomplishments as teachers and their ongoing efforts to improve their teaching. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

Peer Review

While student evaluations are important in assessing certain skills related to teaching, they are not sufficient for a complete appraisal of a candidate's teaching abilities. The purpose of the peer review (PPM 8-11.IV.D.3) is to facilitate the evaluation process primarily through evidence-gathering regarding teaching effectiveness. Evidence may include:

- representative examples of teaching materials,
- assessment measures,
- classroom observations,
- student work, and
- student perceptions of teaching effectiveness (i.e. course evaluation)

Peer review promotes a more accurate understanding of teaching effectiveness by compiling and assessing documentation provided by the candidate to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

It is incumbent upon candidates to provide evidence that they are competent in three different elements of teaching: Subject Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Assessment of Student Learning. The candidate's professional file should serve as an effective summary of teaching activities but should not be an exhaustive treatment. The candidate's self-assessment, which may include representative examples of teaching materials, assessment measures, and student work, should be made available to the Peer Review Committee. Peer reviewers should interpret this information in terms of department and college expectations and summarize, without rating, the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the designated areas.

Student Evaluations

During the candidate's probationary period, student evaluations must be completed for each course. Data acquired from these student evaluations should be summarized. *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.*

A.2. Teaching Ratings

Teaching ratings should emphasize the candidate's history of reflecting on their performance and responding to deficiencies with effective measures to improve student learning. Candidates shall be rated based on evaluations at all levels of instruction in which they are engaged. Please note that any evaluation that is less than **Good** in this category is not acceptable.

Excellent
Candidates will be rated excellent when evaluations indicate that they have consistently been teaching at a level of competence and have made a sustained effort to improve the areas of Subject Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Assessment of Student Learning. A rating of excellent requires outstanding performance at all levels of instruction in which the candidate is engaged.

Good

Candidates will be rated good when evaluations indicate that they have consistently been teaching at a level of competence in the areas of Subject Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Assessment of Student Learning. Although deficits in one or more of these areas may exist, there is evidence that the candidate has addressed and reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

Unsatisfactory

Candidates will be rated unsatisfactory when evaluations indicate that they have consistently been lacking competence in at least one of the areas of Subject Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Assessment of Student Learning. There is minimal evidence that the candidate has addressed or reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

B.   Scholarship

We define scholarship as those activities that advance and disseminate scientific or pedagogical knowledge. The listing of several different possibilities does not imply that an individual should address all of them. Any activity meeting all of the following criteria may be considered as scholarship for tenure:

1. The activity includes an external peer-review of original material created by the candidate.

2. There is a final product or outcome directly related to the reviewed material.

3. The final product or outcome represents a creative contribution to the candidate's field of interest or area of assignment (including education and pedagogy), or constitutes interdisciplinary scholarship.

Category I – Scholarly activities that satisfy the three criteria above.

- scholarship published in refereed journals or discipline-related published work (i.e., edited volume)
- publication of textbooks, manuals, government reports, and other media that was subject to critical editorial review and formal acceptance procedures (i.e., standardized protocols, analytical methods, etc.)
- granted patents
- successful peer-reviewed external grants (federal/national funding agency)
- authoring peer-reviewed contributed papers and presentations for professional conferences

Category II – Scholarly activities that may or may not satisfy the three criteria above.

- authoring invited papers and presentations
- presentations at professional conferences
- submitted external grants/contracts/manuscripts under review
- University funded projects (Hemingway, RSPG, ARCC, etc.)
- supervision of student research that results in a presentation or student report/publication
- publication of in-house books and manuals, including online material

- community-based research or similar professional activity that results in a formal report or presentation
- publication of book reviews, article reviews, or professional commentaries

B.1. Evidence of Scholarship

All types of scholarship will be given consideration by the evaluators based on their merit, but it is the candidate's responsibility to document the significance, impact, and quantity of their scholarship. Significant scholarship is judged as such by peers, and influences and informs policy- and decision-making in relevant groups or institutions. A candidate producing notably significant scholarship may require fewer items to receive a given rating than would otherwise be required. Evaluating entities and candidates are encouraged to obtain independent evaluation of scholarly work from within or outside of the university to assist in establishing the relative merits of the candidate's scholarship. Ratings will also consider the extent to which a candidate has a history that will support continued productivity. This could include grants, collaborations, detailed research plans, or formal student training programs. In addition, the candidate should decide how to categorize scholarship activities that overlap with those of Teaching (see section above) and Service (see section below).

B.2. Scholarship Ratings

Excellent
A rating of Excellent is reserved for a consistent pattern of exceptional scholarship. This rating requires 2 or more items of Category I augmented with items from Category II scholarship and is supported by a consensus among the candidate's peers. Excellent scholarship is characterized by productivity that is integrated, sustained, and successful. A rating of Excellent requires that the candidate has a history that is likely to support continued productivity in scholarship.

Good
A rating of Good is associated with substantial accomplishments in scholarship. This rating requires 1 item of Category I scholarship, augmented with items of Category II scholarship that are recognized by peers as significant contributions. A rating of Good requires that the candidate has a history that is likely to support continued productivity in scholarship.

Satisfactory
At a minimum, one item of Category I scholarship is required to obtain a Satisfactory rating. A rating of Satisfactory requires that the candidate has a history that is likely to support continued productivity in scholarship.

Unsatisfactory
This rating shall be given to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the Satisfactory category.

C. Professional Service

Professionally-related service is defined as those activities that provide value to the institution, community, or professional organizations. Service includes, but is not limited to, activities

such as:

- department, college, and university committees, task forces, and projects
- participation in professional organizations
- professionally-related community engagement
- academic advising
- administrative service
- consulting

All levels of institutional service (department, college, university) will be considered and evaluated based on their merits. Service to the profession includes activities such as acting as a reviewer of scholarly publications, chairing sessions at scholarly meetings, serving as an officer of a professional organization, and any other activity that contributes to one's profession in a meaningful way. Administrative roles, such as program coordinator or department chair, constitute service activities. Service to the community must be professional in nature and utilize the candidate's area(s) of academic expertise. Community service may include activities such as membership on boards, publishing in the popular press, advising advocacy groups, and participating in seminars or workshops.

C.1.   Evidence of Service Effectiveness

Candidates should consult PPM 8-11. IV.G. for detailed information about evaluation criteria. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the quality, quantity, and significance of their service activities, and any leadership roles that they may have fulfilled. For all activities, the emphasis should be on the quality of the service and not on the level of the service. For service outside the institution, candidates are encouraged to provide independent evaluation of the extent and significance of their activities. For all activities, the candidate should decide how to categorize service activities that overlap with those of Teaching and Scholarship (see those sections above).

C.2.   Service Ratings

Significant service in one area is sufficient for a rating of Excellent if the candidate has played a leadership role that led to a substantial positive outcome.

Excellent
Candidates shall be rated excellent in service if they have provided consistent, outstanding leadership within the department, college, university or professional organizations. This is evidenced by service activities that have positively impacted the mission and goals of the institution or of professional organizations. Candidates may be rated excellent with respect to assigned administrative duties if they set appropriate goals and achieve most of them, and if they are consistently rated excellent by their immediate superiors and subordinates, as appropriate.

Good
Candidates shall be rated good in service if their leadership within the department, college, university or professional organizations is recognized as above average. This is evidenced by service activities that have positively impacted the mission and goals of the institution or of professional organizations. Candidates shall be rated good in administration if they set appropriate goals and achieve many of them, and if they are consistently rated good by their

immediate superiors and subordinates, as appropriate.

Satisfactory

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in service if they accept and perform in an acceptable manner those duties constituting an average share of the workload in the department, college, university or academic community. Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in administration if they perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated satisfactory by their immediate superiors and subordinates, as appropriate.

Unsatisfactory

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in service if their activities are deemed below average. An unsatisfactory rating may result from refusal to serve the university in any capacity; being inactive or passive in any area of service shall also be viewed negatively. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in administration if they fail to perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated by their immediate superiors and subordinates as unsatisfactory.

D.   Professional Ethics

The ethical canons, standards of behavior, and philosophy in the PPM Section 9 (Academic Freedom, Rights, Responsibilities, and Due Process) are specifically endorsed, and candidates and evaluators shall consider these to be general criteria for evaluation. Serious deficiencies of a candidate in one or more of these areas shall result in a "no" rating in this category. A "no" rating must be documented by the evaluators.

III.   Evaluation

The candidates for tenure will be evaluated in each of the above categories according to the following definitions and methods:

A.   Definitions of Rating Categories

Candidates must satisfy the minimum degree requirements (PPM 8-11) and the probationary period (PPM 8-23).

Ratings in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service will be made according to the guidelines for each listed above. The rating of Professional Ethics will be made by simply indicating "yes" or "no."

B.   Method of Evaluation

1. In order to achieve tenure, the candidate must satisfy the minimum degree and probationary period requirements, exhibit ethical behavior, and must qualify with at least the minimum standards in one of the following channels:

Channel	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
1	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory
2	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good

3	Good	Good	Good
4	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory
5	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent

2. The composition, selection, and operation of department and college tenure committees shall be governed by the specific provisions of the PPM relating to the granting of tenure (PPM 8-15 and 8-16).

3. A majority vote of the committee members (including the vote of the committee chair) shall determine a committee's recommendation. The committee will base its decision on all available evidence, including, but not limited to, evaluations by students (teaching category only), peers, and supervisors; reports of classroom visits; copies of publications; and the candidate's professional files.

4. All evaluative committees or individuals will attach a letter to the Tenure Evaluation Summary Form detailing reasons for the recommendations.