December 16, 2014

TO: Deans, Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors

FROM: Daniel J. Bernardo  
Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Formal Tenure Progress (Third-Year) Review

Please share these instructions with your chairs and directors, and ask that they distribute copies to all of those people for whom Formal Tenure Progress (Third-year) Review is required. This distribution is important to prevent misunderstandings about the Third-year Review process.

THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

I have attached the following to this memo: a description of the procedure for the Third-year Review, a copy of the form to be completed by the chair and by the dean and chancellors where applicable, and a copy of the advisory recommendation to be completed by each tenured faculty member in a given tenure unit. This recommendation is advisory. It must include a justification and explanation for one of the following recommendations:

- Progress Satisfactory – If current performance continues, the granting of tenure and promotion is likely.

- Some Improvement Required – Current performance falls short of expectations for tenure and promotion. Defects must be corrected to make the granting of tenure and promotion likely. This rating may also be appropriate when a large project that will be required for tenure (e.g., publication of a book, receipt of a nationally competitive grant) has not yet been completed even if good progress has been made to date.

- Substantial Improvement Required – Current performance falls far short of expectations for tenure and promotion. Major adjustments must be made before the granting of tenure and promotion will be likely.
• Unsatisfactory – Current performance falls so far short of expectations for tenure and promotion that performance probably cannot be sufficiently corrected in time for the tenure and promotion review.

If some or substantial improved performance is needed, the recommendation should indicate where improvement is needed. The chair's and dean's analyses should take into account these advisory recommendations, but should not be based simply on a frequency count of the alternative recommendations.

When a department includes tenured faculty members or candidates for third-year review who are located at urban campuses, research and extension centers or other sites remote from Pullman, a single meeting of tenured faculty should be held over AMS. Per EPM #29, Third-year Reviews for faculty at urban campuses require the inclusion of an analysis and recommendation by the campus chancellor.

Materials should be assembled in the order indicated below. The cover material should be prefaced by a table of contents. The table of contents does not need to be numbered by page. The following order is required:

Third-year Tenure Progress Review form (includes dean(s) and chancellor(s) where applicable, academic director(s), department chair(s) and the secondary department chair(s) evaluation in the case of a joint appointment;

Current curriculum vitae;

Past Progress Towards Tenure Reviews;

Statements (e.g., context, scholarship, service) are optional and written by the faculty member (limited to two pages each). The context statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research stations or regional campuses, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances such as commitments to student groups. Scholarship and service are often adequately represented in the vitae. However, if the faculty member would like to clarify the themes of his or her scholarship and/or service activities, he or she may provide short descriptions here;

Teaching portfolio (includes goals, responsibilities, evaluations, results and appendix, or exhibits). The narrative is limited to five pages. The teaching
portfolio should be presented in the approved format. Refer to the Faculty Manual, Section III: http://www.wsu.edu/Faculty_Senate/FM_contents.htm.

Faculty recommendations; and

Supporting materials (for example, it is appropriate to include a statement on the faculty member’s progress toward tenure from their formal mentor(s)).

Third-year tenure progress reviews are due in the Provost’s Office no later than April 6, 2015. Attached is a list of faculty for whom a formal third-year tenure progress review is expected. The date for the third-year review appears in the letter of offer for each faculty member. That date must be followed unless the date has been changed with the agreement of the faculty member, department chair, dean and provost.

cc: Legal Counsel
    HRS
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE FOR FORMAL (THIRD-YEAR) TENURE PROGRESS REVIEW OF FACULTY WITH TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENTS

1. All tenure-track faculty members will ordinarily have a "formal (third-year) tenure progress review." The Third-year Review will occur in the spring of the third year of a tenure-track appointment for those faculty newly hired with no credit toward tenure. If credit toward tenure was given upon appointment, as specified in the employment agreement, or negotiated between the chair, the dean, and the Provost's Office, such reviews should also be scheduled for spring. Whether time spent on leave without pay is counted toward tenure and is included in determining the third-year of employment should be decided by the provost when the leave is approved.

2. As stated in the Faculty Manual, "the tenure progress review shall be conducted by those eligible to perform final tenure evaluations, and follow similar procedures as apply to final tenure consideration, except for external professional evaluations." In the process, the following steps must be included:

   A. For each candidate, all tenured faculty members in his/her tenure unit must have access to a file that includes all information relevant for assessment of tenure progress. When a department includes tenured faculty members or candidates for Third-year Review who are located at regional campuses, experiment stations or other sites remote from Pullman, a single meeting of tenured faculty should be held over AMS. After review and discussion among the faculty, each tenured faculty member in the department or unit will submit a written review, on a standard form developed for this purpose (see attachment), with comments that specifically address the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member under review and his/her progress toward tenure. If some or substantial improvement required is the final determination for a candidate, the area(s) that need improvement must be specified.

   B. After consultation with the tenured faculty and with the academic director at the regional campus for regional campus faculty, the department chair will make a recommendation of progress satisfactory, some improvement required, substantial improvement required or unsatisfactory along with a recommendation to retain or not retain the faculty member. This is to be forwarded to the dean. The dean or analogous administrator, after consultation with the regional campus chancellor or his or her designee for regional campus faculty members, will prepare a separate recommendation and forward the recommendation to the provost, along with the completed forms prepared by the tenured faculty and the chair's recommendation. Taking this information into account, the provost will
then decide on a rating of progress satisfactory, some improvement required, substantial improvement required or unsatisfactory.

C. After completion of the review by the provost, the provost will send the candidate a statement of the outcome. The department chair must meet with the candidate to discuss the review. In the event the department chair is unavailable, the meeting and discussion should be held with the dean (or chancellor in the case of faculty at regional campuses).

D. This process will be completed before the end of spring semester.

3. The Third-year Review should be used to convey appropriate information to non-tenured faculty. Areas of strengths and weaknesses should be identified, with emphasis on encouragement and development of plans for needed improvement. Where the record is unsatisfactory, nonreappointment may be warranted. In that case, the faculty member will be removed from a tenure-track position and given an appropriate terminal contract.
**THIRD-YEAR TENURE PROGRESS REVIEW**

PLEASE FILL OUT FORM COMPLETELY

NAME_________________________WSU ID#_________________________

TITLE_________________________

DEPARTMENT_________________________

CANDIDATE'S MAILING ADDRESS_________________________

YRS @ WSU_________DEGREE_________DEGREE YR_________TENURE ELIGIBLE YEAR________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL ACTION – *Indicate numbers for each.</th>
<th>AREA*</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>DEAN</th>
<th>CHANCELLOR</th>
<th>PROVOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS SATISFACTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT MATERIAL ATTACHED:

____ CURRENT VITAE
____ PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEWS
____ CONTEXT STATEMENT (OPTIONAL)
____ TEACHING PORTFOLIO
____ RESEARCH AND SERVICE STATEMENTS (OPTIONAL)
____ RECOMMENDATIONS OF TENURED FACULTY
____ REPRINTS/CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS
____ SUPPORTING MATERIALS_________________________

SUMMARY OF REVIEW CRITERIA:

CHAIR'S ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION:

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE_________________________DATE_________________________

CHAIR'S NAME (TYPED)_________________________
ACADEMIC DIRECTOR’S ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION

ACADEMIC DIRECTOR’S SIGNATURE __________________ DATE ________________
ACADEMIC DIRECTOR’S NAME (TYPED) ________________________________

DEAN’S ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

DEAN’S SIGNATURE ___________________________ DATE ________________

CHANCELLOR’S ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION:

CHANCELLOR’S SIGNATURE _______________________ DATE ________________
PLEASE COPY THE ATTACHED PAGE ON LIGHT YELLOW PAPER
Faculty should be aware that upon request, the candidate has the right, by law, to be provided the entire third-year review file, including evaluations.

THIRD-YEAR TENURE PROGRESS REVIEW FOR ________________________________

This form is advisory regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure. It is to be completed by all tenured faculty members in the department and forwarded through their principal administrative officers to the provost. Together with other material, the information furnished by this form will be used in evaluating the qualifications of the faculty member under review. The form will not become part of the candidate's personnel file. Information relating to assessment of the candidate is available through the department office. You are requested to review it.

You should clearly indicate, by marking the appropriate recommendation below, whether you think this person is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. All recommendations must include a justification and explanation. Written comments should provide a discussion of your recommendation, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and assessing his or her progress toward tenure. If some or substantial improvement is needed, please specify what aspect of the candidate’s performance needs improvement. Include frank, objective comments concerning such matters as research and creative scholarship, teaching effectiveness, service to the institution and potential for growth.

In some circumstances, the third-year tenure progress review can lead to nonreappointment. This would occur only when performance and progress toward tenure are judged to be so unsatisfactory after review by the unit’s tenured faculty, the chair, the dean, and the provost, that there is little likelihood that the candidate will meet the criteria for tenure.

RECOMMENDATION

_____ This person is making satisfactory progress towards tenure.

_____ Some improvement in performance is required before this candidate's progress toward tenure can be considered satisfactory.

_____ Substantial improvement in performance is required before this candidate's progress toward tenure can be considered satisfactory.

_____ The performance and progress toward tenure of this person are unsatisfactory.